Health Standards for Methamphetamine in Residences: One Size Does Not Fit All

James E. Dennison[1]

[1]Century Environmental Hygiene, Fort Collins, CO

Abstract

Properties that are contaminated with methamphetamine (meth) are sometimes remediated in accordance with state health regulations which contain a health standard for the surface concentration that must be achieved after remedial work is complete. Nearly all states use the same criterion for all parts of the property, even though the extent of dermal and ingestion exposure is related to the occupancy time. For areas such as attics that experience low occupancy time, the high costs of remediation are not justified by exposure considerations. One challenge in defining alternative standards for different space types was the lack of risk-based metrics to use. The analysis reported here provides a framework for determining the exposure differentials as well as the potential cost savings that would occur if alternate standards are set. Low-occupancy space types such as attics, moderate-occupancy space types such as exterior hallways, and HVAC system were evaluated with calculations of frequency of contamination, remediations costs, and incremental exposure/dose to occupants under a broad range of potential standards. Raising very conservative standards set by some states would reduce the average cost to remediate a contaminated house from $18,700 to $15,000 or even $12,500. Substantial remediation cost reductions are likely to be achieved if health standards are based on occupancy time. If all recommended alternate standards are implemented, a further 40-50% cost reduction is possible. These alternate standards still allow the exposure to be within the recommended dose levels, which suggests that these low occupancy spaces are being over remediated. Currently, the high cost of remediation is a burden on thousands of property owners who remediate meth-contaminated property each year, but are also a deterrent to testing suspect properties, resulting in large numbers of contaminated properties remaining occupied.

Introduction

Meth contamination in residential property is a significant on-going problem in the U.S. and in other countries where meth use occurs. The average cost to remediate a property, including associated repair costs, was estimated at $44K and over 5 million residences in the U.S. are estimated to be contaminated above a health standard of 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 (Dennison 2024). Exposures to non-users could be secondhand (during the meth activity) or, more often, third-hand after activity ceases. Third-hand exposure occurs because meth contamination persists for extended periods as surface residues and particulates in indoor spaces (Bitter 2017). Nearly all contamination (~99%) occurs due to meth use (e.g. smoking), not manufacturing, and meth use is found in all states within a ~4-fold range in per capita use. Yet, currently, only 19 states regulate meth contamination in residential property and, of these, only 13 regulate if meth

manufacturing occurred but not if meth was used only (MLCC 2024). One of the major likely reasons for this regulatory issue is the high cost of remediation.

In general, meth regulations specify that a residence with the type(s) of meth activity to which the regulations applies must be tested, and areas that exceed a single numerical health standard must be remediated until each area meets the standard, usually expressed as X ug meth/100 cm^2 of surface area. In the 19 states that have meth regulations, 17 have a single health standard that applies to all parts of the property. The absorbed dose, and therefore risk, from meth exposure is associated with both the 1) concentration of meth residues and 2) the length of exposure. Thus, parts of buildings where occupancy is limited represent a lower contribution to the total absorbed dose. Two states have promulgated alternate higher standards for "low occupancy areas" to date. Herein, "higher standard" means numerically higher (less stringent). Wyoming set a limit of 3.75 ug/100 cm^2 for attics, crawlspaces, and HVAC systems (Wyoming_SERC 2010) with a health standard of 0.75 ug/100 cm^2 for the rest of the property. Colorado established a limit of 4 ug/100 cm^2 for attics and crawlspaces and similar areas and 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 for other areas.

There would be no purpose to increasing health standards were there not concomitant cost savings. Remediation costs are tied to health standards in several ways. First, fewer tested properties would exceed a higher standard and require remediation and, as a general idea, a smaller portion of properties would exceed a higher limit (i.e., an entire house may exceed standard A and only half the house may exceed a higher standard B). Second, it is incrementally more difficult to reduce contaminant levels to lower standards, so the cleanup cost per square foot is lower when higher standards apply. In order to put possible higher health standards into context, some idea of the cost differential is needed. The purpose of the analysis provided here is to evaluate the increase of occupant meth doses for a variety of different health standards and to estimate the concomitant cost savings if higher standards were implemented.

The method used in this study was to evaluate the impact of different health standards on a granular basis. A less granular approach could be performed by taking the average meth concentrations in properties and calculating the fraction of properties that would exceed each proposed standard. However, the remediation scope is usually based on area-by-area sampling, where only specific areas that exceed the standard have to be mitigated. Also, to assess the impact of different standards for different occupancy-time categories, an area-by-area analysis is needed. The granular analysis used here also permits estimation of cost savings if standards are changed. This study assesses these impacts for the following scenarios:

- Impact of raising a singular health standard to a higher singular standard
- Impact of applying a basal health standard to spaces that are normally occupied, and higher standards to spaces that are less frequently occupied
- Impact of altering standards applied to HVAC systems, where essentially no dermal or ingestion exposure occurs
- Effect of considering compliance to be based on average concentrations rather than area maximums

The calculations were performed in a spreadsheet that was coded to allow evaluation of many changes to parameters. For example, differing health standards could be promulgated for normal occupancy areas, low occupancy areas, moderate occupancy areas, and HVAC systems based on the specific contributions to dose from each space type. The spreadsheet allows flexibility in defining what parts of a building falls into each space type and the amount of time spent in each. It also enables use of the state-specific meth property contamination and remediation cost data. The tool is available in supplemental information for possible future use.

