

Global Indoor Health Network

Common Toxins in Our Homes, Schools and Workplaces



Global Indoor Health Network, Inc.
PO Box 777308
Henderson, NV 89077-7308
contact@globalindoorhealthnetwork.com

globalindoorhealthnetwork.com

Original Issue Date: February 2012

Revised copy effective December 17, 2012

Global Indoor Health Network (GIHN)

“Working Together for Healthy Indoor Environments”

PREFACE

The Global Indoor Health Network (GIHN) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing education and awareness of the health effects of mold and other indoor contaminants. GIHN’s worldwide network of scientists, physicians, researchers, building engineers, indoor air quality experts, attorneys, teachers, injured workers, healthy indoor environment advocates and others are working together to promote healthy indoor environments in our homes, schools and businesses. GIHN has members throughout the United States and in eight other countries who have united to share our collective knowledge, expertise and life experiences to advance the understanding and awareness of this very important public health issue.

Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally. Poor indoor air quality affects people from all walks of life. Affected persons include both genders, all ages, those unborn and soon-to-be born, homemakers, stay-at-home moms, teachers and school children, veterans, retirees, disabled individuals, workers of all levels and skills, farmers, professionals, owners of businesses large and small, and all degrees of affluence. In short, anyone who spends time indoors is at risk.

This paper is dedicated to the individuals, families, teachers, employees and school children throughout the world who have been harmed by exposure to indoor contaminants...and to the countless advocates, doctors, scientists and others who have been working tirelessly for years to bring this very important public health issue to the forefront. It is our hope that this paper will help to further advance this cause.

Authors:

Scott W. McMahon, M.D.

Janette Hope, M.D.

Jack Dwayne Thrasher, Ph.D.

William J. Rea, M.D.

Alan R. Vinitsky, M.D.

Michael R. Gray, M.D., MPH

For a brief biography and conflict of interest statement for each author, see page 56. Any questions regarding this paper may be forwarded to Dr. Scott McMahon at (575) 627-5571.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Astute physicians and healers have been aware of the existence of environmental toxins for over a thousand years. The list of substances, both naturally occurring and manmade, which may cause harm to the human organism, is continually growing. Curiously, while heart disease, cancers and rare exotic illnesses frequently grab headlines, illness due to environmental sources, though incredibly common, often receive little or no media coverage. Typically, little education is offered to allopathic physicians in their medical training on this subject. Hence, there is poor understanding of, and by many even contempt for, the concept that our environment is capable of slowly poisoning its inhabitants. However, there are countless research papers and government reports on this topic that include numerous statements describing the significant health effects of indoor air contaminants. We have provided more details in the section titled “Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants.” Here are a few specific quotes relating to the health effects of indoor air pollution:

In a 1989 report by The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Special Legislative Commission on Indoor Air Pollution:

“Indoor air pollution is a growing problem in the United States and accounts for up to 50% of all illnesses.”

In a 1989 report from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):

“Health effects from indoor air pollution cover the range of acute and chronic effects, and include eye, nose, and throat irritation, respiratory effects, neurotoxicity, kidney and liver effects, heart functions, allergic and infectious diseases, developmental effects, mutagenicity, and carcinogenicity.”

In a 2009 report by the World Health Organization (WHO) on dampness and mould:

“Indoor air pollution – such as from dampness and mould, chemicals and other biological agents – is a major cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide.”

In a 2010 report by the WHO on indoor air quality and selected pollutants:

“Indoor exposure to air pollutants causes very significant damage to health globally—especially in developing countries.”

There are statistics available regarding the illnesses caused by some (individual) indoor air contaminants (such as tobacco, radon, lead and solid cooking and heating fuels). However, the illnesses caused by many other indoor air contaminants are not currently being tracked in any country. As a result, there is not one combined statistic available regarding the number of illnesses and deaths caused by indoor air pollution. Nevertheless, there are several estimates of the financial and statistical impact. When you consider the total impact of these contaminants, it is important to consider both the acute and chronic health effects.

We have provided several key statistics in this paper in the section titled “Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants.” These statistics should catch the attention of every physician, every lawmaker and every layperson reading this paper. These numbers are greater than all the cancers and all the heart disease combined. It is time we started to pay more attention to the indoor air we breathe.

Occasionally, an environmental illness becomes national news overnight. Legionnaire’s Disease, caused by the *Legionella* bacteria, became a media superstar in the summer of 1976 as hundreds of people became ill at the American Legion convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This is the exception for most environmental poisons, however. More typically, a few individuals discover the toxic potential of a substance, such as asbestos, publish, and yet it may take 3-4 **decades** for public and Western medical acceptance of the danger.

This delay in widespread awareness of novel science is not new and was certainly around in the times of Copernicus, Galileo and others, whose theories and proofs were opposed by powerful controlling bodies. In time, however, the truths of their works prevailed.

This paper highlights a number of environmental toxins, most of which have already been accepted as capable of causing significant disease. Studying their individual histories of usage and poison potential discoveries confirms that we, as people and as physicians, are usually slow to accept that these substances—found in most homes, schools and workplaces—are capable of harming us and our children.

Radon, asbestos, products of combustion (such as carbon monoxide and cigarette smoke), volatile organic compounds (such as formaldehyde, benzene, pesticides and some personal care products), particulate matter, lead and a number of known and emerging disease-causing microbiological agents are discussed in this paper. However, the most space is reserved for the discussion regarding the secondary metabolic products of molds and bacteria released into the air of water-damaged buildings as these potentially may harm the most people and because of the disinformation war currently being waged suggesting that human disease from these toxins cannot exist.

Indeed, the 2010 Policyholders of America (POA) position statement documents the previously published literature of more than 50,000 patients (a staggering number) displaying aspects of this disease. Yet, some individuals and organizations continue to author reports claiming there is no human data, no credible evidence and no way this disease can even exist. Interestingly, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine’s (ACOEM) 2011 position paper cites no study published after 2002 and does not reference the General Accounting Office’s (GAO) report of 2008 on Indoor Mold (let alone the GAO reports from 1991 and 1995) or the WHO report of 2009 on Dampness and Mould—both of which summarize the existing scientific data and flatly contradict the opinions of the ACOEM’s naysayer paper. Naysayer articles also spend valuable print space suggesting that disease from mold can only occur after ingestion, or can only occur in the presence of large amounts of aerosolized toxin, or can only occur in an acute exposure. In light of the overwhelming peer-reviewed and journal-published evidence to the contrary, it is unimaginable that such papers are still being inked, are

still being used in courts as “evidence” and are still considered relevant in any way. It’s the “Big Lie” all over again—say something long enough and loud enough and many will believe the lie.

“Big Business” has been shown repeatedly to use this tactic regarding the dangers of their products, and the histories of such substances as radium, asbestos and coal are evidence of the same. Workers in these industries, and other industries, were exposed to dangerous materials **for decades** while those making the profits knew the potential harmful health effects. Perhaps the tobacco industry is the most glaring and current example of corporate hubris, claiming, also for decades, that there was no evidence linking smoking to cancer and producing its own studies revealing that cigarette smoking was “safe”. Hence, the era of junk science was not born, but was merely revealed.

Many additional examples of industry’s use of the “Big Lie” strategy are highlighted in David Michaels’ book “Doubt is Their Product.” Ironically, the name for the book came from the following statement written by one of the tobacco industry executives: “*Doubt is our product since it is the best means of competing with the ‘body of fact’ that exists in the minds of the general public. It is also the means of establishing a controversy.*” Michaels provides an excellent summary:

The practices perfected (by the tobacco industry) are alive and well and ubiquitous today. We see this growing trend that disingenuously demands proof over precaution in the realm of public health. In field after field, year after year, conclusions that might support regulation are always disputed. Animal data are deemed not relevant, human data not representative, and exposure data not reliable. Whatever the story—global warming, sugar and obesity, secondhand smoke—scientists in what I call the “product defense industry” prepare for the release of unfavorable studies even before the studies are published. Public relations experts feed these for-hire scientists contrarian sound bites that play well with reporters, who are mired in the trap of believing there must be two sides to every story. Maybe there are two sides—and maybe one has been bought and paid for.

“Big Business” has been aware of the mold issue for more than a decade too. At stake, who will pay for the cost of remediating water-damaged buildings? Since the U.S. EPA estimates that up to ½ of all U.S. buildings are water-damaged, the bill to correct all these spaces is enormous. State and Federal governments do not want to pay this price, nor do school districts or other employers. Building insurers have quietly exempted themselves via the addition of mold riders in their policies (non-existent 20 years ago). Meanwhile, more and more people are getting sick in the buildings where they live, attend school and work. By keeping the issue hushed, “Big Business” is attempting to delay paying the price, or if possible, push the costs of problem solution onto the “little guy”, i.e., the individual homeowner. Also at stake are 1) who pays for the medical care for injured workers and students and 2) who pays for the lost livelihoods of injured employees who are now disabled from their work environment related condition?

If you look at the other side of the equation, billions of dollars could be saved if we implemented specific steps aimed at improving indoor air quality. According to a 2000 report by Fisk, et al “the estimated potential annual economic savings plus productivity gains, in 1996

dollars, are approximately \$40 to \$200 billion” if we would implement specific scenarios to improve indoor environmental quality in U.S. office buildings. Imagine how big those savings would be if we also made these changes in schools, homes and other structures around the world. Other interesting cost estimates resulting from indoor air pollution and unhealthy housing have been made. Literally, hundreds of billions of dollars are in the balance. Details are provided in the section titled “Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants.”

Since widespread understanding in the lay and allopathic medical communities has yet to be achieved, these decisions are being made one by one in the courts. Hence, the emergence of junk science and the Big Lie to obfuscate the obvious—our environments can possess substances dangerous to human health—and some companies are making large profits by not addressing the dangers, insurance companies have revised their policies to exclude coverage for mold, some construction firms improve their bottom line by using poor construction techniques, and some schools are poisoning our children.

Mold illness, mold-related illness and biotoxin-related illness are euphemisms which are collectively referred to as Multi-system Exposure Related Illness (MERI, pronounced “meer-ee”) in this paper. Likely millions of individuals with MERI exist in the U.S. alone. In fact, as noted above, Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally. Most physicians will not recognize the illness because of unawareness and the variable multi-systemic presentations of MERI.

While a massive acute exposure can lead to MERI, the most common mechanism is chronic exposure to low levels of toxins resulting in physiologic changes including an inflammatory response. The inflammatory changes are widespread throughout the body and are likely influenced by individual HLA genotypes as well as genetic polymorphisms affecting detoxification pathways which result in increased susceptibility to chronic exposure to toxins. Individual genetic factors as well as underlying health and nutritional status also contribute to an ongoing inflammatory response and symptoms even after exposure to the water-damaged environment has ended. Direct neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity of some mycotoxins has also been clearly demonstrated in the literature. Additionally, chronic infections, both fungal and bacterial, can result from exposure to water-damaged environments and can contribute to illness.

Currently, our detection and testing methods are not sensitive enough to determine which individual toxin, or group of toxins, causes illness for each individual patient. Different patients likely will have individualized susceptibilities and each water-damaged building has its own unique set of pathogenic, toxin-producing microbes. What is clear from re-exposure studies, however, is that certain buildings will cause a rapid reproduction of symptoms (and abnormal lab studies) in patients when re-exposed off therapy. Should the medical community wait 20 or 30 years to develop the technology to determine which individual toxin(s) is (are) causing MERI, or should buildings be remediated and patients be treated now? The question is rhetorical; the answer is obvious.

The diagnosis of MERI is usually straightforward although a consensus of the exact definition of the disease has not been established since the disease is in the process of being

defined. There are numerous objective biological indicators found in patients suffering from MERI. Dr. Ritchie Shoemaker *et al* have proposed a three-tiered case definition. He and his group use an extensive history, physical exam findings, and results of Visual Contrast Sensitivity testing, Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy, nasal culture and blood tests to look at 10 different bio-markers for this illness.

Other treating physicians use additional testing modalities. Dr. Michael Gray *et al* also look for evidence of fungal colonization in nasal passages, sputum and stool, evaluate potential pesticide exposures and measure urine mycotoxins as proof of exposure. His group also looks at Nerve Conduction Velocities, neurobehavioral testing developed by Dr. Kaye Kilburn and QEEG (Quantitative Electroencephalograms) as part of their evaluation. In addition, Dr. Janette Hope uses detoxigenomic studies which look at various single nucleotide polymorphisms and assesses for nutritional deficiencies frequently found in those with long-term toxic exposures. Dr. Alan Vinitzky assesses for autonomic nervous system (ANS) dysfunction via the Autonomic Nervous System And Respiration (ANSAR) testing system. Dr. William Rea has developed a multi-disciplinary approach to diagnosis (which includes intradermal provocation of mycotoxins) in a facility using state of the art construction techniques to create a “less polluted environment”. As more researchers and treating physicians publish on MERI, a consensus definition and diagnostic approach will be developed.

Treatment protocols also vary and to date there have been no head-to-head trials on the efficacy or superiority of any one regimen. However, each listed practitioner will relate extraordinary results (even up to 90%) of patients who are compliant with the prescribed therapy. The two basic principles of most approaches include 1) toxin avoidance and 2) removal of toxin from the body, usually via sequestering agents.

In summary, MERI is a multi-symptom, multi-system disease occurring in many people due usually to long-term exposure to the interior of WDB. While there are differing opinions on the best diagnostic and therapeutic approaches, it is clear from the literature and from practice that this disease exists and significant relief can be obtained by most sufferers with avoidance of further exposure and appropriate treatment.

Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally. It is staggering to comprehend the enormous impact on our global society as literally millions of individuals and families are harmed by contaminants inside our homes, schools and workplaces. The financial costs are equally staggering with estimates in the hundreds of billions of dollars. The statistics presented throughout this paper should catch the attention of every physician, every lawmaker and every layperson.

Changes over the years in building philosophy, construction materials, pesticides, usage patterns, etc., along with new awareness and improved testing capabilities, have brought us to the understanding that some buildings are sick and can make their occupants sick. Shoddy construction practices and environmental disasters also contribute. Americans spend, on average, 22 hours a day indoors. As such, it is a disconcerting thought that the structures we live in, work at and where we educate our children might lead to significant and even deadly health problems. As a society, we trust and even cherish many of these edifices. Yet some harbor hidden and

harmful dangers. Imagine how different things could be if the truth came to light and all vested parties worked together to improve our indoor air.

- Medical costs would drop significantly.
- Doctors would have accurate, reliable information and be able to provide proper medical diagnosis and treatment.
- We could reverse the huge increase in asthma rates and reduce the billions of dollars being spent on asthma-related illnesses.
- Builders and construction firms would have the information they need to create safe and healthy homes, schools and workplaces.
- Teachers and children would teach and learn in schools with healthy indoor air, thusly increasing scores on educational achievement tests and reducing absenteeism, sick days and drop-out rates.
- Employees could work in buildings with healthy indoor air, increasing worker productivity and decreasing sick days and workers' compensation claims.
- Disability claims would drop significantly, reducing the cost and administrative burden of the rapidly increasing number of social security and private employer disability cases.
- Poor indoor air quality situations would be handled correctly, enabling business owners and landlords to properly remediate and remove contaminants, and prevent homeowners, tenants and employees from losing their homes and jobs as well as their lifetimes of achievements.

In other words, we would create a healthier, more productive society worldwide.

As stated above, the purpose of this paper is to highlight the main threats to human health hidden in our structures. Some agents are radioactive and some are toxins, while others are outright poisons. The list includes mold, bacteria, mycotoxins, endotoxins, microbial particulates, radon, lead, asbestos, chemicals, pesticides, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and other contaminants. Many of these contaminants occur in the interior of water-damaged buildings (WDB), but some of these exist in buildings without water damage. Some sick buildings lead to slowly deteriorating disease while others can bring death quickly.

The published roots of toxicology extend back over a millennium, yet thorough understanding of many toxins—exposure to which impair human health—is not nearly as prevalent as one would expect in our modern medical society. The intent of this paper is to summarize some of the most common and important toxic exposures found in the home, school and workplace.

Call to Action

This position paper is the first step of our **CALL TO ACTION**. Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally. It is time to move beyond the focus of “establishing the fact of mold disease,” because it has already been established in numerous research papers and in the treatment of thousands of patients. It is time for our national and world leaders to develop a comprehensive public health response to this devastating epidemic that has the potential to cripple our individual and collective futures. We have highlighted the extensive research which clearly demonstrates many of these principles and look forward to collaborative efforts in this search for better health and safer living and working conditions. The Global Indoor Health Network puts forth an initial list of recommendations on page 50 of this report.

Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally. It is time to move beyond the focus of “establishing the fact of mold disease,” because it has already been established in numerous research papers and in the treatment of thousands of patients. It is time for our national and world leaders to develop a comprehensive public health response to this devastating epidemic that has the potential to cripple our individual and collective futures.

Table of Contents

Preface	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	x
List of Tables	xi
Introduction	1
Background.....	2
Research Methods.....	2
Findings	3
Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants	4
Statistics on the Health Effects of Indoor Air Contaminants	5
Financial Impact of Poor Indoor Air Quality	16
Common Toxins in Our Homes, Schools and Workplaces	19
Part I: Indoor Contaminants—other than mold	
Radon	19
Asbestos	20
Products of Combustion.....	21
Volatile Organic Compounds.....	23
Particulate Matter.....	25
Lead	26
Legionella	27
Actinobacteria.....	28
Bacillus	28
Conclusion of Part I	29
Part II: Indoor Mold—What More Than 50,000 Patients in the Literature Have Taught Us	
Background	30
The “Big Lie”	31
Pathophysiology.....	34
Diagnosis.....	40
Treatment	42
Causation.....	46
Conclusion of Part II.....	48
Call to Action	50
Appendix A	52
Appendix B.....	54
Biographies and Conflict of Interest Statements	56
References	58

List of Tables

Table 1.....	4
List of Indoor Air Contaminants	
Table 2.....	14
Statistics on the Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants	
Table 3.....	18
Potential U.S. Annual Savings or Productivity Gains	
Appendix A.....	52
Chemicals Often Found in Buildings and Their Health Effects	
Appendix B.....	54
Some Common Fungi, Mycotoxins, and Health Effects from Ingestion, Dermal, or Inhalation Exposure	

Introduction

Indoor air contaminants cause significant damage to health globally.^{1,2,3} It is staggering to comprehend the enormous impact on our global society as literally millions of individuals and families are harmed by contaminants inside our homes, schools and workplaces. The financial costs are equally staggering with estimates in the hundreds of billions of dollars. The statistics presented throughout this paper should catch the attention of every physician, every lawmaker and every layperson.

Changes over the years in building philosophy, construction materials, pesticides, usage patterns, etc., along with new awareness and improved testing capabilities, have brought us to the understanding that some buildings are sick and can make their occupants sick. Shoddy construction practices and environmental disasters also contribute. Americans spend, on average, 22 hours a day indoors. As such, it is a disconcerting thought that the structures we live in, work at and where we educate our children might lead to significant and even deadly health problems. As a society, we trust and even cherish many of these edifices. Yet some harbor hidden and harmful dangers. Imagine how different things could be if the truth came to light and all vested parties worked together to improve our indoor air.

- Medical costs would drop significantly.
- Doctors would have accurate, reliable information and be able to provide proper medical diagnosis and treatment.
- We could reverse the huge increase in asthma rates⁴ and reduce the billions of dollars being spent on asthma-related illnesses.
- Builders and construction firms would have the information they need to create safe and healthy homes, schools and workplaces.
- Teachers and children would teach and learn in schools with healthy indoor air, thusly increasing scores on educational achievement tests and reducing absenteeism, sick days and drop-out rates.
- Employees could work in buildings with healthy indoor air, increasing worker productivity⁵ and decreasing sick days and workers' compensation claims.
- Disability claims would drop significantly, reducing the cost and administrative burden of the rapidly increasing number of social security and private employer disability cases.
- Poor indoor air quality situations would be handled correctly, enabling business owners and landlords to properly remediate and remove contaminants, and prevent homeowners, tenants and employees from losing their homes and jobs as well as their lifetimes of achievements.

In other words, we would create a healthier, more productive society worldwide.⁵

Changes over the years in building philosophy, construction materials, pesticides, usage patterns, etc., along with new awareness and improved testing capabilities have brought us to the understanding that some buildings are sick—and can make their occupants sick. Shoddy construction practices and environmental disasters also contribute. The purpose of this paper is to

highlight the main threats to human health hidden in our structures. Some agents are radioactive and some are toxins, while others are outright poisons (toxins = poisons). The list includes mold, bacteria, mycotoxins, endotoxins, microbial particulates, radon, lead, asbestos, chemicals, pesticides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and other contaminants. The list is by no means exhaustive. Many of these contaminants occur in the interior of water-damaged buildings (WDB), but some of these exist in buildings without water damage. Some sick buildings lead to slowly deteriorating disease while others can bring death quickly.

The published roots of toxicology extend back over a millennium⁶, yet thorough understanding of many toxins, exposure to which impair human health, is not nearly as prevalent as one would expect in our modern medical society. The intent of this paper is to summarize some of the most common and important toxic exposures found in the home, school and workplace.

Background

Astute physicians and healers have been aware of the existence of environmental toxins for over a thousand years. The list of substances, both naturally occurring and manmade, which may cause harm to the human organism, is continually growing. Curiously, while heart disease, cancers and rare exotic illnesses frequently grab headlines, illness due to environmental sources, though incredibly common, often receive little or no media coverage. Typically, little education is offered to allopathic physicians in their medical training on this subject. Hence, there is poor understanding of, and by many even contempt for, the concept that our environment is capable of slowly poisoning its inhabitants.

As documented throughout this paper and in countless research papers and government reports, indoor air pollution causes significant damage to health globally. Based on the statistics available, it is clear that the number of illnesses caused by indoor air is greater than all the cancers and heart disease combined. It is time we started to pay more attention to the indoor air we breathe.

This report was written to meet the needs of a diverse, global audience and includes a discussion of numerous indoor contaminants that will be helpful to experts and laypersons. It also includes information on the pathophysiology and diagnosis of MERI, as well as details regarding the treatment protocols used by some of the leading physicians in this field. We hope this detailed information will be helpful to medical organizations, government agencies and physicians, nurses and others in the health care field.

Research Methods

Our research methods included an extensive search of the peer-reviewed, scientific literature, as well as other relevant sources, and communications with some of the experts in this field.

Findings

Our findings consist of facts and statistics derived from the research materials. They include specific details, observations and insights. We have also included key facts and statistics presented within the report in Tables 1, 2 and 3 and Appendix A and B.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the main threats to human health hidden in our homes, schools and workplaces. Some agents are radioactive and some are toxins, while others are outright poisons (toxins = poisons). The list includes mold, bacteria, mycotoxins, endotoxins, microbial particulates, radon, lead, asbestos, chemicals, pesticides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and other contaminants. This list is not exhaustive. Part I discusses indoor contaminants (other than mold). Part II focuses on mold and its related components.

We also included a section titled “Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants” which provides statistics regarding the health effects of indoor air contaminants and estimates of the financial costs. This section includes information and references from several government reports and research papers. The statistics presented in this section should catch the attention of every physician, every lawmaker and every layperson reading this paper. In short, poor indoor air quality has a tremendous impact on our global economy.

The findings in this paper will help to further the mission and vision of the Global Indoor Health Network and will be used to help raise awareness of this important public health issue that is affecting individuals and families around the globe.

Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants

As discussed in this paper, there are many types of indoor air contaminants. When evaluating the impact of indoor air contaminants, it is important to consider all of the possible sources and the acute and chronic health effects. The following table provides a list of many possible indoor air contaminants, but the list is not intended to be all inclusive.

Table 1	
List of Indoor Air Contaminants	
Indoor air contaminant	Examples (this list is not all inclusive)
Asbestos	
Bacteria	Gram negative and positive bacteria,(e.g. Bacillus, legionella, actinobacteria, actinomycetes, streptomyces, mycobacterium, and nocardia)
Biological contaminants	Mold, mycotoxins, endotoxins, β -D-glucans, spirocyclic drimanes, trichothecenes, aflatoxin, ochratoxin, satratoxins, galactomannans, hemolysins
Chemicals	Benzene, phthlates, polyfluoroalkyl, trichloroethylene, tetrachloroethylene, naphthalene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, household cleaning products, personal care products, pesticides, insecticides, bromated flame retardants, polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), Bisphenol A (BPA)
Heavy metals	Lead, mercury, arsenic
Particulate matter	Biological and non-biological
Products of combustion	Tobacco smoke, solid cooking and heating fuels, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide
Radon	

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)	Formaldehyde, pesticides, sewer water, air fresheners, organic gases, fragrances, laundry products, and off-gassing of furniture, carpet, solvents, copying and printing devices, protective coatings and paint
-----------------------------------	---

Statistics Regarding the Health Effects of Indoor Air Contaminants

There are statistics available regarding the illnesses caused by some (individual) indoor air contaminants (such as tobacco, radon, lead and solid cooking and heating fuels). However, the illnesses caused by many other indoor air contaminants are not currently being tracked in any country. As a result, there is not one combined statistic available regarding the number of illnesses and deaths caused by indoor air pollution. Nevertheless, there are several estimates of the financial and statistical impact. In addition, there are countless statements in reports from government agencies and researchers that illustrate the significant health effects of indoor air pollution and other environmental exposures. When you consider the total impact of these contaminants, it is important to consider both the acute and chronic health effects. The following discussion will highlight the serious health threat posed by indoor air pollution.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Special Legislative Commission on Indoor Air Pollution (1989)

One of the noteworthy statistical estimates comes from a 1989 report by The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Special Legislative Commission on Indoor Air Pollution, titled "Indoor Air Pollution in Massachusetts".¹ This Special Commission was comprised of people from several disciplines including:

- Numerous state senators and representatives and
- Individuals from:
 - Massachusetts Department of Public Health
 - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
 - American Lung Association
 - Massachusetts State Board of Building Regulations
 - Harvard School of Public Health
 - Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries
 - American Lung Association
 - Representatives from the building industry, etc.

There is a lot of good historical information in this report, and it explains in detail that the health impact of indoor air pollution has been known for decades. For example, the report states that sick building syndrome has been known since World War I, but the first published research paper on the topic did not happen until 1948 in England. The following statements are excerpts from the Massachusetts report.

"Indoor air pollution is a growing problem in the United States and accounts for up to 50% of all illnesses."¹

“The indoor air we breathe often contains pollutants which may have health effects ranging from annoying to deadly. Major pollutant types found in indoor environments include tobacco smoke, radon gas, formaldehyde, asbestos, volatile organic compounds, pesticides, combustion products and biological contaminants. For most of these pollutants, concentrations measured indoors exceed levels found outdoors yet current environmental air pollution laws and regulations are not protective of these indoor environments. They focus instead on the outdoor environment even though individuals spend about ninety percent (90%) of their time indoors.”¹

“Biological contamination of indoor environments ranks third in NIOSH's list of indoor air health threats after poor ventilation and building fabric contaminants. Types of biological contamination range from animal dander, pollen and dust to bacteria, fungi, and viruses. Poor ventilation, stagnant water in ventilation systems, and relative humidity levels falling outside the 40-60% range have been implicated as causes of high indoor air concentrations of these biological contaminants. High humidity and moisture concentrations support proliferation of biologicals in ventilation systems.”¹

“The Commission's efforts confirm the seriousness of the indoor air pollution health threat, which worsened with the energy conservation efforts of the 1970s. More insulation and tighter construction led to lower ventilation rates and build-up of contaminants. Many ‘sick’ buildings have been identified where occupants suffer severe or recurring discomforts such as headaches, dizziness, fatigue, eye irritation, and respiratory problems. Other conditions attributable to indoor air contaminants include: cancer; bronchitis; pneumonia; heart, circulatory and respiratory problems; impaired vision; skin rash; chemical sensitivity; birth defects; and mental, nervous and immunological disorders.”¹

U.S. EPA report “The Inside Story: A Guide to Indoor Air Quality” (1988)

In a 1988 report titled “The Inside Story: A Guide to Indoor Air Quality,”⁷ the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) provide additional details on select indoor air pollutants. This report also describes the significant risks to health caused by indoor air pollution, as follows:

“In the last several years, a growing body of scientific evidence has indicated that the air within homes and other buildings can be more seriously polluted than the outdoor air in even the largest and most industrialized cities. Other research indicates that people spend approximately 90 percent of their time indoors. Thus, for many people, the risks to health may be greater due to exposure to air pollution indoors than outdoors.”⁷

U.S. EPA Report to Congress on Indoor Air Quality (1989)

In 1989, the U.S. EPA prepared a report for Congress on Indoor Air Quality. Volume II of the report was titled “Assessment and Control of Indoor Air Pollution.”⁸

“Health effects from indoor air pollution cover the range of acute and chronic effects, and include eye, nose, and throat irritation, respiratory effects, neurotoxicity, kidney

and liver effects, heart functions, allergic and infectious diseases, developmental effects, mutagenicity, and carcinogenicity.”⁸

“Building sicknesses, such as sick building syndrome, building related illness, and multiple chemical sensitivity are issues of potentially great significance but are poorly understood. Additive or synergistic effects from pollutant mixtures, where concentrations of each individual compound are below its known health effect threshold, may help to explain some sick building syndrome complaints. Biological contaminants are a principal cause of building related illness, and can be the principal problem in some buildings. Building related illness can result in death, as in Legionnaire's disease, or serious infectious or allergic diseases.”⁸

“The population health risks posed by exposure to indoor air pollutants appear to be significantly greater than the health risks posed by some of the environmental problems that receive the most public concern and governmental funding, including hazardous and non-hazardous waste sites, and contaminated sludge.”⁸

“It is known that microbial contamination can cause significant damage to buildings and equipment, and there is anecdotal evidence that damage can be so severe as to make a building unfit for human occupation.”⁸

U.S. Government Accountability Office (1991)

In 1991, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report to Congress titled: “Indoor Air Pollution: Federal Efforts are Not Effectively Addressing a Growing Problem.”⁹ Here are a few excerpts:

“In the 1970s increased emphasis on energy conservation measures, such as using more energy-efficient building materials and reducing the air exchange rates of ventilation systems, resulted in increases in indoor air pollution in offices and homes. For example, energy efficiency measures sometimes result in lower air exchange rates for ventilation systems and cause pollutants, such as second-hand tobacco smoke, dust mites, carbon monoxide, benzene, and pesticides, to remain indoors and contribute to indoor air problems. Additionally, certain materials used in carpets, insulation, and home and office furniture contribute to the overall indoor air problem by giving off chemical emissions. Therefore, the elevated levels of such pollutants increase the health risks--headaches, fatigue, respiratory diseases, and cancer--for building occupants when such materials, along with air exchange rate reductions, are employed.”⁹

“In 1989 and 1990 indoor air legislation was introduced in the Congress that called for more direct focus on indoor air by establishing a national program to reduce the human health threat caused by such pollution. Although the Senate passed its indoor air bill, the Congress did not enact any of the proposed legislation. Similar legislative proposals were introduced in both houses of the Congress in 1991. These legislative proposals go beyond research and require more emphasis on source control and mitigation of indoor air pollution.”⁹

More than 10 years later, in 2002 and 2005, proposed legislation about the health effects of indoor mold was again presented to Congress. It has now been more than 20 years since that original legislation was presented, and we are still waiting for Congress to take action.

“Even though EPA recognizes that indoor air pollution represents a serious health risk with symptoms ranging from eye irritation, headaches, and fatigue to respiratory diseases and cancer, funding levels have not been commensurate with these health risks. In its Unfinished Business report, EPA ranked indoor air pollution fourth among 31 environmental problems in terms of the risk it poses to human health and the environment based on the opinions of a task force of 75 EPA scientists, engineers, and managers.”⁹

As noted in the Executive Summary, the GAO issued a report in 2008. The 2008 GAO report is very similar to this one from 1991. The 2008 report is titled “Indoor Mold: Better Coordination of Research on Health Effects and More Consistent Guidance Would Improve Federal Efforts.”¹⁰ Even though the second report was 17 years later, there was little change in the message or conclusions.

U.S. EPA and U.S. GAO (1995)

According to the Healthy School Environment Resources page on the EPA website:

“Twenty percent of the U.S. population, nearly 55 million people, spend their days in our elementary and secondary schools. Studies show that one-half of our nation's 115,000 schools have problems linked to indoor air quality.”¹¹

These statistics were tied to a 1995 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) titled “School Facilities: Condition of America’s Schools.”¹²

Dr. Linda Birnbaum, National Institute of Environmental Health Services (NIEHS) and National Toxicology Program (NTP)

One estimate is included in a recent interview with Dr. Linda Birnbaum, National Institute of Environmental Health Services (NIEHS) and National Toxicology Program (NTP) (footnote 1a). The interview is included in a Scientific American article dated November 23, 2012. The article is titled “Chemical ‘Soup’ Clouds Connection between Toxins and Poor Health.”¹³ Dr. Birnbaum states that human disease due to environmental exposures is “much more than 30%.”¹³ Here’s an excerpt of Dr. Birnbaum’s comments from the interview:

“How much of human disease is due to environmental exposures? The estimates vary, and it depends on how you define environment. People often say it's about 30 percent. I think that's defining environment fairly narrowly, considering only environmental chemical exposures, but your environment includes the food you eat, the drugs you take, the psychosocial stress you're exposed to and so forth. After all, what's the difference between a drug and an environmental chemical? One you intentionally take and the other one you don't. Considering all that, I would say then the environment is much more than 30 percent.”¹³

National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)

The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) just released a new report in November 2012 titled “NIOSH Alert: Preventing Occupational Respiratory Disease from Exposures Caused by Dampness in Office Buildings, Schools, and Other Nonindustrial Buildings.”¹⁴ The report focuses on the respiratory effects of indoor dampness. The report starts with the following warning:

“Occupants within damp office buildings, schools, and other nonindustrial buildings may develop respiratory symptoms and disease.”¹⁴

Here is one excerpt from the report:

“NIOSH has estimated that 29% to 33% of new-onset adult asthma is attributable to work-related exposures and 23% of existing adult asthma is exacerbated by work. If occupants develop asthma or asthma exacerbation while working in damp buildings, medical treatment may not be effective if the occupant continues to be exposed. An occupant in damp buildings with allergic asthma may experience symptoms after exposure to very low levels of a sensitizing agent that may still be present after remediation; in such cases, an occupant may require relocation to another area.”¹⁴

Global Burden of Disease (GBD):

One methodology used to evaluate the impact on global health due to certain causes of disease and injury is known as the Global Burden of Disease (GBD).

“The original Global Burden of Disease Study (GBD 1990 Study) was commissioned by the World Bank in 1991 to provide a comprehensive assessment of the burden of 107 diseases and injuries and ten selected risk factors for the world and eight major regions in 1990.”¹⁵

The WHO published their first report on the GBD concept in 1996. In a 2006 report by the WHO, they “estimated 24% of the disease burden (healthy life years lost) and an estimated 23% of all deaths (premature mortality) was attributable to environmental factors. Among children 0–14 years of age, the proportion of deaths attributed to the environment was as high as 36%.”¹⁶

Beginning in the spring of 2007, a new GBD project was initiated. The new Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study (the GBD 2010 Study) “is the first major effort since the original GBD 1990 Study to carry out a complete systematic assessment of global data on all diseases and injuries. The GBD 2010 Study brings together a community of experts and leaders in epidemiology and other areas of public health research from around the world to measure current levels and recent trends in all major diseases, injuries, and risk factors, and to produce new and comprehensive sets of estimates and easy-to-use tools for research and teaching.”¹⁵

The results of the GBD 2010 study were announced on December 14, 2012. The study is presented as seven articles.

We would have expected that this study (GBD 2010) would include a discussion on indoor microbial contamination. Unfortunately, there was nary a reference to mold, mould, fungi, microbial or biological contaminants in any of the seven articles. This is a glaring omission. It's very disappointing that they neglected to address this important public health issue in the study, and it makes it even more important that we address the global burden of disease from indoor air contaminants in the GIHN position statement. GIHN will be sending a response to the WHO.

Even though the GBD 2010 study did not address those specific indoor air contaminants, they did mention a few other types of indoor air pollutants. In the article titled "A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions,"¹⁷ they mentioned other indoor pollutants such as solid fuels, residential radon, lead exposure and several occupational exposures (i.e., asbestos, arsenic, benzene, cadmium, chromium, diesel exhaust, second-hand smoke, formaldehyde, nickel, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, silica, and sulphuric acid) and occupational asthmagens and occupational particulate matter, gases and fumes.

In the table shown on page 2236 of the article titled "A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions," they list "the proportion of ischaemic heart disease disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) attributable to individual risk factors."¹⁷ Keeping in mind that these percentages only consider a single health effect (ischaemic heart disease), here are a few of the results relating to these three indoor air pollutants:

Ambient particulate matter pollution	22%
Household air pollution from solid fuels	18%
Lead exposure	4%

On pages 2238-2240 of that same article, they provide the number of deaths in 2010 for specific risk factors.¹⁷ Here are a few examples from the table:

Ambient particulate matter pollution	3,223,540
Household air pollution from solid fuels	3,546,399
Residential radon	98,992
Lead exposure	674,038
Second-hand smoke	601,938

In another article included in the GBD 2010 study titled "Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010,"¹⁸ they say that annual updates of the GBD study will now be feasible, so we will not have to wait a decade before the next update.

"Rather than huge periodic revisions of the GBD every decade, it is now feasible to conduct annual updates so that the consumers of health intelligence have the most recent

and comprehensive information on comparative causes of disease burden available where and when it is required to help guide public health decision making. Public health priorities everywhere are changing, or soon will be, as large and avoidable causes of disease burden become more common with development."¹⁸

We will continue to monitor the research being conducted by the WHO and will actively participate in the advancement of these important public health issues. The following discussion will provide additional information about other research papers that have been published by the WHO on the topic of indoor air contaminants. Given that indoor air pollutants have been included in previous papers by the WHO, it is even more surprising that they did not address the health effects of these contaminants in the GBD 2010 study.

World Health Organization (WHO)

The World Health Organization has discussed the health issues resulting from indoor air pollution and environmental exposures in several reports, including the following five publications.

World Health Organization: Indoor Air Pollutants: Exposure and Health Effects (1982)¹⁹

World Health Organization: Preventing disease through healthy environments: Towards an estimate of the environmental burden of disease (2006)¹⁶

World Health Organization: Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality--Dampness and Mould (2009)²

World Health Organization: Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Selected Pollutants (2010)³

World Health Organization: Worldwide burden of disease from exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries (2010)²⁰

World Health Organization: Environmental Burden of Disease Associated with Inadequate Housing (2011)²¹

Each of these reports discusses the health effects, illnesses and deaths caused by indoor air pollutants. We are providing a few key excerpts from each of these reports, as follows:

1982 WHO report (indoor air pollutants):

“With the growing recognition that air pollutant concentrations often vary considerably according to location and time, and that people often spend 80-90% of the whole day within enclosed spaces, it is necessary to determine the total exposure of individuals and populations to different air pollutants in order to assess the adverse health effects associated with them. Epidemiological studies of the health effects of air pollution should ideally be based on personal total

exposure, although in practice this is not always possible and personal passive monitoring is often the only feasible way of acquiring such exposure data.”¹⁹

2006 WHO report (preventing disease through healthy environments):

The World Health Organization published a 2006 report titled “Preventing disease through healthy environments: Towards an estimate of the environmental burden of disease.”¹⁶ This report includes several environmental factors in its analysis, but it is important to note that it excludes many of the indoor air pollutants that are addressed in the GIHN position statement (e.g., mold, mycotoxins, lead, radon, asbestos, VOCs, heavy metals, etc.). As a result, the statistics included in this 2006 WHO report do not relate directly to GIHN’s definition of indoor air pollution, but it does provide some valuable information regarding the health effects of a variety of environmental exposures. The following is a list of environmental factors included in the 2006 WHO report:¹⁶

- pollution of air, water, or soil with chemical or biological agents;
- UV and ionizing radiation;
- noise, electromagnetic fields;
- occupational risks;
- built environments, including housing, land use patterns, roads;
- agricultural methods, irrigation schemes;
- man-made climate change, ecosystem change;
- behaviour related to the availability of safe water and sanitation facilities,
- such as washing hands, and contaminating food with unsafe water or unclean hands.

The 2006 WHO report includes the following excerpts:

“The evidence shows that environmental risk factors play a role in more than 80% of the diseases regularly reported by the World Health Organization. Globally, nearly one quarter of all deaths and of the total disease burden can be attributed to the environment. In children, however, environmental risk factors can account for slightly more than one-third of the disease burden.”¹⁶

“Globally, an estimated 24% of the disease burden (healthy life years lost) and an estimated 23% of all deaths (premature mortality) was attributable to environmental factors. Among children 0–14 years of age, the proportion of deaths attributed to the environment was as high as 36%. There were large regional differences in the environmental contribution to various disease conditions – due to differences in environmental exposures and access to health care across the regions. For example, although 25% of all deaths in developing regions were attributable to environmental causes, only 17% of deaths were attributed to such causes in developed regions. Although this represents a significant contribution to the overall disease burden, it is a conservative estimate because there is as yet no evidence for many diseases. Also, in many cases, the causal pathway between environmental hazard and disease outcome is complex. Where possible, attempts were made to capture such indirect health effects. For instance,

malnutrition associated with waterborne diseases was quantified, as was disease burden related to aspects of physical inactivity attributable to environmental factors (e.g. urban design). But in other cases, disease burden was not quantifiable even though the health impacts are readily apparent.”¹⁶

“Lower respiratory infections. These are associated with indoor air pollution related largely to household solid fuel use and possibly to second-hand tobacco smoke, as well as to outdoor air pollution. In developed countries, an estimated 20% of such infections are attributable to environmental causes, rising to 42% in developing countries.”¹⁶

“An estimated 42% of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), a gradual loss of lung function, is attributable to environmental risk factors such as occupational exposures to dust and chemicals, as well as indoor air pollution from household solid fuel use. Other forms of indoor and outdoor air pollution – ranging from transport to second-hand tobacco smoke – also play a role.”¹⁶

2009 WHO report (dampness and mould):

“The prevalence of indoor dampness varies widely within and among countries, continents and climate zones. It is estimated to affect 10–50% of indoor environments in Australia, Europe, India, Japan and North America. In certain settings, such as river valleys and coastal areas, the conditions of dampness are substantially more severe than the national average.”²

2010 WHO report (selected pollutants):

“Indoor exposure to air pollutants causes very significant damage to health globally – especially in developing countries. The chemicals reviewed in this volume are common indoor air pollutants in all regions of the world. Despite this, public health awareness on indoor air pollution has lagged behind that on outdoor air pollution.”³

2010 WHO report (second-hand smoke):

“Worldwide, 40% of children, 33% of male non-smokers, and 35% of female non-smokers were exposed to second-hand smoke in 2004. This exposure was estimated to have caused 379,000 deaths from ischaemic heart disease, 165,000 from lower respiratory infections, 36,900 from asthma, and 21,400 from lung cancer. 603,000 deaths were attributable to second-hand smoke in 2004, which was about 1.0% of worldwide mortality. 47% of deaths from second-hand smoke occurred in women, 28% in children, and 26% in men.”²⁰

2011 WHO report (environmental burden of disease associated with inadequate housing):

“The findings confirm that housing is a significant public health issue and that policy-makers need to address it as a priority. Furthermore, they show the potential for primary prevention of a wide range of diseases and injuries through the improvement of housing

conditions. However, public health workers cannot tackle the challenge alone. Healthy housing is a multisectoral responsibility, achievable only if all relevant players contribute to it, including not only public health, but also housing, engineering and construction, environment, social welfare, urban planning, and building management. The combination of actions from all these sectors shows the complexity of the subject as well as its great potential to increase the health status of our populations through providing adequate, safe and healthy homes.”²¹

To help further illustrate the magnitude of this issue, we are presenting several of the relevant statistics in the following table:

Table 2			
Statistics on the Global Burden of Indoor Air Contaminants			
Statistic	Pollutant	Year	Source of Statistic
Up to 50% of all illnesses in the U.S	Indoor air pollution	1989	The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
50% of schools in the U.S. have indoor air quality problems	Indoor air pollution	1995	U.S. EPA and GAO
30% of illnesses	Environmental exposures (includes only environmental chemical exposures)	2012	Dr. Linda Birnbaum, NIEHS and NTP
29% to 33% of new-onset adult asthma is attributable to work-related exposures and 23% of existing adult asthma is exacerbated by work (in damp buildings)	Indoor dampness	2012	NIOSH
3,223,540 deaths in 2010	Ambient particulate matter pollution	2012	GBD 2010 Study
3,546,399 deaths in 2010	Household air pollution from solid fuels	2012	GBD 2010 Study
98,992 deaths in 2010	Residential radon	2012	GBD 2010 Study
674,038 deaths in 2010	Lead exposure	2012	GBD 2010 Study

More than 80% of the diseases regularly reported by the World Health Organization	Environmental risk factors	2006	World Health Organization
24% of the global burden of disease and 23% of all deaths	Environmental factors	2006	World Health Organization
For children 0–14 years of age, the proportion of deaths attributed to the environment was as high as 36%.	Environmental factors	2006	World Health Organization
In developed countries, an estimated 20% of lower respiratory infections are attributable to environmental causes, rising to 42% in developing countries.	Indoor air pollution	2006	World Health Organization
42% of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD	Environmental risk factors including occupational exposures to dust and chemicals, as well as indoor air pollution from household solid fuel use. Other forms of indoor and outdoor air pollution – ranging from transport to second-hand tobacco smoke – also play a role.	2006	World Health Organization
10-50% of indoor environments in Australia, Europe, India, Japan and North America are affected (in certain settings, such as river valleys and coastal areas, the conditions of dampness are substantially more severe than the national average)	Indoor dampness	2009	World Health Organization

<p>Worldwide, 40% of children, 33% of male non-smokers, and 35% of female non-smokers were exposed to second-hand smoke in 2004. This exposure was estimated to have caused 379,000 deaths from ischaemic heart disease, 165,000 from lower respiratory infections, 36,900 from asthma, and 21,400 from lung cancer. 603,000 deaths were attributable to second-hand smoke in 2004, which was about 1.0% of worldwide mortality. 47% of deaths from second-hand smoke occurred in women, 28% in children, and 26% in men.</p>	<p>Second-hand smoke</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>World Health Organization</p>
---	--------------------------	-------------	----------------------------------

These statistics should catch the attention of every physician, every lawmaker and every layperson reading this paper. These numbers are greater than all the cancers and all the heart disease combined. It is time we started to pay more attention to the indoor air we breathe.

