ALGORITHMS, METHODS AND RESULTS **OF EVALUATION OF EXPOSITION OF RISK FACTORS**

UDC 614.7 DOI: 10.21668/health.risk/2017.1.02.eng

CHEMICAL FACTORS OF SOIL POLUTION IN TAGANROG AS POPULATION HEALTH RISK FACTORS

G.T. Aydinov^{1,2}, B.I. Marchenko^{1,3}, L.A. Deryabkina¹, Yu.A. Sinelnikova¹

¹Center of Hygiene and Epidemiology in the Rostov region, 67 7-th Line Str., Rostov-on-Don, 344019, Russian Federation

² Rostov State Medical University, 29 Nakhichevanskiy pereulok, Rostov-on-Don, 344022, Russian Federation ³ Southern Federal University, 105/42 Bolshaya Sadovaya Str., Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russian Federation

Our research goal was to perform a hygienic assessment of soil pollution with chemicals on areas aimed for housing and recreation zones in Taganrog, Rostov region. Due to the fact that surface layer of city soils is an open dynamic system which is tightly connected to atmosphere and hydrosphere we treated pollutants content in soils as indicators of territory anthropogenic transformation and technogenic load on population. We used atomic-adsorption spectrophotometry to detect heavy metals and highly efficient liquid chromatography to detect 3,4-benzpyrene content. The results comprise 660 examined soil samples taken from 19 monitoring points; they were examined to detect 7 pollutants content (lead, zinc, copper, nickel, cadmium, chromium, and mercury) over 2008–2015; 144 samples were examined to detect 3,4-benzpyrene content over 2013–2015. We determined that priority pollutants among detected metals were zinc and lead; their content in city soils amounted up to 5.91 and 1.95 maximum permissible concentration. Complex indicator of city soils contamination varied from 1.61 to 2.02, long-term average annual value being 1.83. 3,4-benzpyrene was confirmed to be a substantial risk factor for population health as its concentrations exceeded maximum allowable values in 65.28 % of examined soil samples at average and maximum concentrations (2.45 and 38.05 MPC correspondingly). We recommend to include this chemical into systematic environmental quality monitoring. We detected regional peculiarities of soil pollution with chemicals on city territories aimed for housing, territories of pre-school children facilities, and recreation zones.

Key words: hygienic assessment, social-hygienic monitoring, risk assessment, risk factors, chemical soils pollution, heavy metals, 3,4-benzpyrene, carcinogenic risk.

If we want to provide sanitary and objective epidemiologic welfare and hygienic safety for the population we should improve the helps to substantially decrease influence national system of monitoring based on using the maximum full out management decisions in the sphere of

data components of on "environment - population health" system. It social and hygienic exerted by uncertainty factor when working

Ó Aydinov G.T., Marchenko B.I., Deryabkina L.A., Sinelnikova Yu.A., 2017

Gennadiy T. Aydinov - Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding member of the International Academy of Science, ecology, safety of human and nature, Chief Doctor, Head of the Hygiene Department (email: master@donses.ru; tel.: +7 (863) 251-04-92).

Boris I. Marchenko - Doctor of Medical Sciences, professor, research consultant (e-mail: hie_sfu@mail.ru;

tel.: +7 (863) 464-29-62).

Lyudmila A. Deryabkina – Candidate of Medical Sciences, Head Physician (e-mail: tagcgsen@pbox.ttn.ru; tel.: +7 (8634) 64-29-62).

Juliya A. Sinelnikova - Head of the Social and Epidemiological Monitoring Department (e-mail: sgm@donses.ru; tel.: +7 (863) 251-04-74).

prevention and health improvement. Implementation of modern highly efficient physical-chemical techniques applied for hygienic assessment of environment components becomes really vital as we need to take immediate action aimed at improving domestic risk assessment and analysis methodology including principles of hygienic standardization based on risk assessment [2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13].