Methods

Contamination Model

The contamination model used here needed to determine what parts of residences would exceed ("fail") different health standards. The method used was to extract room-by-room meth contamination data from representative residential projects and to code that into a spreadsheet to determine what parts of each house would fail. The data came from assessments performed in Colorado, as online access to reports was available. Colorado requires properties suspected of meth activity be tested by a "Preliminary Assessment (PA)" sampling protocol in which a sample from each room and space type is collected. Essentially all samples were four-part composite samples where four aliquots were collected from different locations in a room or area and combined into one sample for analysis. Each location was sampled by solvent wipes on cotton gauze of a 100 cm^2 area in accordance with NIOSH methods. Isopropanol is the default solvent in Colorado; in some states, methanol is more commonly used, but the efficacy of the two solvents is similar (Martyny 2008; Van Dyke et al. 2011). HVAC samples are ordinarily collected as discrete samples in Colorado. In some instances, composite samples from HVAC were reported and these were listed as a single sample under furnaces. All samples were analyzed by accredited laboratories using either NIOSH 9109 (Methamphetamine and Illicit Drugs, Precursors, and Adulterants on Wipes by Solid Phase Extraction) or NIOSH 9111 (Methamphetamine on Wipes by Liquid Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry). Samples from contents (personal property), vehicles, adjacent buildings (e.g., in apartment buildings) and appliances were not included as they do not affect remediation costs for the building itself. Contaminant levels in buildings in other states will vary to some degree, but the fact that Colorado's use rate is close to the national average (Dennison 2024) suggests that it may serve as a reasonable dataset. In a state with a higher use rate, properties could be more contaminated but the overall difference should not be large. It is also important to note that the assessments for this analysis are not representative of housing stock in general, but were intended to represent houses that are indeed contaminated. Thus, data on the percent of these houses that were contaminated do not at all apply to houses in general.

The data for contamination analysis consisted of 100 PAs randomly selected from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment on-line repository of PAs (CDPHE 2024). The 100 housing units (HUs) consisted of 1-story apartments (21), 2-4 unit multiplexes (13; one unit each), single family homes (52), and townhomes (14). The PAs were conducted by ten various certified meth consulting firms in Colorado. Three reports were rejected and replaced with another due to report errors that could not be corrected, and all the numerous reports from one

consultant were omitted entirely as it appeared the consultant collected HVAC samples primarily on the exterior of ductwork and furnace housings. Different parts of HVAC systems (supply ducts, return ducts, heat exchanger, fan compartment) were mostly sampled discretely and up to two samples may have been collected in ducts. Non-house "rooms" included attics, crawlspaces (which may be below the house or of the cubbyhole type), garages, sheds, etc. Redundant rooms (e.g. bedrooms) were listed separately and unique room types were listed as miscellaneous rooms. Data for local exhaust systems and separate air conditioners were also reported in some cases.

If data were reported in the table as "Below Reporting Level" or equivalent, the Reporting Limits were used. Sample photographs and drawings were reviewed to confirm locations when sample location descriptions were unclear. Limited report reviews were conducted, primarily to verify that samples noted as HVAC and bathroom fans were collected inside the equipment. As painting over meth can have a significant effect on results, if painting prior to the PA was noted, the data was flagged. Health standards can be expressed as "less than [value]" or "greater than [value]." For this analysis, the "greater than" option was implemented (the area failed if the result was greater than the health standard). All rooms or spaces were thus evaluated for pass or fail, which was then fed into the cost estimate for the property.

Cost Model

Remediation cost data were collected from contractors who are certified or specialize in meth remediation in the U.S. Publicly available lists of meth contractors were obtained from the internet, and all listed contractors were surveyed. Fifteen responses were received and were averaged (Table 1). There were obvious differences in costs in several states, which may depend in part on state regulations, such as numeric health standards and the process for remedial verification, as well as local cost conditions. The data were summarized into costs to remediate apartments and houses of a fixed size, with additional costs for HVAC, attics, crawlspaces, garages, etc., if they are contaminated and for more or fewer contaminated rooms than in the default HU. When contractors bid remediation projects, there are many variables taken into consideration, so these costs are strictly considered to be an average. These data were then used to estimate the cost for remediation for each HU that failed, based on the parameters for that HU, such as what space type failed. For the analysis of remediation costs with alternate health standards, the spreadsheet was programmed to take into account the standard for each space type and re-calculate the overall cost for remediation of each property.

Table 1: Average Remediation Costs

Remediation Costs (U.S. Average)	Cost (US$)
Apartment, 2 Bedroom 1 Bath without HVAC	$6,088
SFH ranch style house, 3 bedroom, 3 bath, attached garage	$11,020
Add for HVAC	$5,408
Add for attic	$8,173
Add for crawlspace	$7,436
Add for garage, outbuildings, porches etc.	$1,657
Adjust per additional/fewer rooms	$1,200

No repair costs are included in the remediation estimates except as noted here. Frequently, HVAC systems are quite recalcitrant to remediation. The cleaning costs listed in Table 1 include additional cleaning for areas that do not pass a post-remediation sample and have to be re-cleaned. Meth can be difficult to remediate and several cleanings are required for many properties until each area passes. HVAC is frequently one of the most difficult areas. In many instances, the furnace and even the supply or return ducts may be removed rather than cleaning or re-cleaning. From the author's experience, the furnace is removed ~40% of the time (especially if it approaches a 20-year service life) and ducts are removed on 15% of projects. As replacements costs are substantial, the costs for new furnaces ($4,000) and ducts ($7,500) were factored into the HVAC mitigation cost pro-rata based on average system costs (HomeGuide 2024). Likewise, if an attic is remediated, insulation is ordinarily removed and if a crawlspace is remediated, a vapor barrier is normally removed and/or installed. Thus, these costs were added for attic insulation at $2,500 (Bob_Villa 2024) and vapor barriers at $2,600 ea. (RFR 2024).

Depending on the contaminant levels as compared to the applicable health standard that must be attained, a contractor has to choose between remediating via cleaning versus "gutting to the studs." While additional repair costs are substantial, the average repair cost per project is unknown so is not included here. Other repair costs such as carpet, appliances, fixtures, cabinets etc. are not included as they also vary. Re-testing costs also vary depending on what portions of a property need post-remediation testing so were not included. Other associated costs such as loss of use would be difficult to estimate, so are not included. Many of these costs might be possible to estimate for a standard situation, but estimating the incremental cost for them for various alternate health standards would be difficult. Thus, the cost estimates provided here should be considered to be minimal, and the actual cost savings for alternate standards are in general going to be higher than estimated.