Financial Impact of Poor Indoor Air Quality

If you look at the other side of the equation, billions of dollars could be saved if we implemented specific steps aimed at improving indoor air quality. According to a 2000 report titled “Health and Productivity Gains from Better Indoor Environments and Their Relationship with Building Energy Efficiency” by William J. Fisk with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory:

“For the United States, the estimated potential annual economic savings plus productivity gains, in 1996 dollars, are approximately \$40 to \$200 billion” if we would implement specific scenarios to improve indoor environmental quality in U.S. office buildings.⁵

Imagine how big those savings would be if we also made these changes in schools, homes and other structures around the world. Other interesting cost estimates resulting from indoor air pollution and unhealthy housing have been made.

- In its 1989 report, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts states: “Indoor air pollution seriously threatens public health. Scientific testimony and information provided to the Commission shows that many diseases and symptoms are attributable to indoor air

pollution: irritation of the eyes, nose and throat, headaches, fatigue, nausea, asthma, emphysema, pneumonia, lung cancer, heart disease, chemical sensitivity, liver and central nervous system damage and many other ailments. As a result, billions of dollars are spent annually on pollution abatement and health care costs resulting from indoor air pollution.¹

- The 2011 WHO report estimates that unhealthy housing in England represents 22% of the 22 million dwellings at a cost of £17.6 billion. About 12% of new childhood asthma in Europe is attributed to indoor mould exposure.²¹

- According to the Healthy School Environment Resources page on the EPA website:

“Twenty percent of the U.S. population, nearly 55 million people, spend their days in our elementary and secondary schools. Studies show that one-half of our nation's 115,000 schools have problems linked to indoor air quality.”¹¹

These statistics were tied to a 1995 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) titled “School Facilities: Condition of America’s Schools.” The 1995 GAO report gave an estimated cost of \$112 billion “to repair or upgrade America’s multi-billion-dollar investment in facilities to good overall condition.”¹²

- With respect to lead in U.S. housing, it has been estimated that remediation of lead paint hazards in housing would have a benefit of \$67 billion.²²
- In the 1989 U.S. EPA report to Congress on Indoor Air Quality:

“Many costs of indoor air pollution have not been calculated. Nevertheless, because of the large numbers of people and buildings potentially affected, as well as the wide range of effects for which there is an economic cost component, it is reasonable to conclude the aggregate costs of indoor air pollution amount to tens of billions of dollars per year.”⁸

- In a 2007 joint study by the U.S. EPA and Berkeley Lab, “The national annual cost of asthma that is attributable to dampness and mold exposure in the home is \$3.5 billion.”²³
- In 2000, William Fisk from Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California established a baseline for quantifying benefits from improved IAQ and demonstrated the economic impacts of increased productivity. As stated in the report:

“The existing literature contains moderate to strong evidence that characteristics of buildings and indoor environments significantly influence rates of communicable respiratory illness, allergy and asthma symptoms, sick building symptoms, and worker performance.”⁵

Some of the findings in the Fisk report are presented in Table 3 on the next page:

Table 3 Potential U.S. Annual Savings or Productivity Gains (If specific scenarios are implemented to improve indoor air quality in U.S. office buildings)		
Source of Productivity Gain	Potential Annual Health or Productivity Benefits	Potential U.S. Annual Savings or Productivity Gain (1996 \$US)
Reduced respiratory illness	15% to 76% decrease (16 to 37 million cases of common cold and influenza avoided)	\$6-\$14 billion
Reduced allergies and asthma	8% to 25% decrease in symptoms for 53 million allergy sufferers and 16 million asthmatics	\$1-\$4 billion
Reduced sick building syndrome symptoms	20% to 50% reduction in sick building syndrome health symptoms	\$10-\$30 billion
Improved worker performance from changes in thermal environment and lighting	0.5% to 5% improvement in office worker productivity	\$20-\$160 billion

In short, poor indoor air quality has a tremendous impact on our global economy. Literally, hundreds of billions of dollars are in the balance. It is time for our world leaders to address this important, and costly, public health issue.

Common Toxins in Our Homes, Schools and Workplaces

PART I

Indoor Contaminants—other than mold

Part I focuses on indoor contaminants (other than mold and its related components). The list of indoor contaminants included in this section are radon, asbestos, products of combustion (such as carbon monoxide and cigarette smoke), volatile organic compounds (such as formaldehyde, benzene, pesticides and some personal care products), particulate matter, lead and a number of other known and emerging disease-causing microbiological agents (such as legionella, actinobacteria and bacillus). This list is not exhaustive, but it discusses some of the major types of indoor contaminants that affect the air we breathe.

Radon

Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive decay product of uranium and is found in the soil throughout the earth.²⁴ It is a tasteless, colorless and odorless gas. As a dense inert gas, once released from the dirt, it tends to accumulate in basements and on the ground floor of buildings.²⁵

Radon is radioactive and accounts for the majority of background radiation humans receive. The ionizing radiation emitted is carcinogenic.²⁶ After smoking, radon exposure is the primary cause of lung cancer²⁷ and is credited with the death of 21,000 people per year in the United States (U.S.) alone.²⁸ Smoking, with radon exposure, increases the likelihood²⁹ of lung cancer by a factor of 4.

Radon is radioactive and accounts for the majority of background radiation humans receive. After smoking, radon exposure is the primary cause of lung cancer.

Typical exposure levels in homes²⁵ are around 100 Bq/m³ (Becquerel/meter³) with a toxic range over 160 Bq/m³ (4 picocuries/Liter air or pCi/L), per the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).²⁹ European authorities have set higher tolerable limits for radon. Of note, the “Working Levels”⁶ noted in uranium mines exceed 7000 Bq/m³.

Radon decays through alpha and beta particle emission through a variety of substances which include ²¹⁴Pb, ²¹⁴Bi, ²¹⁰Pb, and ²¹⁰Bi [isotopes of lead (Pb) and bismuth (Bi)].³⁰ The final product is the stable lead isotope ²⁰⁶Pb. As such, simultaneously elevated levels of lead and bismuth, i.e., in hair analyses, should trigger an evaluation for radon in the patient’s home.

Home testing for radon is simple and inexpensive. Short-term testing gathers radioactivity data over 90 days or less while long-term testing can last up to a year. Numerous inexpensive and effective mitigation techniques are available as are qualified testers.²⁹

Excessive radon exposure should be totally avoidable.

Asbestos

Asbestos has been used by humans for over 4500 years.³¹ Its chemical make-up makes³² it an effective fire retardant and electrical insulator even at high temperatures.³³ As such, it has been very desirable for use in construction. Six different fibers³² from two subgroups (amphibole and serpentine) are classified as asbestos, each differing in chemical formula and physical properties^{34,35}, but all forms share the property of mutagenicity¹⁰: being able to induce malignant transformations in the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) of exposed cells. Over 3000 asbestos containing products³⁶ were used, most extensively as fire retardants and to insulate wiring and plumbing in homes, schools, offices and industrial plants. In the late 1970s, it was discovered that the industry had been aware, for more than 40 years, of the many health hazards of asbestos.³⁷

Crocidolite and amosite asbestos have the greatest potential for human health damage. According to the U.S. EPA Asbestos Building Inspectors Manual, chrysotile (the only serpentine asbestos) accounts for approximately 95% of asbestos found in buildings in the United States, but it often has amphibole contamination. Chrysotile is capable of inducing multiple malignancies in persons exposed. While most exposure occurs with those who mine, fashion or use asbestos professionally, exposure from buildings can also occur. Asbestos fibers remain in the materials in which they are used but aging can cause these materials to become friable and release respirable fibers into the air. Remodeling further disrupts these materials and allows asbestos fibers to infiltrate the air of indoor spaces. The most common diseases associated with chronic exposure to asbestos are asbestosis and pleural abnormalities (mesothelioma, lung cancer).³⁸ Cancers associated with asbestos exposure affect the lungs, gastrointestinal (GI) tract and multiple other organs.

Asbestosis is caused by inhaled asbestos fibers instigating chronic inflammation and scarring or fibrosis in the lungs, typically after long term exposure such as with mining or asbestos manufacturing.³⁹ Amphibole forms of asbestos predominate as they are able to penetrate deeper into the lung. A chronic foreign body reaction develops with resultant interstitial fibrosis due to a chronic inflammatory response. Asbestosis typically presents as dyspnea, usually with exertion,⁴⁰ and can progress to cor pulmonale [irreversible right-sided heart failure associated with pulmonary hypertension (increased blood pressure in the blood vessels of the lungs)]. Patients are at much higher risk for lung cancer and mesothelioma.⁴¹ Supportive measures⁴² such as oxygen form the only treatment options and there is no cure.

Several malignancies such as lung cancer, gastrointestinal (GI) cancers and mesothelioma are caused by long-term asbestos exposure. Concomitant smoking increases the risk of all except mesothelioma⁴³ by a factor of 50 to 84.⁴⁴ Mesothelioma is a cancer of the pleural lining of the lungs and other organs. While there is overwhelming evidence that asbestos exposure is the

cause of mesothelioma, there have been some cases where only indirect or low level acute exposure could be documented.⁴⁵ One third of all mesothelioma victims have been found to have tissue asbestos fiber counts that did not exceed the levels associated with ambient background exposure suggesting that there is no “safe level” of exposure. In fact, regarding mesothelioma and exposure to asbestos, according to the EPA, if there is a safe level of the latter, it is currently below science’s ability to detect it.⁴⁶ This cancer presents as dyspnea, chest pain and weight loss. It may occur decades after exposure with an average latency of 35 - 40 years.⁴⁷ Surgical and radiation interventions are relatively ineffective while newer chemotherapeutic agents⁴⁸ offer some possibility for improvement. There is no cure for mesothelioma and survival rarely exceeds two years from diagnosis.

Several malignancies such as lung cancer, gastrointestinal cancers and mesothelioma are caused by long-term asbestos exposure.

Cross contamination⁴⁹ has occurred in laundries where exposed asbestos and power plant workers’ uniforms were washed. Secondhand exposure has led to asbestosis in family members of exposed employees. Similar cross contamination is found with other environmental toxins.

Products of Combustion

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless, odorless and tasteless gas which is responsible for the most common type of fatal indoor air poisoning in many countries.⁵⁰ Derived as a product of incomplete combustion, CO is released from auto exhausts, cigarettes, malfunctioning gas appliances (water heaters, furnaces, ranges etc.), fireplaces and indoor solid fuel burning devices such as wood stoves.⁵¹

CO competes effectively with oxygen for hemoglobin binding sites thusly reducing oxygen delivery to the tissues.⁵² Exposure to 100 parts per million (ppm) can be hazardous to human health.⁵³ The American Association of Poison Control Centers reported 15,769 cases of carbon monoxide poisoning resulting in 39 deaths in 2007.⁵⁴

CO poisoning may cause acute and chronic poisoning syndromes. Acute toxicity⁵⁵ starts as lightheadedness, confusion, headaches, vertigo and flu-like effects. As exposure progresses, significant cardiovascular and central nervous system (CNS) problems occur which can lead to death. Long-term sequelae are frequent and damage to an exposed fetus may also occur. Chronic low level exposure⁵⁶ can cause depression, confusion, memory loss and frank dementia. Chronic CO poisoning can cause Parkinsonian symptoms,⁵⁷ Chemical Sensitivity (CS) and chronic fatigue.⁵⁸ The easily inducible action of hemeoxygenase (HO-1) produces ferrous iron, CO and biliverdin from free heme.⁵⁹ Some chronic conditions increase free heme levels, potentially creating difficulty distinguishing increased endogenous production from chronic CO exposure.

Diagnosis of acute poisoning is by a simple arterial blood test found at most hospitals, but one must have a high level of suspicion to order it. Treatment includes hyperbaric⁶⁰ or 100% oxygen⁵³ given over time. Low-level chronic CO poisoning is treated by some with high dose oxygen.⁵⁸

Tobacco smoking has been shown to produce over 4000 chemical compounds,⁶¹ which are subsequently inhaled into the smoker's lungs and many of which are subsequently exhaled in the form of secondhand smoke. Nearly 600 compounds may be added to cigarettes—all are approved in the U.S. as additives to food but have not been tested by burning. Many countries include warnings on the label with the United States being the first⁶² in 1966.⁶³ It is important to note that the tobacco industry knew of the dangers of tobacco beginning in 1953,⁶⁴ but they did not allow this information to become public knowledge until it was brought to light during the legal proceedings that occurred over the past decade.

Even with advertised awareness of the dangers of cigarette smoking, it was estimated in 2000 by the World Health Organization (WHO) that 35% of American males and 22% of females continue to smoke.⁶⁵ About 15 **BILLION** cigarettes are sold worldwide every day.⁶⁶ Indeed, "Cigarette smoking is the leading cause of preventable death in the United States, accounting for approximately 443,000 deaths, or 1 of every 5 deaths, in the United States each year."⁶⁷ Cigarettes are responsible for more than 20% of American deaths.⁶⁷

There are many known health hazards of cigarette smoke. Nicotine is addictive⁶⁸ and the cause for many cancers,⁶⁹ including lung, bladder, oral, kidney, cervix and bone marrow. It is estimated that each cigarette smoked shortens the lifespan by 11 minutes⁷⁰ and that one-half of smokers die an average of 14 years early from tobacco-related disease.⁷¹ Smoking is also known to cause harmful effects on nearly every organ in the body and contributes to cataracts and osteoporosis, reduces general health,⁶⁶ affects birth weight of unborn babies and promotes emphysema and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

It is estimated that each cigarette smoked shortens the lifespan by 11 minutes and that one-half of smokers die an average of 14 years early from tobacco-related disease.

Secondhand smoke, also known as environmental tobacco smoke, is generated by the incineration of tobacco products. It is a complex mixture of gases and particles⁷² which contain at least 250 known toxins including more than 50 carcinogens.⁷³ More than 126 million nonsmoking Americans continue to be exposed to secondhand smoke in homes, vehicles, businesses, and public places. Most exposure to tobacco smoke occurs in homes and workplaces. Secondhand smoke causes heart disease and lung cancer in nonsmoking adults.⁷⁴

Almost 60% of U.S. children aged 3 to 11 years - or almost 22 million children - are exposed to secondhand smoke.⁷⁴ Several health conditions, including sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), respiratory infections,⁷⁴ low birth weight infants and increased incidence of ear infections and developing asthma, are attributable to secondhand smoke. It is also a potent lung irritant and trigger of asthma exacerbations.

Thirdhand smoke is the result of smoke gases and particles which linger in clothing, on furniture, in hair, etc. Researchers are beginning to look at the possibility of health effects from these residues.

Volatile Organic Compounds

Molecules of substances with high vapor pressure tend to flow from the liquid (or solid) state to a gaseous or evaporated state. Substances with a high vapor pressure at normal temperatures are said to be “volatile.” Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are organic compounds (carbon based) which come out of their liquid (or solid) phase in significant degree to become gaseous, and hence, part of the air people breathe. Plants are responsible for 90% of all VOCs while anthropogenic VOCs (those produced by humans) make up around 10%.⁷⁵ The latter 10% result primarily from solvents, paints, protective coatings, new furniture, copying and printing devices, cleaning supplies and other sources. Evaporation of organic compounds from these sources indoors is called off-gassing. Other volatile chemicals, such as hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) in solution (as in sewer water), are also toxic and may come from the breakdown of organic materials.

Americans spend 22 hours per day indoors, on average.⁷⁶ Long-term exposure to indoor VOCs can contribute to Sick Building Syndrome (SBS)⁷⁷ and Building Related Illness (BRI). Illness is usually not acute—but due to chronic exposures. VOC levels can be from 5-1000 times outdoor levels.⁷⁸ Leukemia and lymphoma incidences increase as a result of prolonged exposures.⁷⁹

Americans spend 22 hours per day indoors, on average. Illness is usually not acute—but due to chronic exposures.

Examples of toxic VOCs include butanol, hexane, formaldehyde, terpenes, xylene, styrene, toluene, chlorofluorocarbons, aliphatic hydrocarbons, CO, carbon dioxide (CO₂), acetone, methane and hundreds of others. Well-designed heating, cooling and ventilation (HVAC) systems can help lower indoor concentrations of VOCs.⁷⁷

Formaldehyde is known to irritate mucous membranes and is released from paints, adhesives, sheetrock, ceiling tiles⁷⁷ and wood materials.⁸⁰ Formaldehyde has also been shown to have high sympathetic activity,⁸¹ increase the heart rate,⁸² alter the immune system, cause headaches, affect cognitive function and stimulate reproductive problems and possibly cause birth defects.⁸³ In June 2011, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services added eight new substances, including formaldehyde, to its list of known human carcinogens.⁸⁴

Low level VOCs from cleaning products, cosmetics, fragrances and perfumes, laundry products, air fresheners, glues, etc. can cause chest pains, rashes, asthma symptoms, headaches, brain fog, gastrointestinal problems, anxiety, visual disturbances, chronic fatigue and many more symptoms⁸⁵ in those who suffer from chemical sensitivities.⁸⁶

Pesticides are chemicals used to kill or limit the growth of numerous types of pests and their usage can create VOCs. Included in this grouping are herbicides (kill plants), fungicides (kill fungi), insecticides (kill insects) and numerous other classes. They are designed to disrupt biological systems.⁸⁷ Ten of the twelve most dangerous organic chemicals are pesticides.⁸⁸ Pesticides have been used to control mosquitoes and thusly reduce the spread of diseases such as malaria and yellow fever; however, approaches to treatment of mosquitoes and other health

threats often has included excessive and injudicious use of pesticides rather than appropriate vector control. Pesticides are also used extensively in farming. Over 98% of sprayed insecticides reach the air, water or soil.⁸⁹ Exposure has been linked to non-Hodgkins lymphoma and leukemia⁹⁰ as well as fetal death, birth defects⁷⁴ and neurodevelopmental disorders.⁹¹ Recently, after reviewing thousands of published articles, The Endocrine Disruption Exchange released a

Over 98% of sprayed insecticides reach the air, water or soil. Exposure has been linked to non-Hodgkins lymphoma and leukemia as well as fetal death, birth defects and neurodevelopmental disorders.

list of over 1300 potential endocrine disruptors – 269 were pesticides.⁹² The WHO estimates that 3 million agricultural workers, mostly in developing countries, suffer exposure so greatly that severe poisoning ensues and that about 18,000 die⁹⁰ each year. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an ecological approach using multiple strategies of pest control while minimizing the use of

potentially toxic pesticides.⁹⁴ The term “safe” pesticides is used, typically to distinguish chemicals derived from natural sources (such as pyrethrum from chrysanthemums) from their synthetic counterparts (such as dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, known as DDT), however, no pesticide is free of danger.⁹⁵

The U.S. **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC)** approach to indoor air quality follows its own **Indoor Environmental Quality Policy** which is used to govern practices at the CDC and buildings they own and lease.⁹⁶ While not specifically addressing the topics of chemical sensitivities or the dangers of VOCs, included are some of the policy’s provisions which their employees are expected to follow:

“Pest management, for both buildings and lawn care, will emphasize non-chemical management strategies whenever practical, and the least-toxic chemical controls when pesticides are needed. Integrated Pest Management practices must be utilized.”⁹⁶

“CDC will ensure that products used in the workplace, such as soaps, cleaning products, paints, etc. are safe and odor-free or emit low levels of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to the fullest extent feasible. Only green cleaning products shall be specified and used within CDC facilities and leased spaces unless otherwise approved by the Office of Health and Safety.”⁹⁶

“Scented or fragranced products are prohibited at all times in all interior space owned, rented, or leased by CDC. This includes the use of:

- Incense, candles, or reed diffusers
- Fragrance-emitting devices of any kind
- Wall-mounted devices, similar to fragrance-emitting devices, that operate automatically or by pushing a button to dispense deodorizers or disinfectants
- Potpourri
- Plug-in or spray air fresheners
- Urinal or toilet blocks
- Other fragranced deodorizer/re-odorizer products⁹⁶

Personal care products (e.g., colognes, perfumes, essential oils, scented skin and hair products) should not be applied at or near actual workstations, restrooms, or anywhere in CDC owned or leased buildings. In addition, CDC encourages employees to be as fragrance-free as possible when they arrive in the workplace. Fragrance is not appropriate for a professional work environment, and the use of some products with fragrance may be detrimental to the health of workers with chemical sensitivities, allergies, asthma and chronic headaches/migraines. Employees should avoid using scented detergents and fabric softeners on clothes worn to the office. Many fragrance-free personal care and laundry products are easily available and provide safer alternatives.”

Fragrance is not appropriate for a professional work environment, and the use of some products with fragrance may be detrimental to the health of workers with chemical sensitivities, allergies, asthma and chronic headaches/migraines.

Employers have a responsibility to provide safe working conditions for their staffs. The CDC’s Indoor Environmental Quality Policy is a tremendous step forward with the recognition that VOCs such as pesticides, cleaning products and even personal care products can harm the health of personnel. Guidelines such as these are as important in protecting the health of all workers and similar policies should be implemented in all buildings.

Particulate Matter

Solid matter which is suspended in a gas or liquid is called particulate matter (PM) and also is known as particulates, fine particles and soot. PM can be natural, such as ash from volcanoes,⁹⁷ or manmade, as from combustion of solid fossil fuels like coal.⁹⁸ PM can be dissolved into water or suspended in the air. Spherical particles 5 microns in diameter and smaller are called “respirable” and can reach the air sacs, or alveoli, of exposed persons’ lungs. PM often carry toxic agents on their surface—thereby delivering poisons to the surface of the deepest and most delicate structures of the lung. Normal human red blood cells (RBC) average 5 to 7 microns in diameter and are comparable in size to the largest respirable PM. To understand how small these particles are, typically 3.5 to 5.3 million RBC are present in a single cubic centimeter (1 cc or 1 ml) of blood. Sixty years of research by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has repeatedly demonstrated that respirable particles are invisible and unfilterable using any passive filtering device. Only self-contained breathing devices, such as SCUBA gear, can adequately protect from respirable particulates.

Somewhere between 22,000 and 52,000 deaths per year⁹⁹ in the U.S. are attributed to PM pollution, while in Europe¹⁰⁰ around 200,000 deaths per year are suspected. Inhaled particulates are classified by their size as this indicates where in the respiratory tract they can travel. Particles with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or greater are filtered in the mouth and nose. Particles of 5 microns diameter and less can reach the alveoli, whereas particles < 0.1 micron can translocate¹⁰¹ through cell membranes and gain access to other organs in the body.¹⁰¹ Mold spores, pet dander and dust mites are all PM and can cause allergy problems¹⁰² and trigger asthma attacks. Silica, asbestos and coal dust cause not only chronic lung damage but can lead to

lung cancer. Tobacco smoke contains PM. Inhaled lead particulates can contribute to lead poisoning.¹⁰³

Filtering can be effective to remove water-borne PM¹⁰¹ while controlling source exposure and optimizing ventilation may lessen airborne PM exposures.¹⁰³ PM often contain “mycotoxins, endotoxins, antigens, haemolysin”, etc. from molds and bacteria which are immunogenic¹⁰⁴ and may be responsible for neurocognitive damage.¹⁰³

Lead

The 82nd element on the periodic table is lead. Considered a heavy metal, lead has been used for thousands of years because it is quite malleable and melts at a relatively low temperature.¹⁰⁵ Lead has also been used in construction, batteries, pewter and solders and as radiation shields.¹⁰⁶ In the U.S., lead was used as shotgun shot and as an additive of interior paints,¹⁰⁷ pesticides and gasoline¹⁰⁸ for many years until banned due to health risks. It is still used in polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastic,¹⁰⁹ lead glass,¹¹⁰ semiconductors¹¹¹ and some glazes¹¹¹ for painting ceramics.