Urban ecosystems which form in most contemporary cities are characterized with apparent destructive effects in all environment components including soils in areas aimed for housing. Soil is a most essential environment component and it to a great extent determines environment quality and safety parameters, exerts considerable influence on population health and sanitaryhygienic conditions of life activity. Therefore. data obtained via dynamic monitoring over chemical pollution of soils in urbanized territories and changes it undergoes under technogenic load influence attract most attention among other environment parameters which require hygienic characteristics in social-hygienic monitoring system. Such data are also of great importance when danger is identified and exposure is assessed within the procedure of population risk analysis. City soils are an open dynamic system closely connected with atmosphere and hydrosphere; chemical pollution content in their surface horizon is an evidence of intensity and character of anthropogenic their transformation. Thus, dynamic monitoring geochemical pollution over parameters becomes one of the obligatory directions in studying prevalence of ecologically dependent nosologic forms including malignant neoplasms characterized with specific localizations and process types among population of large industrial centers [1, 8, 10, 14, 18].

3,4-benzpyrene being a 1st danger category pollutant holds a special place among priority xenobiotics and super-

ecotoxicants with high degree of persistence, potential carcinogens and chemical carcinogenesis modifiers which accumulate soils of industrial cities; dangerous chemical pollutants also include lead, chromium, nickel. cadmium, and 3,4 widely benzpyrene is a most spread carcinogenic and mutagenic muiltring hydrocarbon aromatic (MAH) in environment. It can be found in emissions of stationary industrial sources and motor transport. As a result of sedimentation and precipitation, 3,4-benzpyrene pollutes soil mantle, penetrates into vegetation easily and becomes a part of nutritional chains through crop production with apparent biological magnification. So, detecting 3,4-benzpyrene in soils becomes greatly vital in ecological analytics system and in social-hygienic monitoring [1, 3, 5, 15, 16, 17, 19]. Thus, when research on ecological assessment of soil and vegetation pollution level was previously accomplished in Rostov region, detected in a zone 3,4-benzpyere was influenced by emissions from Novocherkasskaya state district power station and its concentrations were considerably higher (up to 39.2 times) than maximum permissible concentration (MPC) [4]. We should note that application of 3,4benzpyrene mass concentration assessment results in social-hygienic monitoring system substantially increases information value of of environment hygienic assessment chemical pollution including soils pollution; this hygienic assessment is then followed by health risk assessment.

Our research goal was to give hygienic characteristics of chemical soils pollution in Taganrog as per data obtained in the course of social-hygienic monitoring allowing for applying highly-sensitive technique of 3,4benzpyrene detection.

Data and methods. When performing complex assessment of chemical soils pollution in areas aimed for housing and recreation zones in Taganrog, Rostov region, we used the results of examining 660 samples tested as per seven pollutants content including lead, zinc, copper, nickel, cadmium, chromium, and mercury; all the samples were taken over 2008-2015. They were taken at 19 monitoring points, 8 of which were located on the territory of municipal pre-school children facilities, 8 were situated in areas aimed for housing and influenced by motor transport emissions (in close proximity to crossroads with heavy traffic), and 3 were in recreation zones (Pushkinskaya embankment, Primorskiy park and "Solnechniy" beach). Unfavorable situation with Taganrog population morbidity malignant neoplasms of determined the necessity to expand a range of sanitary-chemical examinations and to include a procedure of potential carcinogenic risk assessment. Thus, since 2013 research on 3,4-benzpyrene content in environment objects has been performed according to a new state assignment within social-hygienic monitoring frameworks; soils have been included into this research (144 soils samples were examined over 2013-2015). Metal content in soils was determined via atomic-absorption technique with the use of "Kvant-2A" atomic-absorption spectrometer. We applied a technique aimed at measuring benzpyrene mass concentration in soils, grounds and sewage precipitations via highly efficient liquid chromatography (certificate No. 27-08 dated March 04, 2008). The mentioned measuring technique can be applied to soil and ground and specifies benzpyrene mass concentration detection via highly efficient liquid chromatography with fluorimetric detection; it provides results of benzpyrene mass concentration measuring within 4-80 mkg/kg range. The applied equipment includes "Stayer" stationary liauid chromatograph with fluorimetric detector and a PC with installed software "MultiChrom for Windows XP", version 1.5.