While there can be more than one attic space, and even occasionally more than one crawlspace, the cleanup cost for each space type is applied if any attic or crawlspace exceeded the health standard. Moderately occupied spaces were likewise assessed the cleanup cost if any garage, outbuilding, or porch was deemed contaminated. The cost for remediation of all areas that fail was totaled to obtain a cleanup cost per project, and then the average of cleanup costs for all projects that failed out of the 100 houses in the dataset was calculated. The total cost to remediate the estimated number of newly contaminated properties in the U.S. per year was based on the estimated number of newly-contaminated houses in 2022 previously reported (Dennison 2024). These estimates ranged as a function of health standards from 7.3% at 0.05 ug/100 cm^2, 4.1% for 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, 2.1 % at 1.5 ug/100 cm^2, and 1.4% at 10 ug/100 cm^2. The U.S. cost for remediation is a hypothetical number, assuming all contaminated units are remediated every year, even as it is understood that only a fraction are remediated. Table 2 provides some relevant portions of the calculation spreadsheet.

Table 2: Portions of the Calculation Spreadsheet

Meth Concentrations in Selected Rooms/Areas											
Supply	Kitchen	Living Room	Bath 1	Bath 2	Hallways /stairs	Bed1	Bed2	Family/ Rec Room	Utility	Laundry	Attic
6.4	4	3.1	4.9	1.95	--	8.9	2.2	--	--	--	1.4
Concentration Table (ug/100 cm2)					Logic Functions						
Average "rooms in house"	Average HVAC	Max Attic	Max HVAC	Max MOA	Pass or Fail on Rooms?	Pass/Fail on HVAC?	PA Pass/Fail on Attic?	Pass/Fail on Crawlspace?	PA Pass or Fail on MOA?	Overall Pass or Fail?	# of rooms failed
2.9	8.9	1.4	13	0.21	F	F	F	P	P	F	9
Cost Table											
Type	Cleanup Cost APT	Cleanup Cost SFH, MP, TH		Adjust for # Rooms Failed	Cleanup Cost HVAC	Cleanup Cost Attics	Cleanup Cost Crawlspaces	Cleanup Cost Garages &	Total Cleanup Cost		
NOTAPT	0	$11,020		-$1,200	$5,408	$8,173	$0	$0	$23,401		
All concentration values in ug/100 cm2. F=Fail. P=Pass											
"Rooms in House" means parts of the house that are continually normally occupied, excluding rooms listed separately											
MOA includes garages, outbuildings (such as barns or sheds), exterior stairwells or hallways, or similar spaces											
NOTAPT means Not an apartment. APT means Apartment											
SFH=single family home; MP means one unit of a multiplex; TH means townhome											

The logic functions in the spreadsheet included "Overall Pass or Fail" = IF (PA Fail on Rooms OR PA Fail on Attic… OR PA Fail on Garages &) THEN "F". An empty cell in this section means that room type didn't exist in the HU and was therefore not sampled.

Cleanup cost columns were coded as "IF [space type]= "F" THEN "Remediation Cost per Table 2"). The cleanup cost for a non-apartment (NOTAPT) was based on 10 rooms in an average house. As the number of rooms can vary widely, the contractors' estimate for add/deduct per additional/fewer rooms was calculated under "Adjust for # Rooms Failed" as "=10-#_of_rooms_failed) * per room cost.

<u>Estimate of Incremental Dose and Selection of Base Case Health Standard</u>

Two health risk assessments have been published for third-hand exposure to methamphetamine. The Colorado risk assessment (Hammon TL 2007) used a deterministic model based on the USEPA Standard Operating Procedures for Residential Exposure Assessment. The assessment concluded that only dermal and ingestion routes of exposure were significant and the inhalation route was not. The operative equation for calculating dermal exposure is Eq. 1:

PDR (mg/kg/day) = ISR*TC*ET*ABSD/BW Eq. 1

Where

PDR is the Potential Dose Rate (mg/kg/day)

ISR = indoor surface transferable residue (mg/cm^2)

TC = transfer coefficient (cm^2/h)

ET is the exposure time (h/day)

ABSD = dermal absorption fraction (unitless)

BW = body weight

Note that the dose rate is proportional to the indoor surface transferable residue (ISR) and the exposure time (ET). The ISR is the surface contamination concentration which can be expressed in ug/100 cm^2. When evaluating various health standards, the health standard itself is used as the ISR. The exposure time is normally set to 24 hours to obtain a daily dose. As the dose is proportional to these parameters, if a health standard or exposure time was doubled, the dose would be doubled as well. The ingestion dose calculation in the Colorado risk assessment follows an analogous equation and is likewise also proportional to concentration and exposure time.

California EPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment published a risk assessment based on the same pathways for exposure (CalEPA 2009a). The CalEPA assessment utilized a sophisticated USEPA exposure model (Stochastic Human Exposure and Dose Simulation Model for Multimedia, Multipathway Chemicals) (USEPA 2008). This model is a non-deterministic model that uses a range of values for input variables. For example, the variable "Mean # hand washes/day per person" was a lognormal distribution with a geometric mean of 3.74 and geometric STDEV of 2.63/day. The model is then run numerous times via Monte Carlo simulation to obtain a statistical average dose calculation. The operative equation for dermal dose is similar to the one used by CDPHE:

$$E_{r,j,e} = SR_e * A_{j,e} * CR_{j,e} * TE_e * T_e \qquad \text{Eq. 2}$$

Where

$E_{,r,j,e}$ = dermal residue exposure for a given event e for body part j [µg]

SR_e = available loading of chemical on the surface contacted [µg/cm^2]