Poisoning from lead has been documented in several ancient civilizations. Exposures have occurred via inhalation, ingestion and even through skin contact.¹⁰⁷ Ingestions can come from produce grown in contaminated soils and some home remedies.¹¹² The primary source of ingested lead in children is from interior paints used before lead was banned. Most of inhaled lead is absorbed¹¹³ while a smaller percentage of ingested toxin is absorbed. Inhalation is much less of a concern since almost all countries have now banned tetraethyl lead from gasoline.

Lead is primarily stored in the blood, soft tissue and bones.¹¹³ Serum lead levels, erythrocyte protoporphyrin levels, appearance of RBC smears and physical exam findings can all detect or infer the acute presence of lead. Bone X-rays can be used as a measure of cumulative exposure. No safe level of lead exposure has been determined.

Lead creates free radicals, interferes with DNA transcription,¹¹⁴ indirectly affects the integrity of cell membranes (RBC especially),¹¹⁵ decreases activity of certain white blood cells (WBC) and interferes with the metabolism of Vitamin D, bones,¹¹⁶ collagen¹¹⁷ and calcium.¹¹⁸ It may also cause excessive production of inflammatory proteins.¹¹⁹

Symptoms of lead poisoning vary based on the chronicity of exposure¹²⁰ and age of the patient.¹²¹ Adult acute poisoning may display muscle weakness, pain, headache, occasional encephalitis and memory loss.¹²² Children with acute lead exposure exhibit weight loss,

Children with acute lead exposure exhibit weight loss, constipation, kidney failure, abdominal pain with vomiting, lethargy and learning disabilities.

constipation, kidney failure, abdominal pain with vomiting, lethargy and learning disabilities.¹²³ Chronic exposure in children¹²³ and adults often shows very subtle symptoms which may gradually become pronounced. Typically, short-term memory loss, concentration deficits, stupor, abdominal pain, loss of coordination and numbness or tingling in the extremities,¹²⁴ as well as fatigue, headaches,

anemia and sleep disturbances,¹²³ are found in chronically exposed adults. Similarly exposed children often refuse play, become excessively active or develop behavior problems.¹²³ Hearing loss and tooth decay are also seen.¹²⁵ Studies have shown that greater incremental loss in intelligence quotient (IQ) points in children occurs at lower levels^{126,127} than for adults.

Prevention is the best treatment and most cases of poisoning are preventable. Screening programs exist for U.S. children.¹²⁴ Treatment of acute lead poisoning (increased blood lead and significant symptomatology) is by chelation with correction of other associated mineral deficiencies.¹²⁴ The longer a person has been exposed, the less likely central nervous system deficits will correct.

Legionella

Bacteria are ubiquitous and even live on the skin, in the mouth and in the GI tract of humans. Commensal bacteria such as these in the gut can be of aid in digesting certain food products. Many bacteria, however, are pathogenic to human hosts. A new genus, *Legionella*, was identified in 1977 after an outbreak months earlier had killed 34 people,¹²⁸ mostly associated with the American Legion convention in Philadelphia.

Legionella is a Gram negative bacteria¹²⁹ found in contaminated hot water of natural and manmade sources which can include HVAC systems and spas. The ideal temperature range for the bacterium is 32 – 42 °C (90-108 °F).¹³⁰ Growth requires cysteine so it will not be detected on standard blood agar plates¹²⁹ and culture methods can take 10 days. A urine antigen test takes only a few hours but detects only one species of *Legionella*.¹³¹ Spread is through droplet inhalation, and there is no documented person to person communication.¹³²

There may be as many as 10,000 – 50,000¹³³ cases of Legionnaire's disease in the U.S. each year, and the vast majority are caused by *Legionella pneumophila*. After a 2-10 day incubation period, symptoms begin with fever, chills and cough. Additional symptoms include "muscle aches, headache, tiredness, loss of appetite, loss of coordination (ataxia) and occasionally diarrhea and vomiting."¹³⁴ Kidney and liver functions may be abnormal and chest X-rays typically show bibasilar consolidation consistent with pneumonia.¹³⁵ Mortality rates vary from < 5% - 50% based on how quickly antibiotics are started and where the disease is acquired.¹³⁵ Quinolones and the newer macrolides are the drugs of choice. Rifampin has been used in combination. Pontiac fever is a lesser form of Legionnaire's disease and usually resolves within 2 days.¹³⁶

Large eruptions of illness have occurred in Philadelphia, New York and Los Angeles (U.S.), London and Essex (England), Paris and Lorquin (France), Amsterdam (the Netherlands), the Urals (Russia), Barcelona, Pamplona and Madrid (Spain), Fredrikstad and Sarpsborg (Norway)^{136,137} and Melbourne, New South Wales and Sydney (Australia). Many other outbreaks of varying sizes have been reported around the world. The sources of infection were typically drinking water systems, hot tubs or cooling towers. Control of *Legionella* may be accomplished by use of chlorine, chlorine dioxide or superheating water frequently to greater¹³⁵ than 60 °C (140 °F).

Actinobacteria

Many bacteria live in our indoor spaces and some are clearly more pathogenic than others. *Actinomycetes*, *Streptomyces*, *Mycobacterium* and *Nocardia*, all genera of the Gram positive phylum Actinobacteria, are gathering attention for their ability to cause human health problems. All of these pathogens may be found in WDB and many are capable of releasing toxins into indoor air. Some of these secondary metabolites have been used in medical practice as antimicrobials (neomycin, chloramphenicol,¹³⁶ etc.) and chemotherapeutic agents (daunorubicin and doxorubicin¹⁰⁵).

Actinomyces are anaerobic and are not acid-fast. Actinomycosis is caused by *Actinomyces israelii* forming very large abscesses at the jaw's angle that can spread to the thorax and abdomen.¹³⁷ Farmer's lung and bagassosis are usually caused by *Actinomyces* as well as endocarditis and other valve abnormalities.

All of these pathogens may be found in water-damaged buildings and many are capable of releasing toxins into indoor air.

Nocardia are aerobic and acid-fast. Nocardiosis can present as abscesses in the brain, chest and skin or as pulmonary disease.¹³⁸ Infections are usually opportunistic,¹³⁸ and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole is the treatment of choice.¹³⁹

Streptomyces are aerobic and not acid-fast. At least 11 antibiotics have been derived from this genus.¹³⁶ Streptomycosis, also known as mycetoma, is a subcutaneous infection which can invade the bone.¹³⁸ Spores from *S. californicus* have been shown to cause "lung inflammation and systemic immunotoxic effects"¹⁰⁵ and appear to harm human health synergistically with components of *Stachybotrys chartarum*.¹⁰⁵

Mycobacterium are aerobic and acid-fast.¹⁴⁰ Known diseases include tuberculosis (*M. tuberculosis*) and leprosy or Hansen's disease (*M. leprae*). Other mycobacteria also cause pulmonary disease similar to tuberculosis, lymphadenitis, skin and disseminated disease.¹⁴¹ "Hot tub lung" is associated with *Mycobacterium* in undrained sources¹⁴² of water. *Mycobacteria* have thick cell walls and natural resistance to many antibiotics. Thusly, they are notoriously difficult to treat. Of note, *Mycobacterium Avium Intracellulare* (MAI) has been linked on at least some occasions to exposure to water-damaged buildings.¹⁴³

Bacillus

The Gram positive rods in the genus *Bacillus* test catalase positive¹⁴⁴ and when stressed produce endospores.¹⁴⁵ *Bacillus* is ubiquitous in nature. *Bacillus subtilis* is used extensively in molecular biology research.¹⁴⁶

Anthrax, a toxin-based illness,¹⁴⁷ is caused by exposures to the spores of *B. anthracis*. Spores are able to survive in soil for decades. Though typically an animal disease and though most livestock have been immunized for over a century, the name "anthrax" strikes terror in the hearts of many since the "white powder postal attacks" of 2001. Inhaled spores make their way

to lung macrophages. Once inside, they are transported eventually to lymph nodes. The spores germinate and multiply destroying the macrophage host. Once in the blood stream, three proteins are released: lethal factor, edema factor and protective antigen.¹⁴⁸ The combination of the three substances makes up what is known as anthrax toxin. Lethal factor causes release of Tumor Necrosis Factor-alpha (TNF-alpha) and Interleukin-1 beta (IL-1B) which ultimately leads to septic shock and death. Antibiotic treatment is successful if initiated early.

B. cereus is a well-known grain contaminant which causes a form of food poisoning.¹⁴⁸

Conclusion of Part I

In Part I, we provided an overview of some of the common indoor contaminants that affect the air we breathe in our homes, schools and workplaces. See Appendix A for a table that was included in a report on *The Green Building Debate*. The table provides a pictorial representation of some of the contaminants that affect indoor air quality and the related health effects.

In 2010, the World Health Organization (WHO) issued a report titled “Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Selected Pollutants”³ which addresses some additional substances and also provides exposure guidelines. The WHO report opens with the following statement regarding the importance of good indoor air quality:

Clean air is a basic requirement of life. The quality of air inside homes, offices, schools, day care centres, public buildings, health care facilities or other private and public buildings where people spend a large part of their life is an essential determinant of healthy life and people’s well-being. Hazardous substances emitted from buildings, construction materials and indoor equipment or due to human activities indoors, such as combustion of fuels for cooking or heating, lead to a broad range of health problems and may even be fatal.

Indoor exposure to air pollutants causes very significant damage to health globally—especially in developing countries. The chemicals reviewed in this volume are common indoor air pollutants in all regions of the world. Despite this, public health awareness on indoor air pollution has lagged behind that on outdoor air pollution.³

Clean air is a basic requirement of life. The quality of air inside homes, offices, schools, day care centres, public buildings, health care facilities or other private and public buildings where people spend a large part of their life is an essential determinant of healthy life and people’s well-being.

This 2010 report by the WHO was the second in a series. The first report in 2009 was titled “Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Dampness and Mould” which leads us into Part II of this paper where we focus on indoor mold and its related components.

PART II

Indoor Mold

What More Than 50,000 Mold Patients in the Literature have Taught Us

Historically, much controversy has arisen in the courts and in medical arenas regarding the supposition that exposure to the interior of water-damaged buildings (WDB), and the molds and other contaminants within them, can cause serious illness in humans. Fortunately, the tide is turning and the naysayers are being defeated. Opinion is losing to data and ignorance to information. The war is not over and dispute still exists, but the truth will prevail. “Mycotoxins are secondary metabolites produced by microfungi that are capable of causing disease and death in humans and other animals.”¹⁴⁹

*Opinion is losing to data and ignorance to information. The war is not over and dispute still exists, but **THE TRUTH WILL PREVAIL.***

The naysayers cling to some serious misbeliefs and continue to publish them. One such false belief is that ingestion¹⁵⁰ is the primary mechanism by which human mold illness can occur. Another incorrect concept is that there must be a very large amount of mycotoxin or mold spores in the air to harm humans.¹⁵¹ Yet another misconception is that disease related to mold must be from an acute exposure and that this would cause greater harm to the human host than repeated, chronic exposure to lower levels of toxin(s)¹⁵². **There is no published human or animal evidence to prove that any of these suppositions are necessary for the mold-related illness argument to be accurate.** Further, none of these mechanisms are even proposed by the pro-mold illness research community.

The naysayer community, in their writings, ignores all human data published¹⁵³ in peer-reviewed journals by treating physicians of mold illness patients as well as the most recent reports by the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) in 2008¹⁰ and the WHO in 2009.² In the latter, the WHO reversed their previous position due to the absolute onslaught of published data supporting the existence of mold-related illness over the last 10 years. Indeed, the ACOEM (American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine) naysayer report¹⁵⁴ from 2011 does not reference any paper after 2002. In the world of medicine, this is seriously outdated and makes the paper’s

Indeed, the ACOEM naysayer report from 2011 does not reference any paper after 2002. In the world of medicine, this is seriously outdated and makes the paper’s stand on mold-related illness completely irrelevant.

stand on mold-related illness completely irrelevant. Contrast that with the consensus statement offered by Policyholders of America (POA) in 2010, which contains over 550 unique citations including Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved prospective human experiments in peer-reviewed journals, animal, toxicological and mycological studies, building industry papers and reports regarding more than 50,000 patients worldwide.¹⁵³ (See Appendix B for a table that was included in a book published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. The table provides a list of some molds/fungus and mycotoxins and their related health effects.) Even the ACOEM 2011 paper,¹⁵⁴ which overtly denies that indoor molds can cause serious illness, recommends proper remediation of all water-damaged spaces. **Why is there any controversy at all?**

The “Big Lie”

Enter the “Big Lie”. It is a misinformation and propaganda tactic designed to deceive very large groups of people. The idea is to create a mistruth so large and grandiose that no one would attempt to disprove it, even if it were ridiculous. The lie needs to be repeated over and over and spoken authoritatively until people believe it. Many Germans were convinced via the Big Lie that the Jewish population was at fault for the loss of World War I.

The Big Lie was used in China in 1989 and since to convince the populace that the government did not use tanks to mow down hundreds of citizens in Tiananmen Square to squelch pro-democracy protests (even though the carnage was televised live worldwide).

Big Tobacco used the Big Lie for

many years stating there were no scientific studies demonstrating that cigarette smoking caused lung cancer—even though they knew better and had studies that proved otherwise.

The Big Lie is a misinformation and propaganda tactic designed to deceive very large groups of people. The idea is to create a mistruth so large and grandiose that no one would attempt to disprove it, even if it were ridiculous.

How does the Big Lie relate to mold? It has been proven that water, added to many modern building materials, leads to amplification of mold and bacterial growth. It has been shown beyond a shadow of doubt that some species of molds and bacteria found in WDB are capable of making toxins. Some of these toxins have been clearly demonstrated in thousands of patients to cause human health effects beyond mere runny noses and sore throats. Indeed, more than 50,000 patients exist¹⁵³ in the literature (and impartial agencies, such as the GAO and the WHO, have summarized this data). Many of these patients have been treated successfully (using protocols like those highlighted below) with documented symptom resolution or marked reduction, and abnormal lab tests returning to normal. It is very easy to connect these dots, but... **enter the Big Lie...** that exposure to mold and bacterial toxins from the interior of water-damaged buildings CANNOT POSSIBLY cause serious human health effects and that there are NO DATA in the literature that support the claims of serious human health effects.

Many treating practitioners are sufferers too. They learned firsthand about the impact that exposure to mycotoxins, endotoxins, etc. can wreak on the human body. Because of a long-established, even cherished, tradition of delayed acceptance of new concepts in allopathic

medicine, these physician/patients had to search for fellow practitioners who possessed understanding. The Big Lie is a double slap in the face for these victims - first denying that their own personal illness exists, and then claiming the disease they treat successfully in others, as well as the data generated, are all figments of their collective medical imaginations.

The Big Lie regarding mold is no vague conspiracy theory. It is prudent to remind the reader that “Big Business” has not always kept the health concerns of its employees first. The Radium Girls,^{155,156} the asbestos scandal^{157,158} and the history of the coal mines^{159,160} in the U.S. and elsewhere are just three instances in which owners, management and even some industry-employed physicians were well aware of occupational health dangers, **for**

decades, while the workers were given the Big Lie. The very fact that the U.S. has unions, labor laws, a federally-mandated 40-hour work week and organizations such as the Occupational Safety and Health

Administration (OSHA) are the result of some employers repeatedly being willing to make dollars at the health risk of those in need of a paycheck.

The Big Lie regarding mold is no vague conspiracy theory. It is prudent to remind the reader that “Big Business” has not always kept the health concerns of its employees first.

In the “distant” past, some researchers and some occupational medicine doctors may have had conflicts of interest. Some received their pay from employers who desired a clean bill of health even though there were numerous health problems in the workplace. Rather than speak up, some remained quiet, or worse, agreed to spread the mistruths. That there were thousands of internal experiments showing how “safe” smoking tobacco was (all purchased by Big Tobacco) proved to everyone that research findings could be bought. Similarly, the naysayers attempt to disprove irrelevant models while concurrently ignoring the last 10 years of many significant published reports. A chilling 2010 report by White and Bero¹⁶¹ documented six research manipulation strategies consistently used by five industries (tobacco, pharmaceutical, lead, vinyl chloride and silicosis-generating) to spawn and distribute “supportive research” and suppress “unfavorable research” regarding their respective products and manufacturing practices. That approach is the very essence of “junk science”.

Many additional examples of industry’s use of the “Big Lie” strategy are highlighted in David Michaels’ book “Doubt is Their Product.”¹⁶² Ironically, the name for the book came from the following statement written by one of the tobacco industry executives: “*Doubt is our product* since it is the best means of competing with the ‘body of fact’ that exists in the minds of the general public. It is also the means of establishing a controversy.” Michaels provides an excellent summary:

The practices perfected (by the tobacco industry) are alive and well and ubiquitous today. We see this growing trend that disingenuously demands proof over precaution in the realm of public health. In field after field, year after year, conclusions that might support regulation are always disputed. Animal data are deemed not relevant, human data not representative, and exposure data not reliable. Whatever the story—global warming, sugar and obesity, secondhand smoke—scientists in what I call the “product

defense industry’’ prepare for the release of unfavorable studies even before the studies are published. Public relations experts feed these for-hire scientists contrarian sound bites that play well with reporters, who are mired in the trap of believing there must be two sides to every story. Maybe there are two sides—and maybe one has been bought and paid for.¹⁶²

“Big Business” is involved in the mold issue too. Billions, if not hundreds of billions, of dollars are at stake, and as such, anyone reading any article claiming that chronic exposure to WDB cannot cause illness should take great care and consider the potential conflicts of interest the authors of such a paper might have. The reader need only review his/her homeowner insurance policy and note the rider, found in most, which excludes the insurer’s liability for mold damage to the insured dwelling¹⁶³ to see the reality of the situation. These exclusions did not exist 20 years ago.¹⁶⁴ The insurance policy riders prove that the insurance companies have known about mold for some time, yet they have not been active in educating the public, or physicians, about the dangers of moldy structures. Instead, they have quietly passed the expense of remediation from themselves to homeowners while allowing this public health debacle to silently escalate. Landlords’ and tenants’ organizations^{165,166} discuss mold-related illness on their websites. The same is true in the building and legal industries.^{164,167} State and federal lawmakers are also contemplating what to do with moldy buildings as are their counterparts in other countries.^{168,169} “Big Business” knows about mold and the sickness it can cause.¹⁷⁰ Allopathic medicine seems to be far behind in its understanding.

Mold illness, mold-related illness and biotoxin-related illness are euphemisms for the same disease. Some refer to this syndrome as Chronic Inflammatory Response Syndrome due to Water Damaged Buildings (CIRS-WDB). Others use the terms Mycotoxicosis or Mixed Mold Mycotoxicosis (of which, the users believe CIRS-WDB is a subset). Still others call it Indoor Mold Sensitivity and Toxicity. Each name has its pros and cons. It is the opinion of this paper that a single unifying name would benefit all the various vested communities (treating physicians, researchers and sufferers) and that those who publish should come together and agree upon or newly develop such a name that would be easily remembered by and resonate with lay people, media and scientific personnel. For purposes of this paper only, rather than favor one group’s name or another’s, the phrase Multi-system Exposure Related Illness (MERI, pronounced “meer-ee”) will be used to refer to the disease as it points to the multi-systemic nature and indoor environmental triggers which include, but are not limited to, toxins, microbial secondary metabolic products, particulates and the microbes themselves. MERI also recognizes

It is the opinion of this paper that a single unifying name would benefit all the various vested communities (treating physicians, researchers and sufferers) and that those who publish should come together and agree upon or newly develop such a name that would be easily remembered by and resonate with lay people, media and scientific personnel.

*For purposes of this paper only, rather than favor one group’s name or another’s, the phrase **Multi-system Exposure Related Illness (MERI)** will be used to refer to the disease.*

that toxins other than mold or microbial secondary metabolic products may create comparable symptomatology, presumably through the same or similar pathways. The source of incitants may also include overflows of waste and sewage, leaks from combustible heating sources (chimneys, wood-burning stoves, oil and gas furnaces or steam-generating radiant units) and resultant odorless carbon monoxide. Poor ventilation can increase humidity and CO₂. Radon buildup, lead (and from paint) and copper from water pipes, well-water bearing contaminants, septic tank back-ups, oil tank leaks are additional examples of indoor toxic exposure that have nothing to do with WDB. Additional factors may include building renovations, painting with VOCs, synthetic off-gassing, pesticides, chemical cleaners, etc., and in the case of WDB, the degradation products of construction materials resulting from chronic water exposure.

Likely millions of individuals with MERI exist in the U.S. alone. Most physicians will not recognize the illness because they are uninformed about the variable multi-system presentations of MERI.¹⁷¹ Typically, one or two systemic problems predominate while several other systems are involved. Those who complain most of fatigue are often lumped into chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS). Those with a chief complaint of severe and chronic muscular pains are wrongly diagnosed as having fibromyalgia. Those with recurrent abdominal pains, with or without diarrhea, are labeled with irritable bowel syndrome (IBS). When the primary concern relates to odd neurologic symptoms, the patient may be misdiagnosed as having multiple sclerosis (MS), etc. However, all these patients show multi-systemic symptomatology. Pidgeon-holing the sufferer into a single system diagnosis requires ignoring or minimizing many other symptoms and systemic clues. Patients are frequently told they are depressed, anxious and need psychiatric medications, while the central environmental history of home and work was never explored. Others are told they are somaticizing (or worse – malingering), that they need to “learn to live with it”, or that it’s “all in their head.”¹⁷² On occasion, the patient will be told honestly by the practitioner that (s)he doesn’t know what is wrong. MERI is usually the diagnosis that answers all the enigmatic multi-systemic, multi-symptom patients’ questions. It also gives sufferers precious hope (that the misdiagnoses do not offer) by accurately identifying the composite causes of their symptoms.

Pathophysiology

Mold and bacteria are ubiquitous, inside and outside of buildings. Construction materials offer a great amount of food resources in the form of sheetrock,¹⁷³ wood, etc. for indoor molds and bacteria. Building interiors themselves provide a location of relatively low competition for such nutrients due to decreased airflow within them. Buildings become water-damaged when water intrudes via numerous pathways including leaking roofs, inadequate vapor barriers,¹⁷⁴ indoor plumbing leaks, faulty HVAC condensation drainage¹⁷⁵ and intrusions into basements and crawl spaces through several mechanisms. Adding water provides the missing ingredient needed for the explosive microbial growth, known as amplification, found in WDB. In an amplified system, there is unchecked expansion of numerous species of molds, bacteria, actinomycetes and mycobacteria, and unfettered production of spores and secondary metabolites such as endotoxins, β-D-glucans,¹⁷⁶ spirocyclic drimanes, trichothecenes,¹⁷⁷ aflatoxin, ochratoxin, satratoxins, galactomannans, hemolysins, fine particulates, etc., as well as VOCs from the building materials and microbial VOCs¹⁷⁸ which are released from damp cavities,¹⁷⁹ through sheetrock, into the air the inhabitants breathe. Illness due to exposure in WDB buildings likely

results from a combination of these factors and includes the direct effects of toxins, chronic inflammation and colonization and infection of microbial agents.