Degree of chemical soil pollution was assessed as per complex soil pollution index (Ksoil). To detect the index, we used a sum

of separate pollutants concentrations coefficients (quotients from division of actual substances content in soil by their maximum permissible concentration) according to the methodical guidelines issued by RF Goscomsanepidnadzor on February 26, 1996, No. № 01-19/17-17 "Complex detection of anthropogenic load on water objects, soil, and atmosphere in areas aimed for housing". Complex soil pollution index (Ksoil) was calculated both in the city as a whole, and for separate categories of monitoring points (territories of municipal pre-school children facilities, areas aimed for housing in close proximity to crossroads with heavy traffic and recreation zones). When processing data, we used our own specialized software and professional package of statistic programs «Statistical Package for Social Science» (SPSS) version 13.0.»

Results and discussion. Examination results over 2008-2015 prove that copper, nickel, and mercury content in soils of monitoring points doesn't exceed their maximum permissible concentrations. Average concentrations of these metals amounted to 23.03±1.04 mg/kg, 20.48±0.55 mg/kg and 0.049 ± 0.008 mg/kg, correspondingly. And their share contribution into complex soil pollution index was 4.08 %, 5.99 % and 0.54 %, correspondingly.

The maximum pollution index among all the detected metals belonged to zinc with its average concentration being 166.50 ± 7.51 mg/kg (0.76 MPC) and share contribution into Ksoil being 17.71 %.

Zink content was higher than maximum permissible concentration in 15.76% samples with maximum index being 5.91 MPC.

Lead took the second rank place with its concentration being higher than MPC in 1.67% of examined samples and its average content in soils being equal to 38.36±2.30 mg/kg, maximum index being 1.95 MPC and specific weight in Ksoils equal to 6.90 %.