A_{je}= surface area of body part j (uncovered) [cm^2]

$CR_{j,e}$= surface contact rate for body part j [1/hr]

TE_e= transfer efficiency [-]

T_e= duration of diary event [hr]

One purpose of a risk assessment is to establish a Reference Dose (RfD). In EPA parlance, the RfD is "An estimate (with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude) of a daily oral exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects during a lifetime" (USEPA 2024). Dermal contributions to dose can be combined into an oral+dermal RfD as was done in both risk assessments. California and Colorado evaluated health literature and derived differing RfDs for meth. Colorado's RfD was a range from 5-70 ug/kg/day. CalEPA published an RfD of 0.3 ug/kg/day (CalEPA 2009b). Even while California's RfD was much lower than Colorado's, California's health standard (1.5

ug/100cm^2) is actually higher than Colorado's (0.5 ug/100 cm^2) due to differences in the exposure models.

This paper will analyze the effects of increasing health standards for different parts of the properties where exposure time is less than in the most occupied parts of a HU. To assess the magnitude of dose for higher health standards, the "incremental dose" that would be experienced by an occupant was calculated. The existing standard is referred to as the Base Health Standard (BHS). Higher Alternate Health Standards (AHSs) will then be analyzed. The incremental does would be the percent increase in dose from

Incremental Dose (%) = (Dose:AHS – Dose:BHS)/Dose:BHS*100

Using Equation 1, the Transfer Coefficient (TC), Absorption Fractions (ABSD), and Body Weight (BW) cancel out; because dose is proportional to the contaminant concentration (allowed by the BHS and AHS) and the Exposure Time (ET). The incremental dose is then calculated as:

$$\frac{((\sum AHS_i * ET_i + BHS * ET_{adj}) - BHS * ET_{bas}))}{BHS * ET_{bas}} \; x \; 100 \qquad \text{Eq. 3}$$

Where AHS is the Alternate Health Standard (ug/100 cm^2) for space type i

BHS is the Base Health Standard (ug/100 cm^2)

ET is the exposure time spent in the area (hrs)

Note that ET is the time spent in each type of space. Where only a Base Health Standard is used, the ET (ET_{bas}) is set to 24 hours to obtain a dose estimate of ug/day. Where there is more than one space type, each space type is assigned the length intended, and the exposure time (ET_{adj}) used for dose calculation for the base standard is 24-$\sum ET_i$.

For this analysis, limited occupancy areas (LOAs) are defined as attics, crawlspaces, and analogous spaces that are not intended or used for purposes other than storage or utilities. Also, moderately occupied areas (MOAs) which are defined as garages, outbuildings, porches, interior hallways, and exterior balconies and stairwells. Data were not located for the range and average amounts of time occupants spend in LOAs and MOAs. The following assumptions were made about the fraction of time spent in these spaces. Alternate assumptions can be explored using the calculator. To calculate the additional dose estimates, the length of assumed time in such spaces is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimate of time spent in low or moderate occupancy areas

Time spent in space types	Example of Space Type	Hours/day
Normal Occupancy Areas (NOAs)	Interior rooms of house	22.97
Low Occupancy Areas (LOAs)	Attics and crawlspaces	0.027
Moderate Occupancy Areas (MOAs)	Garages, outbuildings, exterior hallways and stairwells	1.00
Total		24.00

The effect of alternate health standards depends on the base case, i.e., the existing health standard for a jurisdiction. As mentioned previously, existing standards vary 30-fold and every iteration cannot be reported here. For this analysis, we selected the base case of 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, which is somewhere near the middle of existing standards.

Results and Discussion

Concentrations of meth in all room and space types were averaged for the 100 assessments (Table 4). The average contaminant concentrations were also normalized by setting the lowest room average to 1. Components of the HVAC system and bathroom vents typically had the highest concentrations, and garages, outbuildings, and porches were among the lowest.

Table 4: Meth Concentrations in 100 Housing Units

Space Type	Average, ug/100 cm2	StDev	Normalized (OutBuilding = 1)
Fan Box	23.2	48.5	112
HeatX	26.6	92.5	128
Return	67.3	237.4	324
Return	16.0	18.1	77
Supply	11.2	29.5	54
Supply	11.7	30.0	56
Kitchen	11.3	52.1	54
Living Room	10.0	56.7	48
Bathrooms	2.1	6.2	10
Hallways/stairs	2.1	4.1	10
Bedrooms	2.1	8.9	10
Family/ Rec Room	1.5	2.5	7
Utility	16.7	66.4	80
Laundry	12.1	53.6	58
Basement	19.0	85.0	91
Miscellaneous Room	2.6	5.2	13
Miscellaneous Room	14.9	46.9	72
Garage	0.9	1.8	4
Outbldg	0.2	0.4	1
"Porch"	0.6	1.9	3
Attic	3.1	5.5	15
Crawl space	1.3	2.0	6
Bathroom Vents	298.0	1386.0	1434
Kitchen Vent	7.0	13.7	34
Laundry Vent	11.5	11.7	55
Other Vent	2.2	0.0	11
A/C	71.5	75.2	344

Regulatory Gap Analysis

Many states (13) regulate meth only after cooking and not specifically after use, although anecdotally, in some areas if a property tests positive, remediation may be required through administrative codes or similar mechanisms. In addition, 31 states currently have no public health regulations concerning meth in residences. An estimated 4% of all U.S. housing is currently contaminated with meth at a concentration above 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 and 99% of newly contaminated housing is contaminated by use rather than cooking (Dennison 2024). As the meth health risk assessments are based on meth regardless of contamination method, these regulatory gaps deserve consideration.