In an amplified system, there is unchecked expansion of numerous species of molds, bacteria, actinomycetes and mycobacteria, and unfettered production of spores and secondary metabolites such as endotoxins, β -D-glucans, spirocyclic drimanes, trichothecenes, aflatoxin, ochratoxin, satratoxins, galactomannans, hemolysins, fine particulates, etc., as well as VOCs from the building materials and microbial VOCs which are released from damp cavities, through sheetrock, into the air the inhabitants breathe.

The literature provides ample evidence that exposure to the interior of WDB leads to increases in upper respiratory syndromes, allergies and increased incidence of asthma with further triggering of asthma flares.^{180,181,182,183} These symptoms and diseases have a relative risk of 1.4 to 2.2 due solely to exposure to damp buildings.¹⁸⁴ Risk is affected by genetic factors - including variations in cytochrome p450 detox pathways, glutathione pathways¹⁸⁵ and HLA (human leukocyte antigen) genotype which may affect an individual's ability to detoxify - as well as response to presenting antigens.

While a massive acute exposure can lead to MERI, the most common mechanism is chronic exposure to low level toxins leading to an inflammatory response in the body. Inflammation is not caused by the typical path seen with infecting agents. The MERI inflammatory mechanism is unlike the typical infectious agent that presents antigens to dendritic cells, and antibodies result. Rather, HLA-DR (DR portion of the HLA genome) does not facilitate antigen presenting cell (APC) recognition of antigens as foreign. In this model, the toxin(s) bind to Toll-like (adipose cells) and non-Toll receptors acting as pattern-recognition receptors, then activate the innate immune system in the form of the mannose binding lectin pathway (MBL) of the complement system^{186,187,188} through a secondary messenger scheme. This leads to continuous stimulation of the MBL pathway without an effective "turn-off switch" (since no foreign particle was presented to APCs to be cleared). As such, the MBL runs smoothly and efficiently around the clock for weeks, months, years and even decades, all the while producing pro-inflammatory cytokines¹⁸⁹ with the ultimate intent of destroying "something". Since there is no foreign target being presented or opsonized for destruction, eventually those cytokines will cause damage to the host. Innate immune abnormalities are often demonstrated in patients by elevated TGF- β 1 (transforming growth factor, beta 1), C4a (the activation product of the complement protein C4) and/or MMP-9 (matrix metalloproteinase 9) levels.¹⁸⁶

While a massive acute exposure can lead to MERI, the most common mechanism is chronic exposure to low level toxin leading to an inflammatory response in the body.

Of note, it does not matter which toxin is offending.^{2,10} In the primordial milieus found in WDB, many toxins, particles, fragments, spores, etc. are being released,¹⁰⁵ and each building will be different. The number of cell wall or desiccated colony fragments released into the air will be many hundreds of times greater than spores.^{190,191} Different and multiple species of molds, mycobacteria, actinomycetes and bacteria¹⁹² will be found—many releasing different secondary metabolites including mycotoxins and endotoxins. Unlike animal cells, which digest nutrients in their interior, fungi - including yeasts and molds - actively secrete their digestive enzymes onto their surface in a process called exodigestion. Exodigestive enzymes are proteins that coat the surface of desiccated fungal particulates making them extreme antigens, or immune system stimulants. VOCs and MVOCs may also be released. “At present we know very little about interactions among low-level irritants. It is possible that, in the case of some compounds at subthreshold concentrations, a summation or potentiation takes place, causing sensory reactions to the mixtures of pollutants. It is also possible that chemical reactions take place, converting less irritating compounds to more irritating ones.”¹⁹ This excerpt from the SBS portion of the 1982 WHO Meeting on indoor air pollutants and exposures makes it clear that there may be multiple low-level toxins working in concert to affect human health and that dose response to a single agent may not apply. It is often difficult (and not essential) to discern which toxin or combination of toxins cause harm. That there are one or more toxins causing harm to the exposed human host is the crucial matter.

It is often difficult (and not essential) to discern which toxin or combination of toxins cause harm. That there are one or more toxins causing harm to the exposed human host is the crucial matter.

Put another way, Dr. John Snow, the “Father of Modern Epidemiology,” noted in 1854 that a cholera outbreak centered around the common use of the Broad Street public well.¹⁹³ He removed the pump’s handle and the outbreak dissipated. *Vibrio cholerae*, the organism responsible for cholera, was coincidentally discovered the same year but was not widely known for another 30 years.¹⁹⁴ **Would it have been wise for Dr. Snow to withhold his actions for 30 years until the precise bacterial agent could be identified?** Likewise, Ignaz Semmelweis postulated the theory of hand washing between medical procedures in 1847.¹⁹⁵ He published several works on the subject and was widely criticized. However, Louis Pasteur and his microscope proved the existence of bacteria and refuted the idea of spontaneous generation in the 1860s.¹⁹⁶ Several years later, in 1867, Sir Joseph Lister published on the use of “antiseptic principles”¹⁹⁷ (like hand washing). After 28 years, antiseptic practice finally became the standard of care. Should the medical community wait 28 or 30 years to

Should the medical community wait 28 or 30 years to develop the technology to determine which individual toxin(s) is (are) causing MERI, or should buildings be fixed and patients be treated now? The question is rhetorical; the answer is obvious.

develop the technology to determine which individual toxin(s) is (are) causing MERI, or should buildings be fixed and patients be treated now? The question is rhetorical; the answer is obvious.

In the CIRS-WDB model, toxins from the interiors of WDB are inhaled, transported to the blood and lymph-bile systems, and ultimately find their way to adipose cells to trigger the mannose binding lectin pathway of the complement system. More and more pro-inflammatory cytokines are released into the bloodstream. Initially, neuroregulatory and immune peptides^{198,199,200,201,202} such as Vasoactive Intestinal Polypeptide (VIP) and Melanocyte Stimulating Hormone (MSH) exert control on the immune system to mitigate the damage. However, in an epic tug of war, constant cytokine production eventually outruns overproduction of VIP, MSH and others (ADH or Anti-diuretic hormone included). When the production of these hormones is overwhelmed, it is possible that low levels ensue similar to insulin production in a patient becoming a Type II diabetic. Pro-inflammatory cytokine production becomes relatively unopposed leading to multisystem damage likely mitigated by T_h17 lymphocytes (T helper 17). Chronic systemic inflammation leads to localized degradation of the blood brain barrier (BBB) allowing T_h17 cells access to the cerebral blood supply and the parenchyma itself. TGF-β1 (an anti-inflammatory cytokine) appears to play an important role. Normal CD4+ (cluster of differentiation 4) cells in the presence of normal or elevated TGF-β1 promote commitment to CD4+CD25+ (T_h3 regulatory or T_{REG}) lymphocytes which decrease auto-immunity. However, low levels of TGF-β1 in the presence of pro-inflammatory interleukins (IL-6, IL-21 or IL-23) push naïve CD4+ cells' commitment to T_h17 cells,^{203,204} known to promote auto-immunity and numerous well-described autoimmune diseases. Summing up, the WHO 2009 report states (p. 85), “Many of the health effects may result from recurrent activation of immune defence, leading to exaggerated immune responses and prolonged production of inflammatory mediators. Overproduction of these compounds damages the surrounding tissues and may manifest itself as chronic inflammation and inflammation-related diseases, such as asthma (Martin, Frevert, 2005).”²

In addition, there are degenerative neurologic changes because some mycotoxins are directly neurotoxic¹⁷⁸ causing global neurologic injury manifesting as visual contrast deficits, balance problems, cognitive deficits, abnormal pain patterns, recurrent numbness and tingling, extraordinary skin sensitivity (even on the order of that seen in chronic regional pain syndrome), etc. Cognitive deficits and behavioral issues have been shown in persons with systemic inflammation as well as in those exposed to mold and mycotoxins in water-damaged buildings.^{205,206,207,208} IgG and IgM (immunoglobulin G and M) antibodies to several neuronal peptides have also been demonstrated in persons with documented mycotoxin¹⁷⁸ exposure and neurologic dysfunction. Bacterial endotoxins have been shown to induce neurotoxicity.²⁰⁹ Magnetic Resonance (MR) Spectroscopy²¹⁰ in MERI patients shows reproducible deficits consistent with brain hypoperfusion¹⁸⁶ which reverse after therapy. Some of these patients, without a positive myelin basic protein from cerebrospinal fluid, may be incorrectly diagnosed as having multiple sclerosis.

Treating physicians have observed there is an over-representation of patients with midbrain movement disorders—choreas, obsessive compulsive disorder and Tourette's syndrome—among MERI patients.²¹¹ Basal ganglion lesions found on CT (computerized

tomography) were predictive of movement disorders in people from 13 Chinese provinces who ingested sugar cane contaminated with *Arthrimum sp.*²¹²

MERI often reflects endocrine disruption. It is important to understand that the hypothalamus and pituitary are very much affected by MERI. The hypothalamus, as seat of control over the autonomic nervous system, many of the body's "set points" (such as temperature control) and the endocrine system via the pituitary, is the structure of most ultimate importance in homeostasis of nearly all body functions. As such, almost every system of the body can be affected by MERI and the multiple and varied presentations stem from the fact that different patients, while having many symptoms crossing many systems, tend to have 1 or 2 predominating systemic difficulties. As above, if a practitioner focuses attentions primarily on those 1 or 2 systems (s)he is likely to neglect the larger picture which is the many system involvement known as MERI.

Looking again at the CIRS-WDB model regarding the hypothalamus and pituitary, abnormalities are frequently detected which are believed to be the result of decreased production of MSH. Stimulation of leptin receptors activates the proopiomelanocortin²¹³ (POMC) pathway. Weight gain is frequently seen in those exposed to water-damaged buildings. This could be in part due to leptin resistance which often develops as a result of pro-inflammatory cytokine action, pathway overusage due to increased need of MSH, and/or as a response to increased adiposity in those already overweight.²¹⁴ Increasing leptin resistance with subsequent decreased MSH alters the point of satiation.²¹⁵ Patients often gain significant weight which is not responsive to diet and exercise.^{216,217} MSH modulates mucous membrane immune responses which work against nasal carriage of biofilm forming multiply antibiotic resistant forms of coagulase negative staph (MARCoNS).¹⁸⁶ In turn, MARCoNS produce hemolysin which cleaves MSH. β -endorphins, adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH) and MSH are all produced in the POMC pathway.²¹⁸ Reduction of this pathway's use means less of the body's most potent pain reliever is made. Many patients suffer chronic pain. MSH may also be critical for restorative sleep. Some MERI patients can sleep 10-12 hours but not feel rested upon waking. Many have much more trouble falling asleep and with early awakening.

Low MSH also affects pituitary function. Functional and/or laboratory dysregulation in patients diagnosed with MERI can be documented with 6 of the 9 pituitary hormones including abnormal levels of ADH, ACTH and MSH as well as disproportionate rates of patients on thyroid replacement (thyroid stimulating hormone, or TSH) and/or with extraordinary dysmenorrhea (LH, or luteinizing hormone and FSH, or follicle stimulating hormone). Almost all patients are fatigued and most have some combination of polydipsia/polyuria/nocturia. Abnormalities in ADH/osmolality and ACTH/cortisol feedback loops are also usually demonstrated. Histamine is a known messenger of dehydration, signaling ADH to correct the problem. The symptoms of sneezing, itching, and runny nose are often assumed by patients—not to mention healthcare providers—to be allergy, but with the depletion of ADH, there is a never-ending failure to end dehydration, and many patients suffer from fungal rhinitis, sinusitis, or rhinosinusitis. Since histamine is also alerting, there is a never ending stimulus toward agitation and anxiety. Further, histamine is methylated to its inactivated state. Depleted methylation resources then result in a series of symptom presentations that resemble depression.²¹⁹ MSH is an infundibular pituitary hormone and levels are low in roughly 90% of cases.

Chronic production of pro-inflammatory cytokines with decreased β -endorphins and rare restorative sleep lead to recurrent diffuse debilitating myalgias in many patients. These symptoms are identical to those in many patients diagnosed with fibromyalgia.²²⁰ There are no biomarkers for fibromyalgia but 10 for MERI. As such, all patients diagnosed with fibromyalgia should be evaluated for MERI as a treatable cause of the myalgias.

Multiple derangements in regulation and the immune system can lead to autoantibody production and multi-system dysfunction. MERI patients often develop anticardiolipin antibodies²²¹ and can look very much like those diagnosed with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). In fact, MERI should be in the differential diagnosis of all patients previously labeled as SLE who do not demonstrate a positive anti-double stranded DNA antibody. Clinician's treating MERI patients have also observed a high rate of ANA positivity without diagnosable rheumatologic disease. There is a further connection here, in that the inability to recycle homocysteine to methionine and around, results in reduced production of SAME. The effect is not only on methylation, but on the failure of SAME (S-adenosylmethionine) to donate methionine to putrescine, which is derived from ornithine. Putrescine levels are elevated in Lupus. Putrescine + SAME = Spermadine + SAME = Spermine, which is the precursor to polyamines which encourage nerve healing.

Small vessel dysfunction is commonly seen in persons with MERI. There is also microvascular sludging, which is further associated with the hypercoaguable phenomena already described, capillary shunting, and increased venous oxygen, and excess intrinsic production of carbon monoxide due to the action of hemoxygenase on hemoglobin. This could be the result of persistent triggering of the innate immune system leading to white cell demargination which congests distal small arterioles and chronically decreases red blood cell delivery of oxygen to peripheral capillary beds as well as autonomic nervous system disturbance resulting from long term exposure to toxins. Very cold hands and feet are frequent in sufferers of MERI and some patients report transient blue and even green color changes to appendages not consistent with Reynaud's phenomenon. Increased blood levels of erythropoietin and/or Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF) abnormalities document the peripheral hypoperfusion²²² as does MR spectroscopy of the brain.²²²

Shortness of breath is seen frequently in those exposed to water-damaged buildings. This can result from a variety of factors, including reactive airway disease, with evidence of small airway obstruction frequently noted in pulmonary function testing. The most common abnormalities are seen in markers of small airway obstruction such as FEF_{25-75%} (forced expiratory flow between 25 and 75% of forced vital capacity) and FEF_{75%}. There is sometimes a restrictive component – which the pulmonologists will call “idiopathic.” When Autonomic Nervous System And Respiration (ANSAR) testing of heart rate variability is simultaneously assessed, this restrictive component is associated with decreased parasympathetic nervous system (PSNS) activity. Since PSNS (vagus) regulates diaphragm contraction, there is typically an attempt at increased sympathetic nervous system (SNS) activity (chest wall expansion), to compensate for the decreased air entry. There is sometimes a net result of decreased FVC (forced vital capacity).

Additionally, pulmonary infections such as chronic mycobacteria, including *Mycobacterium Avium Intracellulare* infections, can result from exposure to water-damaged buildings resulting in a variety of chronic pulmonary symptoms including shortness of breath. Hypersensitivity pneumonitis, allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis, bronchiectasis and, in severe cases, pulmonary fibrosis can result from exposure to water-damaged buildings²²³ and mold. Low VEGF has also been demonstrated by some researchers to be associated with shortness of breath (even in well-conditioned athletes).

Neurologic and cognitive symptoms are some of the most frequent complaints, and typically is the most upsetting complex of symptoms experienced, in those exposed to water-damaged buildings.²²⁴ Direct neurotoxic effects from mycotoxins and other toxins found in WDB, vascular hypoperfusion, cytokines and immune system inflammation after T_H17 driven breach of the blood brain barrier²²⁵ can all contribute to these phenomena. What is not in dispute is that brain fog, disturbances in memory, concentration, balance, word finding difficulties and other cognitive symptoms are frequently seen in those exposed to water-damaged buildings, and a dose response relationship has been confirmed by Crago, et. al.²²⁶

Renal effects have also been seen with exposure to water damaged buildings. Ochratoxin A has been associated with Balkan Endemic Nephropathy in humans, urinary tract cancers in animals and humans and focal segmental glomerulosclerosis.²²⁷

Chronic fatigue is the overriding symptom which unites almost every patient with MERI, although about 5% of patients do not describe fatigue as a recurrent symptom. Fatigue most likely results from chronic non-restorative sleep, low cortisol with dysregulation of the Hypothalamic-Pituitary Axis (HPA), peripheral hypoperfusion and mitochondrial injury resulting from exposure to the many toxins, such as mycotoxins, found in water-damaged buildings.

What is not in dispute is that brain fog, disturbances in memory, concentration, balance, word finding difficulties and other cognitive symptoms are frequently seen in those exposed to water-damaged buildings.

Diagnosis

Diagnosis of MERI is usually straightforward although a consensus of the exact definition of the disease has not been established since the disease is in the process of being defined. There are numerous objective biological indicators found in patients suffering from MERI. Lack of consensus regarding definition does not mean a particular disease does not exist—rather that more discussion is needed until consensus is reached. Further, there is no single pathognomonic test which rules CIRS-WDB in or out. The process of establishing a unique constellation of symptoms and lab findings is commonly used in medicine to delineate a diagnosis. The Jones criteria for Rheumatic Fever and the diagnoses of SLE and Kawasaki Syndrome are just three such examples.

Dr. Ritchie Shoemaker *et al* coined the term “CIRS-WDB” and have proposed a three-tiered case definition. He and his group use history, physical exam findings, and results of Visual

Contrast Sensitivity (VCS) testing²²⁸, MR Spectroscopy, nasal culture and blood tests to look at ten different bio-markers for CIRS-WDB. Healthy persons should have, on average, 5% of these markers positive (0-1 per patient) whereas cases usually manifest at least 5-6 (50-60%) abnormal values.

Currently, a CIRS-WDB patient should meet all of the following criteria:²²⁹

- 1) Evidence of exposure (historical,²³⁰ lab and/or objective testing such as ERMI²³¹ (Environmental Relative Moldiness Index)
- 2) 3 of the 6 following criteria:
 - VCS deficits
 - Decreased MSH
 - Elevated MMP-9
 - Abnormal or dysregulated ADH/osmolality
 - Abnormal or dysregulated ACTH/cortisol
 - HLA genotype noted to have a relative risk of 2 or greater to mold exposure
- 3) 2 of the 3 following criteria:
 - Improvement of symptoms and resolution of VCS deficit with cholestyramine (CSM) therapy
 - Reduction of leptin with therapy (if elevated)
 - Reduction of MMP-9 with therapy (if elevated). Note: In the case of normal leptin and MMP-9 at the institution of therapy, fulfilling the first of these three criteria is sufficient.

It is expected that most CIRS-WDB patients will also demonstrate abnormal TGF- β 1, VIP and/or C4a and the presence of MARCoNS. Many will show altered von Willebrand's, iron and/or androgen studies, and often reveal antibodies to cardiolipin and/or gluten (with negative tissue transglutaminase or TTG). MR Spectroscopy often reveals specific abnormalities such as increased glutamate to glutamine ratios. Careful attention to confounding diagnoses is also required.

Other treating physicians use additional testing modalities. Dr. Michael Gray *et al* use the term Mixed Mold Mycotoxicosis and also look for evidence of fungal colonization in nasal passages, sputum and stool, evaluate potential pesticide exposures and measure urine mycotoxins as proof of exposure. His group also looks at Nerve Conduction Velocities, neurobehavioral testing developed by Dr. Kaye Kilburn (found to demonstrate evidence of chemical brain injury in those exposed to environmental toxins including mycotoxins) and Quantitative Electroencephalograms (QEEG) as part of their evaluation. In addition to much of the testing used by Dr. Gray, Dr. Janette Hope uses detoxigenomic studies which look at various single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) and assesses for nutritional deficiencies and food allergies frequently found in those with long-term toxic exposures.

Dr. Alan Vinitzky assesses for autonomic nervous system (ANS) dysfunction via the Autonomic Nervous System And Respiration (ANSAR) testing system. He has developed a

working model of hypomethylation to account for some of the symptoms of ANS dysregulation, as they relate to stress. His treatments initiate recognition and correction of the dehydration patterns that relate to the ADH – Histamine reactions described above. In addition, he has identified a pattern of amino acid deficiencies that result in chronically ill individuals, such as those with MERI. Dr. William Rea, a pioneer in the field of environmental medicine, has developed a multi-disciplinary approach to diagnosis (which includes intradermal provocation of mycotoxins²³²) in a facility using state of the art construction techniques to create a “less polluted environment for patient evaluation, testing and treatment.”²³³ His group has suggested the moniker “Indoor Mold Sensitivity and Toxicity” for the disease. As more researchers and treating physicians publish on MERI, a consensus definition will be developed.

Treatment

Treatment protocols also vary and to date there have been no head-to-head trials on the efficacy or superiority of any one regimen. However, each listed practitioner will relate extraordinary results (even up to 90%) of patients who are compliant with the prescribed therapy. The two basic principles of most approaches include 1) toxin avoidance and 2) removal of toxin from the body—usually via sequestering agents. Some use glutathione and targeted nutritional support to promote detoxification, as well as exercise and sauna therapy when indicated.

Toxin avoidance can be taken to several levels. Dr. Shoemaker suggests testing suspected indoor spaces via ERMI which detects mold DNA from vacuumed carpet or flooring samples. The result is logarithmic and a score of 2.0 or less is considered acceptable unless the patient has low MSH or very high C4a lab values.²³⁴ Unfortunately, there continues to be limits to most testing modalities and it is often necessary to evaluate indoor settings using historical information about the building, as well as signs of water damage and moisture excess, combined with judicious use of focused testing. Multiple testing modalities exist and most experts agree a combination of methods provides optimal results,¹⁵³ False-negative test results are easy to obtain, especially using the common 5-minute spore trap techniques. However, it is nearly impossible to obtain a false-positive test result; therefore, all positive results should be taken seriously. Making sure home and work are mold-free places is critical for adults. Schools are a more challenging locale to test as the school district usually must give permission. Indoor air quality testing alone is often not sensitive enough to detect the low levels required to cause illness, especially in genetically predisposed patients.

For spaces found to be “moldy” (i.e., water-damaged, regardless of the findings on testing, when used), remediation by certified personnel is recommended. Improper efforts can spread microbes (such as mold, bacteria and parasites), spores, fragments and toxins throughout the entire structure as water-damaged building materials are removed.^{235,236} If remediation is attempted, proper containment procedures and personal protective equipment are critical, because disturbing or handling the contaminants can result in increased aerosolized spores and particles containing mycotoxins which can be dangerous to human health and destructive to property.

It is important to note: Although many products can easily kill mold, dead mold (if not removed) can be as dangerous as growing mold due to the continued presence of highly toxic

mycotoxins and viable spores which are often impervious to the effects of the agents used to kill the molds.

Serious disinformation has been popularized and reflected in the guidelines given healthcare workers and the public encouraging the use of bleach and other chlorinated products for cleaning the mold from damp indoor spaces. However, at least two species of concern—*chaetomium* and *stachybotrys*—propagate via spores that are unaffected by chlorine, acids, caustics or ozone. In addition, chlorinating carbon-based organic toxins increases their toxicity by increasing their mutagenicity and their lipid solubility which allows these poisons to enter the skin and accumulate in lipid rich tissue such as fat deposits and the brain.