Table1

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			including:						
Number of examined soil samples abs. 660 288 288 84 LEAD (MPC is 130 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC 1,67 10,69 3,11 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,282 0,351 0,145 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,008 0,008 0,0025 0,010 Maximum actual concentration MPC 1,575 1,280 22,92 1,19 Average actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,036 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,031 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,002 0,002 0,013 0,128 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,002 0,000 0,000 0,000 Average actual concentration MPC 0,005 0,228 0,958 0,958 0,952	Indices		school children	Housing areas	•				
LEAD (MPC is 130 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 1.67 10.69 3.11 0.00 Average actual concentration Maximum actual concentration MPC 0.295 0.282 0.351 0.145 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0.008 0.008 0.025 0.010 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 15.76 12.80 22.92 1.19 Average actual concentration MPC 0.757 0.720 0.905 0.367 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0.025 0.025 0.025 0.025 0.025 0.025 0.031 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Average actual concentration MPC 0.002 0.002 0.010 0.005 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 Average actual concentration MPC 0.256 0.270 0.250 0.228 Specific weight of s	Number of examined soil samples	abs.	660			84			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			LEAD (MPC is 1	30 mg/kg)	•	•			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	1,67	I 0,69	3,11	0,00			
Maximum actual concentration 1,953 1,759 1,953 0,922 ZINC (MPC is 220 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 15,76 12,80 22,92 1,19 Average actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,0367 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,031 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,0174 0,169 0,193 0,128 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,002 0,002 0,001 0,005 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,0256 0,270 0,250 0,228 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,005 0,028 0,005 0,015 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,455 0,35	Average actual concentration		,	,					
ZINC (MPC is 220 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 15,76 12,80 22,92 1,19 Average actual concentration MPC 0,055 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,031 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,025 0,025 0,025 0,001 0,001 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00		MPC	,	,	0,025	,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Maximum actual concentration			,	1,953	0,922			
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} content higher than MPC & \% & 13,76 & 12,80 & 22,92 & 1,19 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,757 & 0,720 & 0,905 & 0,367 \\ \hline Minimal actual concentration & MPC & 0,025 & 0,025 & 0,025 & 0,031 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,002 & 0,002 & 0,010 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,002 & 0,002 & 0,010 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,002 & 0,002 & 0,010 & 0,005 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,958 & 0,958 & 0,950 & 0,523 \\ \hline Minimal actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,028 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,028 & 0,0005 & 0,015 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,045 & 0,35 & 1,19 & 0,35 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC & 0,045 & 0,35 & 1,19 & 0,35 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,030 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,030 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC & MPC & 0,34 & 0,00 & 0,79 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,146 & 0,130 & 0,188 & 0,060 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,146 & 0,130 & 0,188 & 0,060 \\ \hline Minimal actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Maximum actual con$			ZINC (MPC is 22	20 mg/kg)					
Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,025$ $0,000$ $0,00$	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	15,76	12,80	22,92	1,19			
Maximum actual concentration $5,913$ $1,917$ $5,913$ $1,724$ COPPER (MPC is $132 mg/kg)$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,00$ 0	Average actual concentration		0,757	0,720	0,905	0,367			
COPPER (MPC is 132 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,174 0,169 0,193 0,128 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,002 0,002 0,010 0,005 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,958 0,958 0,890 0,523 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,256 0,270 0,250 0,228 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,005 0,028 0,005 0,015 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,45 0,35 1,19 0,35 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,174 0,184 0,135 0,175 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,014 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,34 0,00	Minimal actual concentration	MPC	0,025	0,025	0,025	0,031			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Maximum actual concentration		5,913	1,917	5,913	1,724			
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} content higher than MPC & \% & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,174 & 0,169 & 0,193 & 0,128 \\ \hline Minimal actual concentration & MPC & 0,002 & 0,002 & 0,010 & 0,005 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,958 & 0,958 & 0,890 & 0,523 \\ \hline Minimal actual concentration & MPC & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,00 & 0,00 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,028 & 0,005 & 0,015 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,028 & 0,005 & 0,015 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,005 & 0,028 & 0,005 & 0,015 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,45 & 0,35 & 1,19 & 0,35 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Sagot & 0,000 & 0,030 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Maximum actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,030 & 0,000 & 0,014 \\ \hline Sagot & 1,100 & 5,300 & 2,070 \\ \hline CHROMIUM (MPC is 6 mg/kg) & Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC & 0,34 & 0,00 & 0,79 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,34 & 0,00 & 0,79 & 0,00 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,010 & 0,003 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual concentration & MPC & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 & 0,000 \\ \hline Average actual$			COPPER (MPC is	132 mg/kg)					
Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,002$ $0,002$ $0,002$ $0,010$ $0,005$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,958$ $0,958$ $0,958$ $0,890$ $0,523$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,00$ $0,00$ $0,00$ $0,00$ $0,00$ $0,00$ $0,00$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,256$ $0,270$ $0,250$ $0,228$ $0,005$ $0,015$ $0,228$ $0,005$ $0,015$ $0,228$ $0,005$ $0,015$ $0,428$ $CADMIUM$ (MPC is 2 mg/kg) $0,428$ $CADMIUM$ (MPC is 2 mg/kg) $0,455$ $0,355$ $1,19$ $0,355$ $0,175$ $0,174$ $0,184$ $0,135$ $0,175$ Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,000$	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00			