Analysis of the Cost Implications of Low Health Standards

State health standards exist in 19 disparate states at this time and range from 0.05 to 1.5 ug/100 cm^2, a 30-fold range. Many of the eleven states that set standards at the lowest levels (0.05 – 0.1 ug/100 cm^2) reportedly did so prior to publication of health risk assessments in 2007-2009, and reportedly set standards at method limits of detection (Hammon TL 2007), which were 80-90% lower than the lowest risk-based standards. The intent of the health standard was to protect occupants from exposure to meth, as well as other chemicals that are used at times in meth manufacturing. Typically, by evaluation of potential standards for other chemicals, it was determined that other chemicals would be adequately remediated by meth remediation procedures (USEPA 2021). In some regulations, if meth cooking was known and the cooking process was identified to use other chemicals, some such chemicals (e.g., mercury) may also be a required test. However, as meth cooking is not commonplace today and the process is often unknown, testing for other compounds is rare. Nine other states (one having a dual limit for cooking versus use), regulate meth to 0.5-1.5 ug/100 cm^2. Most of these states set their standards after the risk assessments were published. Thus, setting health standards to equal method detection limits is 5 to 10-fold more conservative than the lowest health standard based on risk assessments.

Figure 1 shows the cost for remediation using base health standards between 0.05 and 10 ug/100 cm^2. 1.5 ug/100 cm^2 is the highest current standard, but 3 and 10 ug/100 cm^2 were also analyzed in case they are considered in the future. The calculations are based on data from HU assessments as compared to single health standards applied to all parts of the HU. Costs for remediation of the individual areas of the HU that fail to meet the comparative standard are summed for each HU and then averaged into an average cost for remediation. Substantial decreases occur in the percent of houses that fail and the cost for remediation as health standards are increased. The cost per remediation project declines from $20,700 at 0.05 ug/100 cm^2, $18,700 at 0.1 ug/100 cm^2, $15,000 at 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, and $12,500 at 1.5 ug/100 cm^2. These estimates do not account for the percentage of HUs that would require no remediation at higher standards. For an AHS of 1.5 ug/100 cm^2, the failure rate declines from 98% to 70%. Expressed as a cost per each of the 100 HUs, if the health standard was raised to 1.5 ug/100 cm^2, the cost per project is reduced to $8,700. Figure 1b shows the specific cost reduction per remediation project if the base health standard was raised from 0.05 to 3 ug/100 cm^2 as compared to AHS between 0.1 to 10 ug/100 cm^2.

Figure 1a: Failure Frequency and Remediation Costs for Different Health Standards. 1b: Cost differential associated with increasing alternate health standards (AHS) as compared to a Base Health Standard.





<u>Use of Health Standards that Account for Occupancy Durations</u>

As previously discussed, the dose received by occupants is proportional to the amount of time an occupant spends in an area. The RfDs for meth assume that occupants spend 100% of their time at home, as at least some of the sensitive population (young children) in fact reside in the home nearly exclusively. Children or other occupants may spend time and have contact with contaminated surfaces in various rooms of the house, but a much smaller proportion of time is spent in low- or moderate- occupancy areas, such as attics. If the health standard doesn't differentiate between occupancy areas, it is implicitly making the assumption that the amount of

time spent in a space such as an attic is $1/n^{th}$ of the amount of time spent in normal-occupancy rooms, where n is the number of rooms in the house +1. So, if the HU is a 5-room apartment with an attic space, the single limit approach assumes that the occupant could spend $1/6^{th}$ of its time in the attic to receive an equal fraction of total dose from all spaces.

All but two states set one health standard for all parts of a property. Thus, all rooms that are tested, including HVAC systems, attics, or other spaces, must meet the single standard or be remediated to that standard. The base health standards promulgated by Colorado and California were intended to prevent occupants receiving more than the RfD recommended in their health risk assessments. There is considerable uncertainty in setting the RfD (which is compensated for), and with sampling data. Under this paradigm, an incremental dose of a few percent might be considered acceptable. Moreover, as detailed below, actual third-hand doses in remediated houses are actually sufficiently lower than required, so the RfD is still not exceeded even with these increased AHS. The increased dose was calculated based on the assumed exposure time in LOA and LOA spaces, along with the failure rates and remedial cost reductions as the AHS was increased. Calculated incremental doses were made for AHSs ranging from 0.75-40 ug/100 cm^2 for LOAs and 0.75 -10 ug/100 cm^2 for MOAs. Calculations were discontinued when the incidence of these spaces that exceed the AHS reached 0%.

Results of the LOA calculations are shown in Figure 2a,b. The calculations start at 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 and when the AHS for LOA is also 0.5, this is actually the base scenario. Per projects costs decline from ~$15,000 to $9,600 for a 40 ug/100 cm^2 AHS. The overall HU failure rate is not affected very much because other parts of the HUs still fail. However, the failure rate of LOAs went from ~50% to 0% over this span. The incremental dose reaches 1% at 4 ug/100 cm^2, and is 2.2% at 10 ug/100 cm^2. As the 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 health standard was used for this calculation, these incremental doses can be expressed as occurring at 8-fold and 20-fold above the base health standard. As the calculation of incremental dose is the ratio of the AHS to BHS adjusted for exposure time, the same incremental dose occurs with respect to any base standard for the same-fold increase.