There are significant health risks at play when patients and their personal effects are subjected to contamination in damp, rotting, moldy—whether visible to the eye or hidden in the wall cavities—conditions indoors. The combination of an infectious threat—the spores—and poisons riding into the occupants' lungs on the surface of respirable particulates coated with a variety of some of the most toxic substances—mycotoxins—known to humankind represents one of the most serious threats to our public's health and to the health of the individual occupants.

When patients find themselves ill after spending time in highly toxic, damp indoor environments, restoring their health depends on their removal from conditions of continued exposure—in addition to the implementation of appropriate treatment protocols. They should be evacuated from the contaminated space and separated from their personal effects including, but not limited to, clothing, bedding, furniture, books, papers, computers and other electronic devices—most have fans and all have electrostatic and magnetic fields that attract toxic respirable particulates and spores—as all of these items are vectors for cross contaminating other indoor environments into which they are brought.

A new study titled "Remediation of mould damaged building materials—efficiency of a broad spectrum of treatments" was published in January 2012 by Peitzsch, et al.²³⁷ It states (in part):

"We compared the efficiency of some commercially available products and methods used for remediation of mould-contaminated building materials. Samples of gypsum board and pinewood were artificially contaminated with toxin-producing isolates of *Stachybotrys chartarum* and *Aspergillus versicolor*, respectively, then, ten different remediation treatments were applied according to the manufacturers' instructions. Microbial and chemical analyses of the infested materials were carried out both immediately before and after treatment, after six weeks of drying at room temperature, and after another six weeks of remoistening. The aim of the study was to determine whether the investigated methods could inhibit the mould growth and destroy some selected mycotoxins produced by the moulds. None of the decontamination methods tested could completely eliminate viable moulds. No remediation treatment eliminated all the toxins from the damaged materials. These results emphasize the importance to work preventatively with moisture safety throughout the construction processes and management to prevent mould growth on building materials."²³⁷

It is also important to note that many published guidelines state that testing is not necessary or not recommended. However, it depends on the situation and many independent and inter-dependent factors including whether the parties are involved in litigation and the current health status, sensitivity, and/or genetic susceptibility of each individual. An additional factor that needs to be considered is that testing is not financially viable for all homeowners, due to the extent of the damage and the tremendous financial losses that families incur in these situations. If testing is used or needed, positive results are a guide to treating the occupants of the exposed site, but negative results do not rule out the need to appropriately remediate.

The processes involved in accomplishing effective mold remediation are dependent upon multiple factors as each water-damage situation presents its own unique set of circumstances and challenges. For example, because some water-damaged structures may produce a false negative test result based on sampling, remediation procedures should still be implemented. Additionally, there are some water-damage situations that cannot be resolved or corrected with remediation. As such, it is not practical to provide a detailed discussion of mold remediation in this paper. Building owners, homeowners and others responsible for the proper maintenance of structures are encouraged to contact experienced, knowledgeable and certified professionals for appropriate guidance.

Mycotoxins routinely travel with spores (alive or dead) and, even more concerning, travel with very small, even submicron sized particles capable of penetrating deep into the lungs. At this level, they are subjected to the effects of pulmonary surfactants which allow otherwise insoluble toxins to be absorbed into the bloodstream. Dr. Walter Hayhurst suggests creating a “safe room” in a moldy dwelling for those who cannot afford to properly remediate the entire space and also thoroughly cleansing pets and vehicles with some “natural” products his group has developed. As a reminder, in the recently published study by Peitzsch et al,²³⁷ researchers tested ten commonly used agents purporting to be capable of neutralizing mycotoxins and/or suppressing mold growth; not one of them completely removed all mold and toxins. (None of Dr. Hayhurst’s products were included in this report.)

Dr. Shoemaker’s sequestration approach uses cholestyramine 3-4 times a day while Dr. Gray uses up to three sequestering agents (bentonite or zeolite clay, charcoal and cholestyramine) twice daily. The clay and cholestyramine are mixed together in a liter of water and drunk over the course of the morning/afternoon and then again after dinner. The charcoal is taken as pills or capsules. Dr. Gray also recommends the simultaneous use of Dr. Grace Ziem’s oxidative stress reducing Neural Sensitization Protocol (NSP), targeting the increased oxidative stress associated with both inflammation and toxicity.

Beyond toxin avoidance and sequestration, Dr. Shoemaker, *et al*, follow a step-wise, pyramidal approach to therapy. As each step is cleared, more patients will be free of symptoms and have a return to the normal biologic regulation and lab work which healthy persons enjoy. This approach is summarized below. Note: Few patients will require every step, and steps are NEVER taken out of order.

Eradicate biofilm-forming agents (MARCoNS)

Correct elevated Anti Gliadin Antibody (after verifying no celiac disease)

- Correct elevated MMP-9
- Correct ADH/osmolality
- Correct elevated C3a
- Correct elevated C4a
- Correct elevated TGF β -1
- Replace low VIP
- Verify patient stable off all meds

Dr. Gray also stresses the need for adequate upper respiratory and pulmonary care, uses supplements such as CoQ₁₀ and, on occasion, enlists systemic anti-fungal agents. Glutathione is heavily emphasized in Dr. Gray's treatment protocol, being used in an oral liposomal form, nebulized and intranasally (Dr. Kaye Kilburn has demonstrated benefits in neurocognitive symptoms as this route allows crossing of the blood brain barrier). Additionally, Dr. Gray frequently uses nasal antifungal agents and Dr. Ziem's oxidative stress protocol (as noted above).

Dr. Hope, in addition to the use of sequestering agents (cholestyramine and charcoal), also prescribes glutathione via all of the above routes and nasal antifungals when indicated, treats detoxigenomics findings to specifically address genetic deficits (SNPs) and nutritional testing to assess for adequate presence of vitamin cofactors needed for proper detoxification. Treatment includes both avoidance of problematic medications, toxins, foods and hormones as well as supplementation of specific cofactors (magnesium, B vitamins, etc.)

Dr. Rea's approach is aimed at decreasing the "total body load"²³⁸ of all toxins and toxic chemicals, injections to neutralize²³⁹ mycotoxins, avoidance of foods and chemicals to which patients may have become sensitized, parenteral and oral nutrition (the latter includes spring water in glass bottles, organic foods and a rotary diet), sauna treatments, exercise and massage. Some patients require an autologous lymphocytic factor, developed at Dr. Rea's center, which modulates the patient's own immune system. In some others, anti-fungals, oxygen therapy and sequestration agents are used.²³⁸

Dr. Hayhurst and Dr. Dennis²⁴⁰ suggest treating fungal infections in the sinuses aggressively and use "The Inflammation Free Diet Plan"²⁴¹ and recommend resveratrol,²⁴² a molecule shown in some studies to prolong the lifespan of worms, fruit flies²⁴³ and short-lived fish.²⁴⁴ It may also reduce the risk of certain cancers in rats.²⁴⁵ Further study is underway to evaluate resveratrol's potential for neuroprotective, anti-inflammatory, cardioprotective, anti-diabetic and anti-viral effects.²⁴⁴

Dr. Vinitzky teaches that chronic overstimulation of the sympathetic nervous system (SNS) also contributes to "mold toxicity."²⁴⁶ His therapies also include relaxation/meditation techniques, energy optimization, dietary changes, exercise, nutritional supplements, increasing purified water intake and development of a positive mental attitude to help the body heal itself of toxins and toxic stress as precursors to the inflammatory response.²⁴⁷ The intent is to integrate the mind, body and spirit into the healing process. As a further metabolic basis of treatment, Hydroxocobalamin is a recognized scavenger of inflammation stress (nitric oxide) as described by Martin Pall. That is part of the basis of Dr. Ziem's protocol. Dr. Vinitzky has identified a patent-pending 5:2 ratio of sublingual/transbuccal Folate:Hydrocobalamin as a means of cleaning

up oxidative stress (aldehydes) and Nitric Oxide, first as a means of cleaning up stress, then replenishing sufficient doses on a patient-to-patient basis to correct methylation defects. He has defined the Methylation Priority Principle© as a relative ranking of the need for methylation processes, of which there are more than 50 in the body. Included in this ranking are Adrenalin-activation and inactivation; followed by Histamine, Metals and Estrogen; then neurotransmitters Norepinephrine, Dopamine, Serotonin, and Melatonin; next RNA synthesis and DNA, histone, and microRNA repair; and finally, creatine production. In a recent review of 8 years of using this open-label protocol for patients of all ages, a significant portion who have been mold-affected, more than 2.37 million doses have been administered. As a side note, Henry Wright, a faith healer, believes that chronic fear, worry and anxiety are the roots of SNS overload²⁴⁸ which then causes chronic hypothalamic stress and eventual HPA and overall endocrine dysfunction.

Causation

Causation is the final issue to address. Differing levels of proof are required for different audiences. For example, some women received silicone gel breast implants and years later had ruptures or slow leakages. Many of these women subsequently developed tremendous symptomatology similar to that described in MERI. One report indicated that 97% of women had significant improvement in their auto-immune symptoms by simply removing the failed implant.²⁴⁹ That level of evidence would be convincing for most persons, including most judges and jury members, however the scientific community demands an even higher level. Large, IRB approved, controlled, prospective, double-blinded and reproducible trials are considered the gold standard. Yet, with MERI it is very unlikely an IRB will ever approve a prospective study which exposes humans to aflatoxin, endotoxin, digestive enzymes, polysaccharides, lipoproteins or any of the other biological toxins found in WDB to further prove that they cause illness in exposed humans. Regardless, sufficient data is already present in the published literature.

The 2008 GAO report (page 8) addresses this issue and offers three criteria which, if all are met, credibly establish causation in the matter of MERI. These are:

- 1) epidemiologic associations,
- 2) experimental exposure in animals or humans that leads to the symptoms and signs of the disease in question, and
- 3) reduction in exposure that leads to reduction in the symptoms and signs of disease.¹⁰

In the case of MERI, these criteria have clearly been met, as follows: 1) There are a plethora of studies demonstrating epidemiologic associations between exposure to the interior of WDB (with the associated toxins) and the various symptoms and lab/imaging/neurobehavioral testing found in patients suffering from MERI. Literally tens of thousands of human patients¹⁵³ are also documented in the literature. 2) Many prospective animal studies have been performed which reveal that exposure to various mycotoxins, endotoxins and VOCs have harmful health effects. Re-exposure studies by Dr. Shoemaker *et al* further demonstrate directly that exposure changes symptom scores and lab findings in previously treated humans. In fact, it can be shown reproducibly that patients improve on treatment out of

In the case of MERI, these criteria have clearly been met.

exposure and get worse without treatment when re-exposed. 3) The same re-exposure studies prove also that humans removed from exposure do indeed improve.

For some individual patients, it is very difficult or impossible to demonstrate that they themselves improve with reduction of exposure because they are unable to limit their presence to certain exposures. An example would be a person made sick in the workplace. In an ideal world, the patient would take a month or so off work with pay while diagnostic and therapeutic efforts are underway and significant improvement is achieved. Re-exposure upon return to the water-damaged workspace with exacerbation of previous symptoms and lab work would essentially seal the deal. However, many patients will have already exhausted sick leave and vacation time because of previous symptomatology. They are unable financially to remove themselves from the workplace exposure adequately to optimally restore health. These patients will sometimes seek other employment but usually continue working in the environment that is making them ill. A few employers are sympathetic and offer testing, remediation and/or accommodations to relieve the problem. This scenario potentially allows the opportunity to prove that the exposure truly is reduced by re-testing after the employer's intervention is implemented with the patient's physician documenting changes in health status. However, many employers disbelieve that mold can cause illness, others may feel threatened by potential lawsuits and the hassles of workers' compensation insurance or disability procedures. Some will be more concerned by the potential cost of appropriate remediation than the costs to the employee's health. In these scenarios, where the patient continues to work (or go to school) in an unmodified space, causation can still be inferred by treating with a sequestering agent such as cholestyramine, charcoal and/or clay. Since their actions are to bind and remove bile acids and the ionically charged molecules attached to them (through the enterohepatic circulation), sequestering agents are intended to reduce total body loads of many substances including many toxins. Reduced body toxin loads can be monitored via VCS and other targeted diagnostic testing modalities including urine mycotoxin studies (available through RealTime Laboratories in Dallas, Texas).²⁵⁰ Documented symptoms, reduced by severity, frequency and/or duration, reveal a positive patient response. Resolution of abnormal blood tests further displays disease improvement.

Of note, a common scenario for the persistence of symptoms, after escaping exposure from a water-damaged building, is caused by cross contamination, or the transport of materials which have been contaminated with mycotoxins and other toxic and microbial agents, from the previous water-damaged building to the new setting. This phenomenon results in an ongoing exposure, as there was never any practiced avoidance.

Dr. Shoemaker's group has developed and published a re-exposure trial known as the ABB'AB protocol.²⁵¹ The first "A" stands for a patient who is ill in an exposure. The first "B" represents the same patient—now improved on therapy and out of exposure. B' refers to an improved patient who remains out of exposure and maintains improved health off of therapy. The second "A" indicates that the patient, off therapy, is re-exposed to the previous suspected environment for at least three days. The final "B" documents the patient once again on therapy after the re-exposure. Symptom logs, VCS testing and specific labs are obtained just prior to re-exposure and at 24, 48 and 72 hours after re-exposure. If the suspected environment is an exposure, and hence a health risk for this patient, symptom scores will increase, VCS scores will

decrease and certain lab tests will increase and/or decrease predictably in post-exposure levels compared to those obtained just prior to re-exposure.

While performing the ABB'AB protocol²⁵¹ may not be required to establish causation for a patient, successful administration of this trial is very powerful evidence, difficult to refute, and clearly meets all three GAO-suggested criteria for causation between a purported exposure and an individual. It is a prospective re-exposure trial with the only variable being re-introduction to the suspected sick building.

It is also helpful to test one or more suspected environments to document the presence of water damage. A WDB, by definition, will have multiple species of molds, bacteria, etc. There are a number of testing strategies and using a combination of methods is recommended by many.¹⁵³ Verifying the presence of water damage in the interior of a building proves the existence of potentially harmful microbial agents and the secondary metabolites they exude. As noted above, it is not possible, nor necessary, to identify the individual toxin(s) which is (are) harming the human host. That there is at least one toxin in the interior of a WDB causing disease is inferred by the presence of water damage (causation has already been established as above) and the patient's improvement on a sequestration protocol with/without removal from the exposure. In the words of the WHO 2009 report (Executive Summary, p. XV), "As the relations between dampness, microbial exposure and health effects cannot be quantified precisely, no quantitative health-based guideline values or thresholds can be recommended for acceptable levels of contamination with microorganisms. Instead, it is recommended that dampness and mould-related problems be prevented."²

When treating patients only (i.e., litigation is not involved), it is not necessary to prove that a school or place of employment is the only exposure implicated. The treating practitioner's recommendation will be to test and/or remediate all spaces with water damage to which the patient is exposed. However, those who administer schools and workplaces are mandated by various laws and agencies to provide safe facilities for their students and employees. As such, even if a school or business is not the only WDB to which the patient is exposed, proper testing, remediation as needed and re-testing of these places must be performed. Landlords have a similar duty. As a generality, lawsuits usually only occur when the responsible parties appear to shirk these responsibilities.

The practitioner should always keep in mind, however, the possibility of future (or current) litigation. As such, documentation is the most basic key to demonstrating causation. Documenting worsening of the condition with re-exposures is also important. Some physicians use standardized symptom scales as a way to document symptoms. Dr. Gray uses the Davidoff Inflammatory Symptom Frequency Profile.

Conclusion for Part II

In summary, MERI is a multi-symptom, multi-system disease occurring in many people due usually to long-term exposure to the interior of water-damaged buildings. While there are differing opinions on the best diagnostic and therapeutic approaches, it is clear from the literature

and from practice that this disease exists and significant relief can be obtained by most sufferers with avoidance of further exposure and appropriate treatment.

As stated throughout this paper, it is time to move beyond the focus of “establishing the fact of mold disease,” because it has already been established in numerous research papers and in the treatment of thousands of patients. It is time for our national and world leaders to develop a comprehensive public health response to this devastating epidemic that has the potential to cripple our individual and collective futures.

MERI is a multi-symptom, multi-system disease occurring in many people due usually to long-term exposure to the interior of water-damaged buildings. It is clear from the literature and from practice that this disease exists and significant relief can be obtained by most sufferers with avoidance of further exposure and appropriate treatment.

Call to Action

This position paper is the first step of our **CALL TO ACTION**. It is time to move beyond the focus of “establishing the fact of mold disease,” because it has already been established in numerous research papers and in the treatment of thousands of patients. It is time for our national and world leaders to develop a comprehensive public health response to this devastating epidemic that has the potential to cripple our individual and collective futures. We have highlighted the extensive research which clearly demonstrates many of these principles and look forward to collaborative efforts in this search for better health and safer living and working conditions. The Global Indoor Health Network puts forth the following recommendations:

Marketing and Education

1. Create educational programs for mass distribution to rapidly increase awareness of this illness (e.g., books, videos, pamphlets, announcements on TV/Internet/radio/social networking sites, blogs, webinars, etc.)
2. Collaborate with key stakeholders to reach consensus on a common name for this illness
3. Participate in the development of a marketing strategy to ensure accurate and consistent messaging

Promoting Safe Indoor Environments

4. Provide accurate information to architects, builders, construction firms and others associated with developing homes, schools and business in order to promote construction of safe indoor environments
5. Develop and disseminate a thorough and accurate set of guidelines regarding testing, evaluation and remediation of water-damaged buildings
6. Develop a specific message for remediation of schools (because a high percentage of schools have already been identified as having indoor air quality problems and it is imperative that those structures be remediated correctly and in a timely manner)
7. Join with other interested parties to develop and promote the design and construction of housing that eliminates and/or minimizes the impact of indoor contaminants (e.g., emphasize the importance of using materials that promote good indoor air quality)

Working with Government Agencies and Organizations

8. Participate in and encourage open and good faith collaboration with international, federal, state and local government agencies and private and public organizations to develop written materials, actionable plans, resources to help individuals locate safe housing and other initiatives to address this important public health issue
9. Recommend to the U.S. President and Congress that they allocate funds and appoint someone at the federal level to oversee this issue on a national level so there is a coordinated approach for dissemination of information and development of solutions for this important public health initiative

Developing Resources

10. Participate in the development of a website and telephone hotline where people can get accurate information and a list of resources
11. Identify funding sources in order to provide loans and grants to individuals and families who need emergency housing and personal supplies due to emergency situations that require them to leave their homes and apartments in order to protect their health because of mold, water damage and other environmental pollutants
12. Assist with the development of a handbook for physicians, hospitals and medical organizations to inform them about the health effects of indoor contaminants and the appropriate testing and treatment protocols
13. Create an international resource list of medical professionals, specialized services and products relevant to the diagnosis and management of this illness
14. Provide consistent information to global relief agencies regarding the importance of requiring their volunteers to use personal protective equipment when assisting in disaster areas where there is likely to be indoor contaminants in water-damaged buildings

Ongoing Research

15. Develop strategies to fund research to increase our understanding of the mechanisms involved in the development and treatment of this illness
16. Identify more comprehensively the epidemiological aspects of this disease
17. Participate in and initiate research projects to investigate the effectiveness of remediation methods and to identify new products that will aid in remediation efforts
18. Work with national labs to develop rapid screening tests that identify those individuals with the potential to develop this illness and to identify those who are already showing symptomatic evidence of exposure

Please join us in our mission to promote healthy indoor environments for everyone around the globe.

—Members of the Global Indoor Health Network—

APPENDIX A

Chemicals Often Found in Buildings and Their Health Effects

CHEMICAL	POTENTIAL INDOOR BUILDING SOURCES	POTENTIAL HEALTH RISKS
<i>Asbestos</i>	Deteriorating, damaged or disturbed insulation, fireproofing, acoustical materials and floor tiles.	Long-term risk of chest and abdominal cancers and lung diseases.
<i>Arsenic</i>	Pesticides, wood preservatives, paint; natural water; smoke from burning arsenic-treated wood; chromated copper arsenate (CCA)—a chemical wood preservative—in decks or playground sets. <i>(Non-organic chicken)</i>	Long-term exposure to high levels of inorganic arsenic in drinking water has been associated with skin disorders and risks for diabetes, high blood pressure, and several types of cancer.
<i>BPA</i>	Residential water supply lines, hoses and many other plastics. BPA is found in building conduits that distribute water and air.	Hormone-like effects on the developing reproductive system and neuro-behavioral changes in the offspring.
<i>Bromated flame retardants</i>	Furniture foam; consumer electronics; wire insulation; back coatings for draperies and upholstery; and plastics for television cabinets and small appliances.	Animal studies show effects on the thyroid and liver in doses much higher than people would encounter; EPA has classified certain PBDEs (polybrominated diphenyl ethers) as a possible carcinogen.
<i>Formaldehyde</i>	Pressed wood products, wood products. Urea-formaldehyde foam insulation (UFFI). Durable press drapes, other textiles, and glues. Average concentrations in older homes without UFFI are generally below 0.1 ppm; in homes with significant amounts of new pressed wood products, levels can be greater than 0.3 ppm	Respiratory irritation; fatigue; skin rash; severe allergic reactions; cancer.
<i>Lead</i>	Paints, enamels, surface coatings on furniture. <i>(Decay product of radon)</i>	Adverse health effects of lead on the nervous system are well-documented, and there is no “safe” level of exposure.

Mercury	Fluorescent lamps, high intensity discharge lamps, mercury-containing switches, mercury-containing thermostats, silent wall switches, commercial/industrial HVAC equipment, freezers, sensors, switches, meters, manometers and barometers, pipes, thermometers, rubber floors, sump pumps and septic tanks.	Tremors, emotional changes; insomnia; neuromuscular effects, sensory disturbances, headaches; devices can break and release mercury vapor to the air, particularly in warm or poorly ventilated indoor spaces. (<i>Impairs methionine to homocysteine looping in at least 6 pathways</i>)
Pesticides	75% of U.S. households used at least one pesticide product indoors during the past year.	Headaches, dizziness, muscle twitching, weakness, tingling sensations, and nausea; may cause long-term damage to the liver and the central nervous system, and increased risk of cancer.
Phthalates	Phthalates are added to soften and make PVC more pliable; also used in latex adhesives, vinyl tiles, carpet tiles, fragrances and air fresheners; widespread in indoor air.	Developmental and reproductive effects; infertility; sperm damage; childhood studies link phthalate exposure to risk of asthma and allergies. Prenatal exposure and reduced anogenital distance in boys.
Polyfluoroalkyl Chemicals (PFCs)	Produced since the 1950s to make products that resist oil, stains, heat, water and grease, including stain-resistant carpets and fabrics. (<i>Nonstick and Teflon coatings</i>)	Limited animal studies available; not all PFCs have been tested. Some studies show that some types of PFCs can cause tumors, damage to the liver and other organs, and developmental and reproductive effects.
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	Found in a wide variety of commercial, industrial and residential products, solvents, cleaners and degreasers and pesticides. Estimated that indoor air concentrations of VOCs are much higher than concentrations found outdoors.	Asthma, headaches, nausea, damage to liver, kidney and central nervous system. Some organics are suspected or known to cause cancer in humans.

Source: Environment & Human Health, Inc. 2010. *The Green Building Debate: LEED Certification—Where Energy Efficiency Collides with Human Health.*²⁵²

NOTE: This table was taken directly from the source indicated. It is presented here as a pictorial representation of some of the topics presented in this paper and is not intended to be all inclusive. A few select notes (shown in parentheses and italics) have been added by the authors of this paper.