Maximum actual concentration 0,958 0,958 0,890 0,523 NICKEL (MPC is 80 mg/kg) NICKEL (MPC is 80 mg/kg) NICKEL (MPC is 80 mg/kg) 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,256 0,270 0,250 0,228 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,005 0,028 0,005 0,015 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,681 0,681 0,479 0,428 CADMIUM (MPC is 2 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,174 0,184 0,135 0,175 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,001 0,001 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,174 0,184 0,135 0,175 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,34 0,00 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,146 0,130 0,188 0,060 Average actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,001 0,003 </td <td>Average actual concentration</td> <td></td> <td>0,174</td> <td>0,169</td> <td>0,193</td> <td>0,128</td>	Average actual concentration		0,174	0,169	0,193	0,128			
NICKEL (MPC is 80 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,014$ $0,428$ $CADMIUM$ (MPC is 2 mg/kg) $Specific weight of samples with concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000<$	Minimal actual concentration	MPC	0,002	0,002	0,010	0,005			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Maximum actual concentration		0,958	0,958	0,890	0,523			
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} \hline content higher than MPC & \% & 0,00 &$			NICKEL (MPC is	80 mg/kg)					
Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,005$ $0,028$ $0,005$ $0,015$ Maximum actual concentration $0,681$ $0,681$ $0,479$ $0,428$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,455$ $0,355$ $1,19$ $0,355$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,174$ $0,184$ $0,135$ $0,175$ Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,000$ <	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00			
Maximum actual concentration $0,681$ $0,681$ $0,479$ $0,428$ CADMIUM (MPC is 2 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,45$ $0,35$ $1,19$ $0,35$ Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,174$ $0,184$ $0,135$ $0,175$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,030$ $0,000$ $0,014$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,344$ $0,00$ $0,79$ $0,00$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Specific	Average actual concentration		0,256	0,270	0,250	0,228			
CADMIUM (MPC is 2 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,45$ $0,35$ $1,19$ $0,35$ Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,174$ $0,184$ $0,135$ $0,175$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,030$ $0,000$ $0,014$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,34$ $0,00$ $0,79$ $0,00$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$	Minimal actual concentration	MPC	0,005		0,005	0,015			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Maximum actual concentration		/		0,479	0,428			
content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,45$ $0,55$ $1,19$ $0,55$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,174$ $0,184$ $0,135$ $0,175$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,030$ $0,000$ $0,014$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,030$ $0,000$ $0,014$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,34$ $0,00$ $0,79$ $0,000$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,001$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC $\%$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,$			CADMIUM (MPC	' is 2 mg/kg)					
Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,030$ $0,000$ $0,014$ Maximum actual concentration 5,300 1,010 5,300 2,070 CHROMIUM (MPC is 6 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % $0,34$ $0,00$ $0,79$ $0,00$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Minimal actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentration MPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ MercURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) Mercure (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Average actual concentration MPC $0,023$ $0,016$ $0,033$ $0,014$ Minimal actual concentration MPC<	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	0,45	0,35	1,19	0,35			
Maximum actual concentration 5,300 1,010 5,300 2,070 Maximum actual concentration 5,300 1,010 5,300 2,070 CHROMIUM (MPC is 6 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,34 0,00 0,79 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,146 0,130 0,188 0,060 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 MercURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) Mercury (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) Mercury (0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 Average actual concentration % 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	Average actual concentration		0,174	0,184	0,135	0,175			
CHROMIUM (MPC is 6 mg/kg)Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC% $0,34$ $0,00$ $0,79$ $0,00$ Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentrationMPC $0,146$ $0,130$ $0,188$ $0,060$ Maximum actual concentration Maximum actual concentrationMPC $0,000$ $0,010$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentrationMPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,003$ $0,000$ Maximum actual concentrationMPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ MercURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg)Mercury (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ Average actual concentrationMPC $0,023$ $0,016$ $0,033$ $0,014$ Minimal actual concentrationMPC $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$ $0,000$	Minimal actual concentration	MPC	0,000	0,030	0,000	0,014			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Maximum actual concentration	aximum actual concentration		5,300 1,010		2,070			
Content higher than MPC % 0,34 0,00 0,79 0,00 Average actual concentration MPC 0,146 0,130 0,188 0,060 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 Average actual concentration MPC 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000			CHROMIUM (MPC	C is 6 mg/kg)					
Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentration Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,146 0,130 0,188 0,060 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) 0,000 0,000 0,000 Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 Average actual concentration MPC 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%	0,34	0,00	0,79	0,00			
Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,010 0,003 0,000 Maximum actual concentration MPC 3,983 0,988 3,983 0,438 MERCURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC Average actual concentration % 0,002 0,000 0,000 0,000 Average actual concentration MPC 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	Average actual concentration		0,146	0,130	0,188	0,060			
Maximum actual concentration 3,983 0,988 3,983 0,438 MERCURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg) Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC % 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 Average actual concentration 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	Minimal actual concentration	MPC				0,000			
MERCURY (MPC is 2.1 mg/kg)Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC%0,000,000,000,00Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentration0,0230,0160,0330,014Minimal actual concentrationMPC0,0000,0000,0000,000	Maximum actual concentration		3,983	0,988		0,438			
Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC%0,000,000,000,00Average actual concentration Minimal actual concentration0,0230,0160,0330,014MPC0,0000,0000,0000,0000,000									
Average actual concentration 0,023 0,016 0,033 0,014 Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	Specific weight of samples with content higher than MPC	%			0,00	0,00			
Minimal actual concentration MPC 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000			0,023	0,016	0,033	0,014			
	Minimal actual concentration	MPC				,			
	Maximum actual concentration		0,881	0,192	0,881	0,098			