Figure 2a,b. Average remedial costs per project, total U.S. remedial costs, percent of HU that fail, and incremental dose calculations to Alternate Health Standards for Low-Occupancy Areas





The same analysis was conducted for MOAs which were assumed to be occupied for 1 hour per week. While this could underestimate exposure time for adults, it may reasonably estimate exposure time for young children, for which the RfD was established. The Adult RfD published by Colorado was already substantially higher at 4 ug/100 cm^2 (Goyal 2014), so the exposure time for adults is not necessarily an issue. Modest decreases in remedial costs per project and in failure rates are found at concentrations up to 10 ug/100 cm^2, where the failure rate for MOAs reached 0% (Figure 3a,b). However, this cost assessment ignores important additional costs. From an industrial hygiene standpoint, meth testing is done to define the extent of a building that exceeds the health standard. If meth activity occurs in an apartment, some meth migrates through the unit door to the exterior stairwell or interior hallway and can exceed a standard such as 0.5 ug/100 cm^2. Based on the data in twelve PAs, the average concentration in interior hallways was 0.61 ug/100 cm^2, and 33% exceeded the health standard (0.5 ug/100 cm^2). The concentrations in the hallway averaged 25-fold lower than in the source unit. This situation

triggers a need to test the hallway again to determine how far the contamination plume migrated, and several additional tests may be needed before the plume is defined. If the plume extends to the hallway by other units, testing may be needed in those units as well. In the case of condominiums, homeowner associations permission is required for testing and other owners or tenants' permission may become necessary. Yet, based on the levels normally seen in hallways, and the ratio between hallways and units (25-fold lower), the potential for significant exposure going into other units is small. In summary, a health standard for hallways equal to the BHS sometimes creates additional testing costs, inconveniences, delays, anxieties and other psychosocial costs, legal involvement and other issues, where the potential for any significant migration is very limited. The same issues may occur with exterior stairwells, which also typically get scarcely contaminated. These factors make it advisable to base an Alternate Health Standard on an appropriate increment to dose. The incremental dose is 4.2% at 1 ug/100 cm^2.

Figure 3a, b:

Average remedial costs per project, total U.S. remedial costs, percent of HU that fail, and incremental dose calculations to Alternate Health Standards for Moderate-Occupancy Areas





HVAC Systems

HVAC systems represent a significant fraction of remediation costs yet, as discussed below, do not represent a clear degree of exposure. For the purposes of this analysis, HVAC systems are heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems that use a heater (usually a furnace), a fan to move air through supply ductwork, return ducts (which may be very short in smaller apartments), and possibly cooling equipment. Local exhaust systems such as bathroom exhaust fans are not considered here, but are discussed separately below. In the dataset used here, 84% of the HUs had HVAC. Contamination of HVAC means the meth concentration inside the ducts and equipment, and any contamination on the exterior is considered as "room contamination" just like contamination on cabinets or fixtures.

HVAC constitutes a unique exposure situation, as occupant contact with the system interior is rare. At most, an occupant would ordinarily change a furnace filter once or twice a year, which is a negligible exposure time. The main concern with HVAC would be the potential for emissions in supply air. While inhalation exposure was considered insignificant in the published risk assessments, one could consider the idea that HVAC emissions could increase contaminant concentrations in the residence and thus increase dermal and ingestion dose. However, all HVAC systems are designed and normally operated with a furnace filter that will collect a fraction of airborne particulates during each pass through the system. Residential furnace filters remove 10%-60% of particulates during each pass through the system, as measured in downstream supply air (Li and Siegel 2020) with MERV 8-14 filters in place. Ambient air particulate concentrations in the residence were also reduced by the HVAC filters, again depending on the MERV rating (Stephens 2012). Thus, in terms of chemical fate and transport, HVAC systems are a *sink*, and emission of meth in supply air is inherently lower than in return air and reduces the concentrations in the HU. Dirty ducts are the result of particle deposition and could theoretically be a concern; yet, if emissions were greater than intake, the HVAC would be a "self-cleaning" device, and the ducts would tend to be clean. Therefore, HVAC systems result in a net negative exposure, lessening exposure rather than increasing it, provided that significant dermal contact with interior components does not occur. This is a basis for raising the health standard as it applies to HVAC.

It could be hypothesized that remediating HVAC systems could be only a temporary measure as well. In the 100 PA dataset, for the 84 HUs with HVAC, the HVAC systems were on average 9.8-fold more contaminated than the house that the system serviced. If a remediation project had a health standard of 0.5 ug/100 c, and the average in the HVAC system after remediation was 50% of the health standard, after a period of equilibration, the HVAC system should regain a concentration of ~3 ug/100 and thus, be "re-contaminated." Thus, remediating HVAC systems may be somewhat of an illusion.

Beyond that, there is a question on how effective remediation of duct systems is. The normal process for cleaning HVAC is to use a mechanical duct cleaning system (brushes, whips, etc.)

connected to a HEPA-filtered negative air machine to collect the particulates emitted from agitation equipment. EPA-approved detergents may be used, but have to be limited in amount to avoid corrosion or water damage to the house. Hand cleaning of furnaces, louvers, and reachable sections of supply and return ducts is then usually conducted. Post-remedial sampling is normally performed but is usually heavily or exclusively biased to hand-accessible portions of the furnace or ducts. The difficulty in sampling randomly selected locations in ducts is apparent (see Figure 4). Thus, sampling is normally representative of machine plus hand cleaning at the ends of ducts and not the machine-only cleaning in the duct runs. The effect of this biased sampling issue is unclear. Statistically representative data were not identified to compare the concentrations after remediation in random portions and at the ends of ducts. However, three projects were identified where a comparison could be made. The concentrations after remediation were 80-fold (+/- 32) higher in the middle of ducts as compared to at duct ends that were hand-accessible. Thus, absent requirements to actually test middle sections of ducts, the assumption that entire duct runs are as clean as duct ends is very questionable.

Figure 4: Sampling in the middle of a duct run in ceiling joists required cutting ceiling drywall and then cutting the sheet metal.

There are two ways in which HVAC data can be acquired, either through composite sampling or discrete sampling. Composite sample results are an average of the residue concentrations in the locations sampled. Discrete samples could be averaged to compare to health standards or the highest sample can be the comparison. The analysis will look at both methods. Calculations are based on the 84 HUs out of the 100 PAs that had HVAC systems. The cost of remediating HVAC systems to the BHS and AHSs and the resultant failure rates are shown in Figure 5. These data indicate that, for a base health standard of 0.5 ug/100, increasing the HVAC health standard to 4 ug/1 or 10 ug/100 cm^2 would reduce costs by ~$1,300 and $1,800 respectively, per remediation project if the HVAC average meth concentrations are used. If the maximum concentration in HVAC samples is used, the cost savings is $1,000 and $1,800 respectively.