APPENDIX B

Some Common Fungi, Mycotoxins, and Health Effects from Ingestion, Dermal, or Inhalation Exposure

Derived from Kendrick, 1992; Arafat and Musa, 1995; Osborne et al., 1996

CAVEAT: The entries in this table provide examples of the toxins and health effects that have been associated with some fungi. The listed fungi may also produce other toxins, fungi other than those listed may produce some of these toxins, and health effects other than those listed may also be associated with these toxins.

Fungus	Mycotoxin	Possible Health Effect
Acremonium spp.	Cephalosporin	Antibiotic
Alternaria alternata, Phoma sorghina	Tenuazoic acid	Nephrotoxic, hepatotoxic, hemorrhagic
Aspergillus clavatus	Cytochalasin E Patulin	Affects cell division, inhibits protein synthesis, nephrotoxic, carcinogenic
Aspergillus flavus, Aspergillus parasiticus	Aflatoxins	Mutagenic, carcinogenic, hepatotoxic
Aspergillus fumigatus	Fumitremorgens Gliotoxin	Tremorgenic Cytotoxic
Aspergillus nidulans, Aspergillus versicolor, Cochliobolus sativus	Sterigmatocystin	Hepatotoxic, carcinogenic
Aspergillus ochraceus, Penicillium verrucosum, Penicillium viridicatum	Ochratoxin A	Nephrotoxic, hepatotoxic, carcinogenic (<i>immunotoxic, neurotoxic</i>)
Cladosporium spp.	Epicladosporic acid	Immunosuppressive
Cladosporium cladosporioides	Cladosporin, Emodin	Antibiotics
Claviceps purpurea	Ergot alkaloids	Vasoactive (cause smooth muscles to constrict), hallucinogenic
Fusarium graminearum	Deoxynivalenol Zearalenone	Emetic Estrogenic

Fusarium moniliforme	Fumonisin	Neurotoxic, hepatotoxic, nephrotoxic, carcinogenic
Fusarium poae, Fusarium sporotrichoides	T-2 toxin	Hemorrhagic, immunosuppressive, causes nausea and vomiting
Penicillium chrysogenum	Penicillin	Antibiotic
Penicillium crustosum	Penitrem A, Roquefortine C	Tremorgenic Neurotoxic (tremorgenic)
Penicillium expansum	Citrinin, Patulin, Roquefortine C	Tremorgenic Neurotoxic (tremorgenic)
Penicillium griseofulvum, Penicillium viridicatum	Griseofulvin	Tumorigenic, teratogenic, hepatotoxic
Pithomyces chartarum	Sporidesmin Phylloerythrin	Hepatotoxic Causes photosensitization and eczema
Stachybotrys chartarum (atra)	Satratoxins, Verrucarins, Roridins Stachyocins (<i>Trichothecenes</i>)	Inflammatory agents, immunosuppressive, cause dermatitis, hemotoxic, hemorrhagic
Tolypocladium inflatum	Cyclosporin	Immunosuppressive

Source: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). 1999.
*Bioaerosols: Assessment and Control.*²⁵³

NOTE: This table was taken directly from the source indicated. It is presented here as a pictorial representation of some of the topics presented in this paper and is not intended to be all inclusive. A few select notes (shown in parentheses and italics) have been added by the authors of this paper.

Biographies and Conflict of Interest Statements

Scott W. McMahon, M.D., is a board certified pediatrician, practicing for nearly 20 years in Roswell, New Mexico. His introduction to MERI came when 15 teenagers and adults, all sharing significant exposure to the same local school, were presented to him. Seeing the truth, he opened Whole World Health Care to evaluate and treat pediatric and adult MERI patients. Dr. McMahon received his M.D. at Creighton University and completed his pediatric residency at Duke University Medical Center. He reports receiving income from testimony in one case involving mold litigation. Dr. McMahon is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network and is on the Board of Directors for the organization and serves as the Treasurer.

Janette Hope, M.D., works in the field of environmental medicine in private practice in Santa Barbara, California. Dr. Hope completed her family practice residency at Santa Monica UCLA Medical Center and graduated from medical school at the University of Hawaii John A. Burns School of Medicine, with Alpha Omega Alpha honors, where she subsequently served as a Clinical Assistant Professor of Family Medicine. She is board certified in family practice, environmental medicine and integrative and holistic medicine and recently published an article in the Journal of Environmental and Public Health reviewing human health effects of inhalational exposure to ochratoxin A including kidney disease. Dr. Hope reports receiving income for a deposition in one case related to exposure to a water-damaged building and mold. Dr. Hope is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network and is on the Board of Directors for the organization where she serves as Secretary. She is also a member of the Board of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine.

Jack Dwayne Thrasher, Ph.D, is semiretired. He received his Ph.D. in human anatomy specializing in cell biology from UCLA. He has consulted to the practice of Dr. Michael Gray. He has been an expert witness in both defense and plaintiff cases regarding toxic exposures. Dr. Thrasher is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network.

William J. Rea, M.D., is a thoracic, cardiovascular and general surgeon with an added interest in the environmental aspects of health and disease. Founder of the Environmental Health Center - Dallas (EHC-D) in 1974, Dr. Rea is currently director of this highly specialized Dallas-based medical facility. He received his MD from Ohio State University College of Medicine in Columbus, Ohio. He is board certified in general surgery, thoracic surgery, and environmental medicine. Dr. Rea reports receiving income as an expert witness in both defense and plaintiff cases regarding toxic exposures. Dr. Rea is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network.

Alan R. Vinitsky, M.D., is a board-certified Internist and Pediatrician, who has been in private practice for 33 years. He has a special interest in environmental medicine, nutrition, and the autonomic nervous system. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine. He has provided testimony for patients who were exposed to mold and other environmental exposures. He has not been asked to provide defense testimony but would do so if the opportunity presented itself. He is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network. During the writing and review of this paper, Dr. Vinitsky's office suffered extended water damage exposure, requiring him to seek a temporary alternative office location. The office status is in

litigation at the time of publication. Dr. Vinitzky did not compose any wording relative to litigation in this paper, nor did he seek advice or opinions from any of the co-authors concerning litigation.

Michael R. Gray, MD, MPH, has practiced Internal Medicine, Emergency Medicine, Occupational Medicine, and Clinical Toxicology for 38 years. Dr. Gray is the Medical Director of Progressive Healthcare Group which operates a state licensed Rural Health Clinic in Benson, Arizona, 50 miles southeast of Tucson, Arizona. Dr. Gray treated his first MERI patients in 1994 when a bank branch manager from Tucson presented to his office wheelchair bound from rheumatoid arthritis and reported that 9 out of 10 of her employees suffered from a strange illness that manifested itself with symptoms occurring on Monday morning, worsening through the week, and abating on weekends and vacations. A leak in a pipe chase in a wall between the restroom and the closet housing the air handler caused the wall cavity to fill with mold, and the air handler spread the toxic bioaerosols throughout the entire building causing the employees' illnesses. For the next 18 years, Dr. Gray's clinical research has focused on furthering our understanding of the complexity of MERI, and approaches to effectively treating and preventing this devastating illness. Dr. Gray is Board Certified in General Preventive and Occupational Medicine and is Board Prepared in Internal Medicine, Emergency Medicine and Toxicology. Dr. Gray completed his residencies in Internal and Occupational Medicine, with an emphasis in Toxicology, at Cook County Hospital in Chicago, Illinois, from 1974 to 1975. He has served as an expert witness in litigation involving illness associated with exposure to bioaerosols in water damaged buildings, asbestos, pesticides, radiation sources, silica dust, coal dust, solvents, and other toxins and infectious agents. Dr. Gray reports no conflicts of interest and has been retained by both defense and plaintiff's counsel. He is a member of the Global Indoor Health Network.

References

1. Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Special Legislative Commission on Indoor Air Pollution. Indoor Air Pollution in Massachusetts. April 1989.
2. World Health Organization. WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality – Dampness and Mould. 2009.
3. World Health Organization. WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality – Selected Pollutants. 2010.
4. Mayo Clinic. "Mayo Clinic Study Implicates Fungus As Cause Of Chronic Sinusitis." *ScienceDaily*, 10 Sep. 1999.
5. Fisk WJ. Health and Productivity Gains from Better Indoor Environments and Their Relationship with Building Energy Efficiency. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Annual Review Energy Environ. 2000. 25:537–66.
6. Ernest H. A Textbook of Modern Toxicology. John Wiley and Sons. 2010. P. 10. ISBN 047046206X.
7. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). The Inside Story: A Guide to Indoor Air Quality. 1988.
8. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Report for Congress on Indoor Air Quality. Volume II: Assessment and Control of Indoor Air Pollution. August 1989.
9. U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Superfund, Ocean and Water Protection, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate. Indoor Air Pollution: Federal Efforts are Not Effectively Addressing a Growing Problem. October 1991.
10. U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). Report to the Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate. Indoor Mold: Better Coordination of Research on Health Effects and More Consistent Guidance Would Improve Federal Efforts. September 2008.
11. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Healthy School Environment Resources. Web. May 10, 2012.
12. U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). School Facilities: Condition of America's Schools. 1995.
13. Birnbaum, Linda. Chemical 'Soup' Clouds Connection between Toxins and Poor Health. *Scientific American*. November 23, 2012.
14. National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). NIOSH Alert: Preventing Occupational Respiratory Disease from Exposures Caused by Dampness in Office Buildings, Schools, and Other Nonindustrial Buildings. November 2012.
15. GlobalBurden.org. Web. 2012.
16. World Health Organization (WHO). Preventing Disease Through Healthy Environments: Towards an Estimate of the Environmental Burden of Disease. 2006.
17. World Health Organization (WHO). A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. www.thelancet.com, Vol 380, December 15/22/29, 2012.
18. World Health Organization (WHO). Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. www.thelancet.com, Vol 380, December 15/22/29, 2012.
19. World Health Organization (WHO) Regional Office for Europe Copenhagen. Indoor Air Pollutants: Exposure and Health Effects. Report on a WHO Meeting. June 8-11, 1982.
20. World Health Organization (WHO). Worldwide burden of disease from exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries. www.thelancet.com, published online November 26, 2010, DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61388-82010.
21. World Health Organization (WHO). Environmental Burden of Disease Associated with Inadequate Housing: A method guide to the quantification of health effects of selected housing risks in the WHO European Region. 2011.
22. Nevin R, Jacobs DE, Berg M, Cohen. J. Monetary Benefits of Preventing Childhood Lead Poisoning With Lead-Safe Window Replacement. *Environmental Research*, Volume 106, Issue 3, March 2008, Pages 410–419.
23. Berkeley Lab Research News. Berkeley Lab, EPA Studies Confirm Large Public Health and Economic Impact of Dampness and Mold. May 24, 2007.
24. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Toxicological profile for radon. U.S. Public Health Service, in collaboration with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. December 1990.
25. Bader RFW. An Introduction to the Electronic Structure of Atoms and Molecules. McMaster University. n.d. Web.

-
26. Darby S, Hill D, Doll R. Radon: a likely carcinogen at all exposures. *Ann. Oncol.* 2005; 12 (10): 1341. doi:10.1023/A:1012518223463. PMID 11762803.
 27. Huang SXL, Partridge MA, Hernandez-Rosa E, Davidson MM, Hei TK. Asbestos Induces Mitochondrial DNA Mutation and Functional Alteration: Potential Source of Intracellular Oxidants and Implications for Mechanism of Mutagenicity. Center for Radiologic Research. Updated 10/21/2010. Web. Jan. 2012.
 28. Environmental Protection Agency. Report: EPA Assessment of Risks from Radon in Homes. [EPA 402-R-03-003]. June 2003.
 29. A Citizen's Guide to Radon: The Guide to Protecting Yourself and Your Family from Radon. Updated 10/12/2010. Web. May 2011.
 30. "Radon." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. January 2012.
 31. Ross M, Nolan RP. History of asbestos discovery and use and asbestos-related disease in context with the occurrence of asbestos within the ophiolite complexes. In Dilek, Yildirim. *Ophiolite Concept and the Evolution of Geological Thought*. Special Paper 373. Boulder, Colorado: Geological Society of America. 2003. ISBN 0-8137-2373-6.
 32. Bostock J, Riley HT (Translators). *Asbestinon. The Natural History of Pliny*. Vol. IV. London: Henry G. Bohn. 1856. p. 137.
 33. Allemen JE, Mossman BT. Asbestos Revisited. *Scientific American*: July 1997; 54–57.
 34. Asbestos, CAS No. 1332-21-4. National Toxicology Program, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 35. Berman DW, Crump KS. Final draft: technical support document for a protocol to assess asbestos-related risk. Washington DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. pp. 474.
 36. FAQs: Asbestos Exposure Law Firm Texas. Pursley Law Firm, n.d. Web. Jan. 2012.
 37. Burke B. Shipyards, a Crucible for Tragedy: Part 1: How the war created a monster. *Virginian-Pilot Norfolk, Virginia (newspaper)*. May 6, 2001.
 38. "Mesothelioma: Questions and Answers." National Cancer Institute, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 39. Becklake MR. Asbestos-related diseases of the lung and other organs: their epidemiology and implications for clinical practice. *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* 1976; 114 (1): 187–227. PMID 779552.
 40. Sporn TA, Roggli, VL, Oury TD. *Pathology of asbestos-associated diseases*. Berlin: Springer. 2004. ISBN 0-387-20090-8.
 41. World Health Organization. *Air Quality Guidelines for Europe, 2nd Edition—Man-made Vitreous Fibers*. WHO Regional Publications, European Series, No. 91. 2000.
 42. Berger SA, Castleman BI. *Asbestos: medical and legal aspects*. Gaithersburg, Md: Aspen Publishers. 2005. ISBN 0-7355-5260-6.
 43. Muscat JE, Wynder EL. *Cancer Res.* May 1991; 51 (9): 2263–7. PMID 2015590.
 44. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. *Cigarette Smoking and Asbestos Exposure: Why is it a Problem?* June 2006.
 45. Roggli VL, Sharma A, Butnor KJ, Sporn T, Vollmer RT. Malignant mesothelioma and occupational exposure to asbestos: a clinicopathological correlation of 1445 cases. *Ultrastruct Pathol* 2002; 26 (2): 55-65. doi:10.1080/01913120252959227. PMID 12036093.
 46. "NIOSH Working Group Paper from the Centers for Disease Control—November 1980." CDC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 47. "Mesothelioma Latency Period." Sokolove Law, n.d. Web. Jan. 2012.
 48. Vogelzang N, Rusthoven J, Symanowski J, Denham C, Kaukel E, Ruffie P, et al. Phase III study of pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin versus cisplatin alone in patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma. *J Clin Oncol.* July 2003; 21(14):2636-44.
 49. "Mesothelioma Prevention Measures." HOLPlus > Disease and Conditions > Cancers. HolPlus, n.d. Web. Jan. 2012.
 50. Omaye ST. Metabolic modulation of carbon monoxide toxicity. *Toxicology* 2002; 180 (2): 139–150. doi:10.1016/S0300-483X(02)00387-6. PMID 12324190.
 51. Nelson LH. Carbon Monoxide. *Goldfrank's Toxicologic Emergencies*. (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. 2002. pp. 1689–1704. ISBN 0-07-136001-8.
 52. Weaver LK. Clinical practice. Carbon monoxide poisoning. *The New England Journal of Medicine* March 2009; 360 (12): 1217–1225. doi:10.1056/NEJMcp0808891. PMID 19297574.
-

-
53. Prockop LD, Chichkova RI. Carbon monoxide intoxication: an updated review. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* November 2007; 262 (1-2): 122–130. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2007.06.037. PMID 17720201.
 54. Bronstein AC, Spyker DA, Cantilena LR Jr., Green JL, Rumack BH, Heard SE. American Association of Poison Control Centers 2007 Annual Report. December 2008.
 55. Hardy KR, Thom SR. Pathophysiology and treatment of carbon monoxide poisoning. *Journal of Toxicology. Clinical Toxicology* 1994; 32 (6): 613–629. doi:10.3109/15563659409017973. PMID 7966524.
 56. Fawcett TA, Moon RE, Fracica PJ, Mebane GY, Theil DR, Piantadosi CA, Warehouse workers' headache. Carbon monoxide poisoning from propane-fueled forklifts. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* January 1992; 34 (1): 12–15. PMID 1552375.
 57. Choi IS, Cheon HY. Delayed movement disorders after carbon monoxide poisoning. *EurNeurol.* 1999; 42(3):141-4.
 58. "Background on Sources, Symptoms, Biomarkers and Treatment of Chronic Carbon Monoxide Poisoning." MCSRR.org, n.d. Web, Jan. 2012.
 59. Maines MD. Heme oxygenase: function, multiplicity, regulatory mechanisms, and clinical applications. *FASEB J.* 1988 Jul; 2(10):2557-68.
 60. Raub JA, Mathieu-Nolf M, Hampson NB, Thom SR. Carbon monoxide poisoning-a public health perspective. *Toxicology* April 2000; 145(1): 1–14. doi:10.1016/S0300-483X(99)00217-6. PMID 10771127.
 61. "Mutagenic Activity of Flavour Compounds." December 12, 1986. FN AQ2222, BN 400916808-400916815, Bupa.co.uk. Web. May 2011.
 62. Harris G. F.D.A. Unveils Proposed Graphic Warning Labels for Cigarette Packs. *The New York Times.* November 10, 2010.
 63. "Tobacco packaging warning messages." Wikipedia, n.d. Web May 2011.
 64. A Frank Statement to Cigarette Smokers. January 4, 1954. SourceWatch, n.d. Web. Sept. 2011.
 65. "Cigarette." Wikipedia, n.d. Web May 2011.
 66. "Global Smoking Statistics for 2002." QuitSmoking, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 67. "Cigarette Smoking (fact sheet)." CDC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 68. "Nicotine Withdrawal." QuitSmoking, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 69. 2004 Surgeon General's Report – The Health Consequences of Smoking. CDC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 70. "Pocket Guide for Physicians (to share with patients who smoke)." NYC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 71. Doll R, Peto R, Boreham J, Sutherland I. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)* 2004; 328(7455): 1519. doi:10.1136/bmj.38142.554479.AE.PMC 437139. PMID 15213107.
 72. "Secondhand Smoke." CDC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 73. National Toxicology Program. 11th Report on Carcinogens, 2005. (PDF–219KB) Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Sciences, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2000 [cited 2006 Sep 27].
 74. The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke: A Report of the Surgeon General. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coordinating Center for Health Promotion, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, cited 2006 Sep 27. Surgeon General.
 75. Goldstein AH, Galbally IE. Known and Unexplored Organic Constituents in the Earth's Atmosphere. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2007; 1515-1521. doi: 10.1021/es072476p.
 76. Bernstein JA, Alexis N, Bacchus H, Bernstein IL, Fritz P, Horner E, et al. The health effects of nonindustrial indoor air pollution. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 2008; 121(3), 585-591.
 77. Wang S, Ang HM, Tade MO. Volatile organic compounds in indoor environment and photocatalytic oxidation: State of the art. *Environment International*, 2007; 33(5), 694-705.
 78. Jones AP. Indoor air quality and health. *Atmospheric Environment*, 1999; 33(28), 4535-4564.
 79. Irigaray P, Newby JA, Clapp R, Hardell L, Howard V, Montagnier L, et al. Lifestyle-related factors and environmental agents causing cancer: An overview. *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, 2007; 61(10), 640-658.
 80. Wolkoff P, Kjærgaard SK (2007). "The dichotomy of relative humidity on indoor air quality". *Environment International*, 33(6), 850-857.
 81. Vinitzky AR. Sublingual or Intranasal B12 & Hydroxocobalamin Protocol. College Pharmacy, n.d. Web. Jan. 2012.
-

-
82. Tox Town. U.S. National Library of Medicine, n.d. Web. Jan. 2012.
 83. Thrasher JD. Brief Toxicology of Formaldehyde. DrThrasher, n.d. Web. March 2011.
 84. National Toxicology Program--12th Report on Carcinogens (RoC). National Toxicology Program. June 10, 2011.
 85. Gibson PR. Understanding and Accommodating People With MCS. ILRU Program. 2005.
 86. Gibson PR, Elms AN, Ruding LA. Perceived treatment efficacy for conventional and alternative therapies reported by persons with multiple chemical sensitivity. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2003; 111(12):1498-1504.
 87. "Pesticides: Introduction." The Endocrine Disruption Exchange, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 88. Gilden RC, Huffling K, Sattler B. Pesticides and health risks. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* January 2010; 39 (1): 103–10. doi:10.1111/j.1552-6909.2009.01092.x. PMID 20409108.
 89. Miller GT. *Sustaining the Earth*. 6th edition. Thompson Learning, Inc.: Pacific Grove, California. 2004. p. 211-216.
 90. "Human Health Issues: Pesticides." EPA, n.d. Web May 2011. .
 91. Sanborn M, Kerr KJ, Sanin LH, Cole DC, Bassil KL, Vakil C. Non-cancer health effects of pesticides: systematic review and implications for family doctors. *Can Fam Physician* October 2007; 53 (10): 1712–20. PMC 2231436. PMID 17934035.
 92. Jurewicz J, Hanke W. Prenatal and childhood exposure to pesticides and neurobehavioral development: review of epidemiological studies. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health* 2008; 21 (2): 121–32. doi:10.2478/v10001-008-0014-z. PMID 18614459.
 93. "Hormone Disruptors." Rodale. May 12, 2011.
 94. Pesticides and Food: What Integrated Pest Management Means. United States Environmental Protection Agency, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 95. Muhawi, Daniela. Safe Pesticides. EcoWorld.com. Posted on 25 June 2004.
 96. Indoor Environmental Quality Policy. CDC-SM-2009-01. Office of Health and Safety, Office of the Director, Centers for Disease Control. June 22, 2009.
 97. Understanding Lake Data. Compiled by James Vennie. Authors include: Gary Horton (Nevada Division of Water Planning), Byron Shaw, Christine Mechenich and Lowell Klessig (University of Wisconsin — Stevens Point), Ken Wagner — CLM (ENSR, Northborough, MA), Libby McCann (Adopt-a-Lake and Project WET Wisconsin) (2007). North American Lake Management Society — Water-Words Glossary.
 98. "Aerosols." Earth Observatory. NASA, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 99. Mokdad AH, et al. Actual Causes of Death in the United States, 2000. *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.*2004; 291 (10): 1238–45. doi:10.1001/jama291.10.1238. PMID 15010446.
 100. "Particulate." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 101. Peters A, Veronesi B, Calderón-Garcidueñas L, Gehr P, Chen LC, Geiser M, Reed W, Rothen-Rutishauser B, Schürch S, Schulz H. Translocation and potential neurological effects of fine and ultrafine particles a critical update. *Particle and Fibre Toxicology*. 2006; 3:13 doi:10.1186/1743-8977-3-13.
 102. "Particulate." Health Vermont, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 103. Thrasher JD, Crawley S. The biocontaminants and complexity of damp indoor spaces: more than what meets the eyes. *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 2009; 25(9-10) 583–615.
 104. Gorny RL (2004) Filamentous microorganisms and their fragments in indoor air – a review. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine: AAEM* 11: 185–197.
 105. "Malleable." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 106. "Lead." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 107. Toxic Substances Portal-Lead. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry/Division of Toxicology and Environmental Medicine. 2006.
 108. Lead replacement petrol phase-out – Information to motorists. Department for Transport (gov.uk). National Archives, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 109. Zweifel H. *Plastics Additives Handbook*. Hanser Verlag. 2009. p. 438. ISBN 9783446408012.
 110. Amstock JS. *Handbook of glass in construction*. McGraw-Hill Professional. 1997. pp. 116–119. ISBN 9780070016194.
 111. Henkels WH, Geppert LM, Kadlec J, Epperlein PW, Beha H. Josephson 4 K-bit cache memory design for a prototype signal processor. Harvard University. September 1985.
-