Indices of soil pollution with metals in Taganrog, Rostov region, over 2008-2015




Figure 1. Complex index of chemical soils pollution in Taganrog over 2008-2015

Cadmium content higher than MPC was detected in 3 samples (0.45 %), and chromium content higher than MPC in 2 samples (0.34 %). maximum cadmium content was equal to 5.3 MPC, and chromium, 3.98 MPC.

The accomplished comparative analysis revealed that the highest content indices for such metals as lead, zinc, cadmium, and chromium, were detected in areas aimed for housing influenced by massive emissions of motor transport (crossroads), when their content was higher than MPC in 3.11 %, 22.92 %, 1.19 % and 0.79 % of examined pollution samples. Soil indices were significantly lower territories on of municipal pre-school children facilities where lead content (0.69%), zinc content (12.80%), and cadmium content (0.35%) in examined samples was higher than MPC. The lowest soil pollution indices were detected in recreation zones where only one sample had zinc content which was higher than MPC (table 1).

Complex city soils pollution index (Ksoil) determined by content of seven metals varied within 1.606 to 2.019 during the whole examined period. Average value amounted to 1.825, including municipal pre-school children facilities with 1.956, areas aimed for housing in close proximity to crossroads with heavy traffic with 1.910, and recreation zones with 1.077 (table 1, figure 1).

Results obtained over 2013-2015 prove that city soils are heavily polluted with 3,4benzpyrene. Thus, 65.28% of 144 examined samples contain this pollutant in concentrations MPC, exceeding its actual average concentration being equal to 0.049±0.013 mg/kg (2.45 MPC). And its maximum registered content amounted to 0.761 mg/kg (38.05 MPC). And it is understandable that 3.4benzpyrene pollution was considerably higher in areas aimed for housing in close proximity to crossroads with heavy traffic. MPC was exceeded in 71.30% of all examined samples with its average actual concentration being equal to 0.053±0.016 mg/kg (2.65 MPC). Recreation zones were less polluted with 3,4benzpyrene as its concentrations higher than MPC were detected only in 50.00% of samples and its average and maximum concentration amounted to 1.85 MPC and 7.71 MPC, correspondingly (table 2, figure 2).

With 3,4-benzpyrene content taken into account in hygienic assessment of chemical soils pollution, its complex chemical index value and structure changes greatly. Thus, average value of complex index (Ksoil) over the last three years amounted to 4.338, with 3,4-benzpyrene share contribution being 56.44 % (table 2, figure 1).

Table 2

					Taganrog	including:	
Indices			Years of monitoring			Areas for housing (cross	City recrea- tion
		2013	2014	2015	2013-2015	roads)	zones
Number of examined soils samples abs.		48	48	48	144	108	36
Samples with concentrations higher than MPC (0.02 mg/kg)	abs.	35	34	25	94	77	18
Specific weight of samples with concen- trations higher than MPC	%	72,92	70,83	52,08	65,28	71,30	50,00
Average actual concentration	mg/kg	0,0484	0,051 4	0,047 1	0,0490	0,0529	0,0369
	MPC	2,42	2,57	2,35	2,45	2,65	1,85
Its limiting error ($\pm\Box$, p<0.05)	mg/kg	0,0198	0,011 4	0,032 1	0,0127	0,0163	0,0128
Specific weight of pollutant in Ksoil	%	56,17	56,00	57,20	56,44	58,92	63,41
Minimum actual concentration	mg/kg	0,0044	0,007 7	0,003 2	0,0032	0,0044	0,0032
	MPC	0,22	0,39	0,16	0,16	0,22	0,16
Maximum actual concentration	mg/kg	0,3710	0,154 2	0,761 0	0,7610	0,7610	0,1542
	MPC	18,55	7,71	38,05	38,05	38,05	7,71

Indices of soils pollution with 3,4-benzpyrene in Taganrog, Rostov region, over 2013–2015