Figure 5: HVAC Remediation costs and failure percentages



These cost estimates do not include some ancillary costs. HVAC systems are likely the most recalcitrant part of the house to remediate to a base standard. Thus, it typically requires two additional cleanings to meet base standards (three total cleanings) and three verification samplings. Consequently, a lot of the contractor's contingency budget is used by HVAC re-cleanings, and if the HVAC health standard is increased, the contingency cost would be reduced. Additionally, the additional cost for re-testing have not been included in the cost estimate, so an additional $500-$1,000 per project may be saved were higher standards applied.

Data were not identified to allow an estimate of incremental dose under various increased HVAC AHSs. In theory, an AHS could be very high without any increase in exposure or dose, but at some point, it could be possible for emissions to equal or exceed ambient concentrations. It is worth mentioning that for a typical house, the HVAC system contains about 2.5% of the surface area of the house, so even if some emissions occur, once they are distributed in the house, they are quantitatively fairly small.

Exhaust Vent Systems

The most common exhaust vent in residential HUs is the bathroom system, consisting of a louvered cover, with a fan motor behind or above it, connected to a duct that usually exits the building through a wall or through the attic and roof. Bathroom exhaust fans tend to become very contaminated. In the PA dataset, the average concentration in a bathroom fan system was 50 times higher than the average in the house. Similarly to HVAC systems, however, occupants

rarely if ever have dermal contact or ingestion exposures with the interior of the system. If a composite sample is collected in a bathroom, and one aliquot is from the exhaust system, the exhaust aliquot would increase the resulting concentration by approximately 13-fold and would make the room fail even when the room itself is 13 times lower than the health standard. There are instances where the only area that failed in a house was the bathroom, and the bathroom only failed due to an aliquot collected from inside the fan system. Fan and duct remediation adds approximately $1,000 to remediation costs, and significantly more if the exhaust ducts are enclosed in drywall. A sampling professional may feel compelled to sample inside the fan so they don't "miss" a likely location that could fail. As the exhaust systems likely contribute very little to occupant exposure, they could simply be excluded from testing and remediation requirements. Guidance documents could simply recommend that, if the bathroom fails and the exhaust duct is accessible, that it be removed as an extra precaution. Remediating exhaust ducts in-place is likely a false panacea, as they are rarely if ever tested.

The ratio of meth concentrations in the greasy areas of the kitchen to the walls nearby in 25 units was found to be 41:1. As an organic compound with a molecular weight of 149, it is not surprising that meth would partition into organic substrates. For the same reasons, other exhaust systems such as kitchen stove range exhaust systems, attics fans, whole house fans, dryer fans, or other local exhaust ventilation could be excluded. Guidelines might recommend that, if the room in which they are located is deemed contaminated, accessible parts be cleaned or removed, but can be excluded if not accessible.

Averaging of Results

In most states, any part of a property that exceeds the health standard is required to be mitigated. Yet, health risk is based on average exposure to occupants. An argument can be made for defining contamination under regulations based on the average concentration in the normally occupied part of HUs. In the PA dataset, 71 properties were defined as contaminated when one or more normal-occupancy rooms or areas exceeded the health standard of 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 (15 failed in low or moderate occupancy areas). If the average of test data were applied for the normal occupancy areas, only 54 failed. A substantial reduction in costs would ensue from this approach. However, one must consider the possibility that an occupant could spend more time in rooms that were more contaminated than the average. To consider this issue, the global coefficient of variation on normal-occupancy rooms is ~100%, meaning that if the average concentration in "rooms" was 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, most other rooms would be all in the range of 0.5 +/- 0.5 ug/100 cm^2.

Combined AHS

The small incremental exposures or doses could raise some concern as they would be "on top of" the exposure in normal-occupancy areas. However, the dose occupants receive is already less than the dose correlated with the health standard in almost all cases. For example, in the 14 HUs in the PA dataset that "passed", the average concentration in the occupied portion of the HU was 0.04 +/- 0.04 ug/100 cm^2 as compared to a health standard of 0.5 ug/100 cm^2. This means that over 99% of the occupants were exposed to concentrations of ~0.12 ug/100 cm^2 or less, and a 2-

6% incremental dose from exposure in LOAs and MOAs would not cause the total dose to exceed or even approach the dose allowed by the base health standard. The same is true with remediated properties. A survey of 15 remediated properties from the CDPHE on-line database found the average post-remediation concentration in normally occupied parts of HUs was 0.1 +/- .07 ug/100 cm^2. This means that over 99% of future occupants would be exposed to ~0.3 ug/100 cm^2 or less, so total exposure would remain under 70% of the base health standard. This provides more than enough of a margin of safety to permit small increases in dose if AHSs were increased for LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC.

Potentially, different AHSs could be promulgated for each type of space, NOAs, LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC. The combined assessment for these recommended AHSs is portrayed in Table 5 in respect to BHSs of 0.5 and 1.5 ug/100 cm^2. The LOA and HVAC AHS levels were varied up to 20-fold above the base. However, the MOA AHS was kept at 2-fold above the base.

Table 5: Failure rates and Remediation Costs for Increased AHS

AHS, ug/100 cm^2	Overall Fail %	Average Remedial Cost ($)	Total U.S. Remedial Cost ($)	Cost Reduction ($)
Base Standard 0.5 ug/100 cm2				
0.5	86	14,951	5,233	
1	81	13,397	4,689	1,554
1.5	79	13,091	4,582	1,860
5	74	10,129	3,545	4,822
10	71	8,841	3,094	6,110
Base standard 1.5 ug/100 cm2				
1.5	70	10,172	3,560	
7.5	58	7,287	2,550	2,885
15	56	5,751	2,013	4,421
30	56	4,963	1,737	5,209

Based on this analysis, implementation of all the AHSs would reduce remediation costs by 41-51% for the two base standards.

Recommendations and Conclusions

Based on the calculations reported here, the following recommendations are made.

1. States that do not regulate meth contamination or only apply regulations to manufacturing sites may want to consider regulations on cooking and use, considering the substantial number of contaminated properties that appear to exist.
2. The cost estimates made in this study are biased low and the true cost reductions would be considerably higher if all forms of costs could be included.
3. Base health standards should be based on the published risk assessment values. In particular, health standards of 0.1 and 0.05 ug/100 cm^2 should be increased to one of the risk assessment-based standards. The average remedial cost would be reduced from ~$21K to $15K or $13K depending on which risk assessment is used.

4. Alternative health standards for low-occupancy areas should be established at 20-fold higher than the base health standard, where the incremental dose was 2.2%, and the cost reduction is ~$5K per project.
5. Alternative health standards for moderate-occupancy areas should be established at 2-fold higher than the base health standard, which carries an incremental dose of 4.2%. While this is a very small change in the health standard, it would obviate the need for a lot of additional testing, including in property which is sometimes owned by other property owners.
6. HVAC systems do not contribute to dermal and ingestion exposure to a significant extent, and if biased cleaning and sampling is performed focusing on the reachable ends, the ducts are likely not effectively decontaminated anyway. Alternative health standards for HVAC systems should be established at 20-fold higher than base standards. This is not expected to result in substantial additional exposure and would reduce per project costs by ~$2K.
7. Local exhaust systems should be exempted from testing and remediation requirements to avoid confounding with samples of rooms themselves. Guidance might suggest that if they are in rooms that are contaminated and are practicable to remove or clean, optional efforts could be made in that regard.
8. Increases to the health standard should be considered for LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC systems simultaneously. The increase in dose to occupants will remain under the dose contemplated by the base health standards even while remediation costs may be reduced by 50% or potentially even more.

As meth use is increasing throughout the U.S. and more properties are becoming contaminated, it is critical to re-evaluate standards so that the remediation costs are applied in the most practicable manner. Lowering the cost of remediation will expand the health protections as more properties will end up being remediated.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available upon request from the author.

Competing Interests

The author discloses that he has no competing interests although he supervises and performs meth consulting activity.

Funding

No funding was received for this study.

References

Bitter JL. 2017. The persistence of illicit drug smoke residues and their recovery from common household surfaces. Drug Test Anal. 9(4):603-612.
Bob_Villa. 2024. How much does attic insulation cost. [accessed]. https://www.bobvila.com/articles/attic-insulation-cost/.
CalEPA. 2009a. Assessment of Children's Exposure to Surface Methamphetamine Residues in Former Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs, and Identification of a Risk-Based Cleanup Standard for Surface Methamphetamine Contamination.
CalEPA. 2009b. Development of a Reference Dose (RfD) for Methamphetamine. California Environmental Protection Agency.
CDPHE. 2024. Meth Reports. [accessed]. https://cdphe.colorado.gov/hm/records-review.
Dennison J. 2024. Methamphetamine-contaminated residences in the United States: assessment of the environmental health significance of third-hand exposure. MedRXiv https://doiorg/101101/2024073024311229.
mGoyal R. 2014. Alternate Adult Methamphetamine Cleanup goal for Limited Access Areas. Memoranda to Colleen Brisnehan.
Hammon TL GS. 2007. Support for selection of a methamphetamine cleanup standard in Colorado. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 48(1):102-114.
HomeGuide. 2024. Central Air Conditioning Installation. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://homeguide.com/costs/hvac-cost.
Li T, Siegel JA. 2020. In situ efficiency of filters in residential central HVAC systems. Indoor Air. 30(2):315-325.
Martyny JW. 2008. Methamphetamine Sampling Variability on Different Surfaces Using Diffferent Solvents (unpublished report).
MLCC. 2024. Meth Lab Cleanup Standards. Meth Lab Cleanup Company [accessed 2024 March 17]. https://www.methlabcleanup.com/Meth-Lab-Cleanup-Standards.html.
RFR. 2024. Regional Foundation Repair. Average Cost of a Vapor Barrier. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://www.regionalfoundationrepair.com/crawl-space/average-cost-of-vapor-barrier/.
Stephens B, & Siegel, J. A. . 2012. Comparison of Test Methods for Determining the Particle Removal Efficiency of Filters in Residential and Light-Commercial Central HVAC Systems Aerosol Science and Technology. 46(5):504-513.
mUSEPA. 2008. Stochastic Human Exposure and Dose Simulation Model for Multimedia, Multipathway Chemicals. SHEDS-Multimedia Model Version 3 Technical Manual. EPA 600/R-08/118.
USEPA. 2021. Voluntary Guidelines for Methamphetamine and Fentanyl Laboratory Cleanup. EPA-540-B-21-002.
USEPA. 2024. Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Glossary. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://sor.epa.gov/sor_internet/registry/termreg/searchandretrieve/glossariesandkeywordlists/search.do%3Bjsessionid%3DVlwqcwYyLhUo1oDvgiO0TvQRBc0DnFfnaT0N8nvQPdtRKQaPCtCF!1236830639?details&vocabName=IRIS%20Glossary&filterTerm=reference%20dose&checkedAcronym=false&checkedTerm=false&hasDefinitions=false&filterTerm=reference%20dose&filterMatchCriteria=Contains.
Van Dyke MV, Serrano KA, Kofford S, Contreras J, Martyny JW. 2011. Variability and specificity associated with environmental methamphetamine sampling and analysis. J Occup Environ Hyg. 8(11):636-641.

mWyoming_SERC. 2010. State Emergency Response Commission CHAPTER 2 Clandestine Lab Testing and Remediation.