Figure 2. Indices of soils pollution with 3,4-benzpyrene in Taganrog, Rostov region, over 2013–2015

Conclusion. So, in our research we detected high level of soils pollution with 3,4-benzpyrene in Taganrog. This pollutant is highly stable, has great accumulation capacity in natural ecological systems and penetrates

nutrition chains quite easily. Its carcinogenic, mutagenic and teratogenic effects on people are proved. It is advisable to examine 3,4benzpyrene as a priority pollutant. In our opinion, integration of relevant databases into regional geoinformation systems (GIS) and data software providing transfer into assessment of carcinogenic effects risk caused by chemical soils pollution in Rostov region would be a very promising trend in developing hygienic assessment of chemical soils pollution social-hygienic in monitoring examination of system. Sampling crop production (fruit and vegetables) grown on personal plots in the city in terms of 3,4benzpyrene content in it is to take place in accordance with State Standard P 51650-2000 "Food stuffs. Techniques for detecting benzpyrene mass concentration". All the results obtained in this work will give grounds for population health risk assessment.

References

1. Kurchanov V.I., Lim T.E., Voetskii I.A., Golovin S.A. Aktual'nost' otsenki mnogosredovogo kantserogennogo riska dlya zdorov'ya naseleniya ot vozdeistviya khimicheskikh veshchestv, zagryaznyayushchikh okruzhayushchuyu sredu [The relevance of assessment of multicompartment carcinogenic risk to health from exposure to chemicals that pollute the environment]. *Zdorov'e naseleniya i sreda obitaniya*, 2015, vol. 268, no. 7, pp. 8–12 (in Russian).

2. Onishchenko G.G., Zaitseva N.V., May I.V., Shur P.Z., Popova A.Yu., Alekseev V.B. [et al]. Analiz riska zdorov'yu v strategii gosudarstvennogo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya: monografiya [Health risk analysis in the strategy of state social and economic development: monograph]. In: G.G. Onishchenko, N.V. Zaitseva eds. Moscow, Perm', Izd-vo Permskogo natsional'nogo issledovatel'skogo politekhnicheskogo universiteta Publ., 2014,783 p. (in Russian).

3. Butenko G.S., Polonskaya D.E. Soderzhanie 3,4-benz (a) pirena v pochvakh tekhnogenno zagryaznennykh territorii [3.4-benz (a) pyrene availability in the tehnogenically polluted territory soils]. *Vestnik Krasnoyarskogo gosudarstvennogo agrarnogo universiteta.* – 2012. – \mathbb{N} 7. – S. 86–90 (in Russian).

4. Gorobtsova O.N., Nazarenko O.G., Minkina T.M. Soderzhanie 3,4-benz (a) pirena v rastitel'nosti, raspolozhennoi v zone vliyaniya Novocherkasskoi GRES [The content of 3,4-benzo (a) pyrene in vegetation located in the zone of influence of the Novocherkassk Thermal Power]. *Izvestiya vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii. Severo-Kavkazskii region. Seriya: Estestvennye nauki*, 2006, no. 3, pp. 63–66 (in Russian).

5. Kislitsyna L.V. Gigienicheskaya otsenka soderzhaniya kontaminantov v produktakh pitaniya po dannym sotsial'no-gigienicheskogo monitoringa [Hygienic assessment of the content of contaminants in food products according to socio-hygienic monitoring]. *Zdorov'e. Meditsinskaya ekologiya. Nauka*, 2013, vol. 52, no. 2–3, pp. 49–53 (in Russian).

6. Zaitseva N.V., Popova A.Yu., May I.V., Shur P.Z. Metody i tekhnologii analiza riska zdorov'yu v sisteme gosudarstvennogo upravleniya pri obespechenii sanitarno-epidemiologicheskogo blagopoluchiya naseleniya [Methods and technologies of health risk analysis in the system of state management under assurance of the sanitation and epidemiological welfare of population]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2015, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 93–98 (in Russian).

7. Onishchenko G.G. Aktual'nye zadachi gigienicheskoi nauki i praktiki v sokhranenii zdorov'ya naseleniya [Actual problems of hygiene science and practice in the preservation of Public health]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2015, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 5–9 (in Russian).

8. Onishchenko G.G. Khimicheskaya bezopasnost' – vazhneishaya sostavlyayushchaya sanitarnoepidemiologicheskogo blagopoluchiya naseleniya [Chemical safety is the most important constituent of the sanitary and epidemiological well-being of population]. *Toksikologicheskii vestnik*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 2–6 (in Russian).

9. Avaliani S.L., Bezpal'ko L.E., Bobkova T.E., Mishina A.L. Perspektivnye napravleniya razvitiya metodologii analiza riska v Rossii [The perspective directions of development of methodology of the analysis of risk in Russia]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2013, no. 1, pp. 33–36 (in Russian).

10. Gabov D.N., Beznosikov V.A., Kondratenok B.M., Yakovleva E.V. Politsiklicheskie aromaticheskie uglevodorody v pochvakh tekhnogennykh landshaftov [Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the soils of technogenic landscapes]. *Geokhimiya*, 2010, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 606–617 (in Russian).

11. Popova A.Yu. Strategicheskie prioritety Rossiiskoi Federatsii v oblasti ekologii s pozitsii

sokhraneniya zdorov'ya natsii [Strategic priorities of the Russian Federation in the field of ecology from the position of preservation of health of the nation]. *Zdorov'e naseleniya i sreda obitaniya*, 2014, vol. 251, no. 2, pp. 4–7 (in Russian).

12. Rakhmanin Yu.A., Malysheva A.G. Kontseptsiya razvitiya gosudarstvennoi sistemy khimikoanaliticheskogo monitoringa okruzhayushchei sredy [The concept of the development of the state of chemical-analytical environmental monitoring]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2013, no. 6, pp. 4–9 (in Russian).

13. Rakhmanin Yu.A., Mikhailova R.I. Okruzhayushchaya sreda i zdorov'e: prioritety profilakticheskoi meditsiny [Environment and Health: Priorities for Preventive Medicine]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2014, vol. 93, no. 5, pp. 5–10 (in Russian).

14. Unguryanu T.N. Mnogosredovyi kantserogennyi risk dlya zdorov'ya naseleniya promyshlennogo goroda [Multiple environmental population health risk for cancer in industrial town]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2011, no. 6, pp. 77–80 (in Russian).

15. Fetter V.V. Otsenka riska dlya zdorov'ya naseleniya khimicheskoi kontaminatsii produktov pitaniya i prodovol'stvennogo syr'ya [Human health risk assessment of the chemical contamination of food products and raw foods]. *Health Risk Analysis*, 2013, no. 4, pp. 54–63. DOI: 10.21668/health.risk/2013.4.07.eng.

16. Frolova O.A., Karpova M.V. Otsenka riska razvitiya kantserogennykh i nekantserogennykh effektov pri upotreblenii produktov pitaniya [Risk assessment of carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic effects in the use of food]. *Gigiena i sanitariya*, 2012, no. 5, pp. 107–108 (in Russian).

17. Food safety risk analysis – A guide for national food safety authorities. *FAO food and nutrition paper*. Rome, 2006, vol. 87, 50 p. Available at: <u>www.fao.org/docrep/012/a0822e/a0822e.pdf</u> (22.09.2016)

18. Muthumbi W., De Boever P., Pieters J.G., Siciliano S., D"Hoogec W., Verstraete W. Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) and Estrogenic Compounds in Experimental Flue Gas Streams. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 2013, vol. 32, pp. 417–422.

19. Fismes J., Perrin-Ganier C., Empereur-Bissonnet P., Morel J.L. Soil-to-Root Transfer and Translocation of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons by Vegetables Grown on Industrial Contaminated Soils. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 2002, vol. 31, pp. 1649–1656.

Aydinov G.T., Marchenko B.I., Deryabkina L.A., Sinelnikova Yu.A. Chemical factors of soil polution in taganrog as population health risk factors. Health Risk Analysis, 2017, no. 1, pp. 13–20. DOI: 10.21668/health.risk/2017.1.02.eng

Received: 25.12.2016 Accepted: 15.02.2017 Published: 30.03.2017