-
112. Case Studies in Environmental Medicine Lead (Pb) Toxicity: How are People Exposed to Lead? ATSDR, CDC, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 113. Karri SK, Saper RB, Kales SN. Lead encephalopathy due to traditional medicines. *Current drug safety* 2008; 3 (1): 54–9. doi:10.2174/157488608783333907.
 114. Flora SJ, Mittal M, Mehta A. Heavy metal induced oxidative stress & its possible reversal by chelation therapy. *The Indian Journal of Medical Research* 2008; 128 (4): 501–23. PMID 19106443.
 115. Yu, MH. Soil and water pollution: Environmental metals and metalloids. *Environmental Toxicology: Biological and Health Effects of Pollutants*. CRC Press. 2005. ISBN 156670670X.
 116. Casarett LJ, Klaassen CD, Doull J, (Editors). Toxic effects of metals. *Casarett and Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of Poisons*. 7th edition. McGraw-Hill Professional. 2007. ISBN 0071470514.
 117. Needleman, H. Lead poisoning. *Annual review of medicine* 2004; 55: 209-22. doi:10.1146/annurev.med.55.091902.103653.
 118. Chisolm, JJ. Lead poisoning. In *Crocetti, Barone, Oski's Essential Pediatrics*. 2nd edition. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. 2004. ISBN 0781737702.
 119. "Lead Poisoning." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 120. Kosnett MJ. Lead. *Brent's Critical Care Toxicology: Diagnosis and Management of the Critically Poisoned Patient*. Gulf Professional Publishing. 2005. ISBN 0815143877.
 121. Pearce, JM. Burton's line in lead poisoning. *European Neurology* 2007; 57 (2): 118–9. doi:10.1159/000098100. PMID 17179719.
 122. "Lead Poisoning." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 123. Mycyk M, Hryhorczuk D, Amitai Y. Lead. In *Erickson, Ahrens, Aks, and Ling's Pediatric Toxicology: Diagnosis and Management of the Poisoned Child*. McGraw-Hill Professional. 2005. ISBN 0071417362.
 124. Patrick L. Lead toxicity, a review of the literature. Part 1: Exposure, evaluation, and treatment. *Alternative Medicine Review : A Journal of Clinical Therapeutics* 2006; 11 (1): 2–22. PMID 16597190.
 125. Lanphear BP, Hornung R, Khoury J, Yolton K, Baghurst P, Bellinger DC, Canfield RL, Dietrich KN, et al (2005). Low-level environmental lead exposure and children's intellectual function: an international pooled analysis. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2006; 113 (7): 894-9. doi:10.1289/ehp.7688. PMC 1257652. PMID 16002379.
 126. Koller K, Brown T, Spurgeon A, Levy L. Recent Developments in Low-Level Lead Exposure and Intellectual Impairment in Children. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2004 June; 112(9): 987–994. Published online April 28, 2004. doi: 10.1289/ehp.6941.
 127. Lidsky TI, Schneider JS. Lead neurotoxicity in children: basic mechanisms and clinical correlates. *Center for Trace Element Studies and Environmental Neurotoxicology*. Jan. 2003; 126(Pt 1):5-19.
 128. "Legionella." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 129. Heuner K, Swanson M (Editors). *Legionella: Molecular Microbiology*. Caister Academic Press. 2008. ISBN 978-1-904455-26-4.
 130. "Legionella and the Prevention of Legionellosis." World Health Organization, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 131. Benin AL, Benson RF, Besser RE. Trends in legionnaires disease, 1980-1998: declining mortality and new patterns of diagnosis. *Clin Infect Dis* November 1, 2002; 35(9):1039-46. Epub October 14, 2002.
 132. Winn WC Jr. *Legionella*. *Baron's Medical Microbiology*, Baron, S. et al., eds. (4th ed.). University of Texas Medical Branch. 1996. ISBN 0-9631172-1-1. NCBI, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 133. "Legionnaires Disease." OSHA, Safety and Health Topics, n.d. Web. May 2011. .
 134. "Legionellosis." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 135. "Legionnaires Disease." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 136. Kieser T, Bibb MJ, Buttner MJ, Chater KF, Hopwood DA (2000). *Practical Streptomyces Genetics* (2nd ed.). Norwich, England: John Innes Foundation. ISBN 0-7084-0623-8.
 137. "Mycology." *Pathmicro.med.sc.edu*, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 138. "Nocardia." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 139. Bartlett JG. *Nocardia*. October 5, 2007. *MedLibrary*, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 140. Ryan KJ, Ray CG (editors). *Sherris Medical Microbiology*. 4th edition. McGraw Hill. 2004. ISBN 0-8385-8529-9.
 141. "Mycobacterium." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
 142. Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, Catanzaro A, Daley C, Gordin F, Holland SM, Horsburgh R, Huitt G, Lademarco MF, Iseman M, Olivier K, Ruoss S, Fordham von Reyn C, Wallace RJ Jr., Winthrop K. An Official
-

-
- ATS/IDSA Statement: Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prevention of Nontuberculous Mycobacterial Diseases. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine September 2006, January 2007; 175:367-416.
143. Jussila J, Komulainen H, Huttunen K, Roponen M, Iivanainen E, Torkko P, Kosma VM, Pelkonen J, Hirvonen MR. Mycobacterium terrae isolated from indoor air of a moisture-damaged building induces sustained biphasic inflammatory response in mouse lungs. Environ Health Perspect. 2002 Nov; 110(11):1119-25. PMID: 12417483.
144. Turnbull PCB. Bacillus. Barron's Medical Microbiology. (Baron S et al., Editors.) 4th Edition. 1996. Univ of Texas Medical Branch. ISBN 0-9631172-1-1.
145. Madigan M, Martinko J (editors). Brock Biology of Microorganisms. 11th Edition. Prentice Hall. 2005. ISBN 0-13-144329-1.
146. Graumann P (Editor). Bacillus: Cellular and Molecular Biology. 1st Edition. Caister Academic Press. 2007. ISBN 978-1-904455-12-7 .
147. Smith H, Keppie J. Observations on experimental anthrax: demonstration of a specific lethal factor produced in vivo by Bacillus anthracis. Nature 1954; 173 (4410): 869–70. doi:10.1038/173869a0. PMID 13165673.
148. "Anthrax." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
149. Bennett JW, Klich M. Mycotoxins. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2003 July; 16(3): 497–516. doi: 10.1128/CMR.16.3.497-516.2003. PMCID: PMC164220.
150. Robbins CA, Swenson LJ, Neally ML, Gots RE, Kelman BJ. Health Effects of Mycotoxins in Indoor Air: A Critical Review. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 2000; 15(10): 773–784.
151. Hardin BD, Kelman BJ, Saxon A. Adverse Human Health Effects Associated with Molds in the Indoor Environment. American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. Approved by ACOEM Board of Directors on 10/27/2002.
152. Bush RK, Portnoy JM, Saxon A, Terr AI, Wood RA (2006). "The medical effects of mold exposure."
153. Shoemaker RC, Mark L, McMahon SW, Thrasher JD, Grimes C (2010). "Research Committee Report on Diagnosis and Treatment of Chronic Inflammatory Response Syndrome Caused by Exposure to the Interior Environment of Water-Damaged Buildings".
154. "Adverse Human Health Effects Associated with Molds in the Indoor Environment" (February 24, 2011). Position Statement of the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine.
155. "Radium Girls." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
156. "Undark and the Radium Girls." Damninteresting, n.d. Web. May 2011.
157. Merewether ERA, Price CW. "Report on Effects of Asbestos Dust on the Lung" H.M. Stationery Office. 1930.
158. Asbestos scandal. (16 December 2010). Nature 468: 868. doi:10.1038/468868a, Published online 15 December 2010.
159. "Coal Mining." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. May 2011.
160. History of Mine Safety and Health Legislation. U.S. Department of Labor. MSHA, n.d. Web. May 2011.
161. White J, Bero LA. Corporate Manipulation of Research: Strategies Are Similar Across Five Industries". Stanford Law & Policy Review 2010; 21:105-103.
162. Michaels, David. "Doubt is Their Product: How Industry's Assault on Science Threatens Your Health." Oxford University Press. 2008. ISBN 978-0-19-530067-3.
163. Cameron E. Will Homeowner's Insurance Cover Mold Problems? Ehow, n.d. Web. May 2011.
164. "Mold and Moisture Control." AGC, n.d. Web. June 2011.
165. "State Law." Landlord association, n.d. Web. June 2011.
166. "Tenants Rights." Tenants-Rights, n.d. Web. June 2011.
167. "Mold." Law Crawler, n.d. Web. June 2011.
168. Australian Mould Guideline. AMG-2005-1. Mycologia Australia Pty Ltd. March 2005.
169. Canada: Residential Indoor Air Quality Guidelines. Health Canada. 2007.
170. Curry P. Higher homeowners premiums? Blame it on the mold. BankRate, n.d. Web. May 2011.
171. Etzel, RA. What the Primary Care Pediatrician Should Know about Syndromes Associated with Exposures to Mycotoxins. Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care. September 2006, 282-305.
172. Kilburn, K. Neurobehavioral and pulmonary impairment in 105 adults with indoor exposure to molds compared to 100 exposed to chemicals. Toxicology and Industrial Health 000(00) 1–12.
173. Prezant B (August 20, 1998). Should you be concerned about mold? DJC, n.d. Web. May 2011.

-
-
174. Lee, TG. Health Symptoms Caused by Molds in a Courthouse. In "Molds and Mycotoxins." Archives of Environmental Health: An International Journal, Society of Occupational and Environmental Health. Dr. Kaye H. Kilburn, M.D. (ed.) Heldref Publications, July 2004, Vol.58, No7, p. 442-446.
 175. Indoor Air Quality in Commercial and Institutional Buildings. Occupational Safety and Health Organization. OSHA 3430-04. 2011.
 176. Giovannangelo ME, Gehring U, Nordling E, Oldenwening M, van Rijswijk K, deWind S, Hoek G, Heinrich J, Bellander T, Brunekreef B. Levels and determinants of (1-3)- β -glucans and fungal extracellular polysaccharides in house dust of (pre-) school children in three European countries. *Environ Int* 2007; 33(1): 9-16.
 177. Charpin-Kadouch C, Maurel G, Felipe R, Queral J, Ramadour M, Henri D, Garans M, Botta A, Charpin D. Mycotoxin identification in moldy dwellings. *Journal of Applied Toxicology* 2006; 26: 475-479.
 178. Campbell CW, Thrasher JD, Madison RA, Vojdani A, Gray MR, Johnson A. Neural Antibodies and Neurophysiologic Abnormalities in Patients Exposed to Molds in Water-Damaged Buildings. *Arch Environ Health* 2003; 58(8):464-74.
 179. Pessi AM, Suonketo J, Pentti M, Kurkilahti M, Peltola K, Rantio-Lehtimäki A. Microbial growth inside insulated external walls as an indoor air biocontamination source. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2002; 68(2): 963-967.
 180. Hope AP, Simon RA. Excess dampness and mold growth in homes: an evidence based review of the aero-irritant effect and its potential causes. *Allergy Asthma Proc* 2007; 28(3): 262-270.
 181. Menzies D, Comtois P, Pasztor J, Nunes F, Hanley JA. Aeroallergens and work-related respiratory symptoms among office workers. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1998; 101(1): 38-44.
 182. Bornehag G, Sundell J, Sigsgaard T. Dampness in buildings and health (DBH): report from an ongoing epidemiological investigation on the association between indoor environmental factors and health effects among children in Sweden. *Indoor Air* 2004; 14(Suppl 7): 59-66.
 183. Jaakkola MS, Nordman H, Piipari R, Uitti J, Laitinen J, Karjalainen A, Hahtola P, Jaakkola JJK. Indoor dampness and molds and development of adult-onset asthma: a population-based incident case-control study. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2002; 110(5): 543-547.
 184. Kirby GM, Wolf CR, Neal GE, Judah DJ, Henderson CJ, Srivatanakul P, Wild CP. In vitro metabolism of aflatoxin B1 by normal and tumorous liver tissue from Thailand. *Carcinogenesis*. 1993 Dec;14(12):2613-20.
 185. Bornehag CG, Blomquist G, Gyntelberg F, Jarvholm B, Malmberg P, Nordvall L, Nielsen A, Pershagen G, Sundell J. Dampness in buildings and health. Nordic interdisciplinary review of the scientific evidence on associations between exposure to "dampness" in buildings and health effects (NORDDAMP). *Indoor Air* 2001; 11(2): 72-86.
 186. Moretti S, Bellocchio S, Bonifazi P, Bozza S, Zelante T, Bistoni F, Romani L. The contribution of PARs to inflammation and immunity to fungi. *Mucosal Immunol* 2008; 1: 156-68.
 187. Roeder A, Kirschning C, Rupec R, Schaller M, Weindl G, Korting H. Toll-like receptors as key mediators in innate antifungal immunity. *Med Mycol* 2004; 42: 485-98.
 188. Netea M, Van der Graaf C, Van der Meer J, Kullberg B. Recognition of fungal pathogens by Toll-like receptors. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2004; 23: 672-6.
 189. Murtoniemi T, Nevalainen A, Suutari M, Toivola M, Komulainen H, Hirvonen MR. Induction of cytotoxicity and production of inflammatory mediators in raw 264.7 macrophages by spores grown on six different plasterboards. *Inhal Toxicol* 2001; 13(3):233-247.
 190. Gorny RL. Filamentous microorganisms and their fragments in indoor air - A review. *Ann Agric Environ Med* 2004; 11: 185-197.
 191. Gorny RL, Mainelis G, Grinshpun SA, Willeke K, Dutkiewicz J, Reponen T. Release of *Streptomyces albus* propagules from contaminated surfaces. *Environmental Research* 2003; 91: 45-53.
 192. Rao CY, Riggs MA, Chew GL, Muilenburg ML, Thorne PS, Van Sickle D, Dunn KH, Brown C. Characterization of airborne molds, endotoxins, and glucans in homes in New Orleans after hurricanes Katrina and Rita. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2007; 73:1630-4
 193. Indoor air pollutants: exposure and health effects. Report on a WHO meeting. Nördlingen, 8-11 June 1982. ISBN 92 890 1244 7.
 194. "John Snow." UCLA Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 195. "Vibrio Cholerae." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 196. "Ignaz Semmelweis." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 197. "Louis Pasteur." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
-
-

-
-
198. Lister J. Antiseptic Principle Of The Practice of Surgery, 1867. Fordham. Web. June 2011.
 199. Eskandari F, Webster JI, Sternberg EM. Neural immune pathways and their connection to inflammatory diseases. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2003; 5(6): 251-265.
 200. Maier SF, Watkins LR. Immune-to-central nervous system communication and its role in modulating pain and cognition: Implications for cancer and cancer treatment. *Brain Behav Immun* 2003; 17 Suppl 1: S125-131.
 201. Watkins LR, Maier SF. Immune regulation of central nervous system functions: from sickness responses to pathological. *J Intern Med* 2005; 257(2): 139-155.
 202. Hopkins SJ. Central system recognition of peripheral inflammation: a neural, hormonal collaboration. *Acta Biomed* 2007; 78 Suppl 1: 231-247.
 203. Wilson CJ, Finch CE, Cohen HJ. Cytokines and cognition-the case for a head-to-toe inflammatory paradigm. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2002; 50(12): 2041-2056.
 204. Vojdani A, Lambert J. The Role of T_H17 in Neuroimmune Disorders: Target for CAM Therapy. Part I. e-published on eCAM 2009:1-8. doi:10.1093/ecam/nep062.
 205. Vojdani A, Lambert J. The Role of T_H17 in Neuroimmune Disorders: Target for CAM Therapy. Part II. e-published on eCAM 2009:1-7. doi:10.1093/ecam/nep063.
 206. Rafnsson SB, Deary IJ, Smith FB, Whiteman MC, Rumley A, Lowe GD, Fowkes FG. Cognitive decline and markers of inflammation and hemostasis: the Edinburgh Artery Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; 55(5): 700-707.
 207. Magaki S, Mueller C, Dickson C, Kirsch W. Increased production of inflammatory cytokines in mild cognitive impairment. *Exp Gerontol* 2007; 42(3): 233-240.
 208. Clarkson AN, Rahman R, Appleton I. Inflammation and autoimmunity as a central theme in neurodegenerative disorders: fact or fiction? *Curr Opin Investig Drugs* 2004; 5(7): 706-713.
 209. Perry VH. The influence of systemic inflammation on inflammation in the brain: implications for chronic neurodegenerative disease. *Brain Behav Immun* 2004; 18(5):407-413.
 210. Qin L, Liu Y, Wang T, Wei SJ, Block ML, Wilson B, Liu B, Hong JS. NADPH oxidase mediates lipopolysaccharide-induced neurotoxicity and proinflammatory gene expression in activated microglia. *J Biol Chem* 2004; 279(2): 1415-1421.
 211. Browne SE, Lin L, Mattsson A, Georgievska B, Isacson O. Selective antibody induced cholinergic cell and synapse loss produce sustained hippocampal and cortical hypometabolism with correlated cognitive deficits. *Exp Neurol* 2001; 170(1): 36-47.
 212. Empting, LD. Neurologic and neuropsychiatric syndrome features of mold and mycotoxin exposure. *Toxicology and Industrial Health*. 2009; 25(9-10), 577-581.
 213. Peraica M, Radic B, Lucic A, Pavlovic M. Diseases Caused by Molds in Humans. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. September 1, 1999.
 214. "Leptin." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 215. Considine RV, Sinha MK, Heiman ML, Kriauciunas A, Stephens TW, Nyce MR, Ohannesian JP, Marco CC, McKee LJ, Bauer TL. Serum immunoreactive-leptin concentrations in normal-weight and obese humans. *New England Journal of Medicine*. February 1996; 334 (5): 292-5. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199602013340503. PMID 8532024.
 216. Williams KW, Scott MM, Elmquist JK (March 2009). From observation to experimentation: leptin action in the mediobasal hypothalamus. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 89 (3): 985S-990S. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.2008.26788D. PMC 2667659. PMID 19176744.
 217. Heiman ML, Ahima RS, Craft LS, Schoner B, Stephens TW, Flier JS. Leptin inhibition of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis in response to stress. *Endocrinology* September 1997; 138 (9): 3859-63. PMID 9275075.
 218. Hamilton BS, Paglia D, Kwan AY, Deitel M. Increased obese mRNA expression in omental fat cells from massively obese humans. *Nat. Med*. September 1995; 1 (9): 953-6. PMID 7585224.
 219. "Proopiomelanocortin." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 220. Haas, H; Sergeva, OA; Selbach O. Histamine in the Nervous System. *Physiol Rev* 88:1183-1241.
 221. Chang L. (Reviewer). Slideshow: A Visual Guide to Fibromyalgia. WebMD. March 3, 2010.
 222. Shoemaker RC, Maizel MS. Innate immunity, MR spectroscopy, HLA DR, TGF beta-1, VIP and capillary hypoperfusion define acute and chronic human illness acquired following exposure to water-damaged buildings. *Surviving Mold*, n.d. Web. June 2011.
 223. Zhou YF, Stabile E, Walker J, Shou M, Baffour R, Yu Z, Rott D, Yancopoulos GD, Rudge JS, Epstein SE. Effects of gene delivery on collateral development in chronic hypoperfusion: diverse effects of angiotensin-1 versus vascular endothelial growth factor. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004; 44(4): 897-903.

-
-
224. Falikingham JO 3rd. Mycobacterial Aerosols and Respiratory Disease. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2003 Jul;9(7):763-7.
225. Anyanwu EC. The validity of the environmental neurotoxic effects of toxigenic molds and mycotoxins. *The Internet Journal of Toxicology*. ISSN: 1559-3916. 2008; Volume 5, Number 2.
226. Kebir H, Kreymborg K, Ifergan I, Dodelet-Devillers A, Cayrol R, Bernard M, Giuliani F, Arbour N, Becher B, Prat A. Human TH17 lymphocytes promote blood-brain barrier disruptions and central nervous system inflammation. *Nat Med*. 2007 Oct;13(10):1173-5. Epub 2007 Sep 9.
227. Crago BR; Gray MR; Nelson LA; Davis M; Arnold L; Thrasher JD. Psychological, neuropsychological, and electrocortical effects of mixed mold exposure. *Archives of Environmental Health*. 2003; Volume 58, Issue 8, 452-463.
228. Hope J, Hope BE. A Review of the Diagnosis and Treatment of Ochratoxin A Inhalational Exposure Associated with Human Illness and Kidney Disease including Focal Segmental Glomerulosclerosis. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*. Volume 2012 (2012), Article ID 835059, 10 pages. doi:10.1155/2012/835059.
229. Hudnell HK, House D, Schmid J, Koltai D, Stopford W, Wilkins J, Savitz DA, Swinker M, Music S. Human visual function in the North Carolina clinical study on possible estuary-associated syndrome. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 2001; 62(8): 575-594.
230. Shoemaker R, Rash JM, Simon EW. Sick Building Syndrome in water-damaged buildings: Generalization of the chronic biotoxin-associated illness paradigm to indoor toxigenic fungi; 5/2005; Pg 66-77 in Johanning E. Editor, *Bioaerosols, Fungi, Bacteria, Mycotoxins and Human Health*.
231. Bloom E, Bal K, Nyman E, Must A, and Larsson L. Mass spectrometry-based strategy for direct detection and quantification of some mycotoxins produced by *Stachybotrys* and *Aspergillus* spp. in indoor environments. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol*. 2007; 73:4211-4217.
232. Vesper S, McKinstry C, Cox D, Dewalt G. Correlation between ERMI values and other moisture and mold assessments of homes in the American Healthy Homes Survey. *J Urban Health*. 2009 Nov;86(6):850-60.
233. Rea WJ, Pan Y, Griffiths B. The Treatment of Patients with Mycotoxin-induced Disease. *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 25(9-10) 711-714
234. Rea, W. Environmental Health Center-Dallas. EHCD, n.d. Web. Sept. 2011.
235. Shoemaker, R. "Step by Step" treatment. *Surviving Mold*, n.d. Web. June 2011.
236. Guidelines on Assessment and Remediation of Fungi in Indoor Environments. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. November 2008.
237. Maintaining Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ) during Construction and Renovation. CDC, n.d. Web. June 2011.
238. Peitzsch M, Bloom E, Haase R, Must A, Larsson L. Remediation of mould damaged building materials—efficiency of a broad spectrum of treatments. *J. Environ. Monit*. 2012. doi: 10.1039/c2em10806b.
239. Rea WJ, Pan Y, Griffiths B. The Treatment of Patients with Mycotoxin-induced Disease. *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 25(9-10) 711-714.
240. Lee CH, Williams RI, and Binkley EL Jr (1969) Provocative testing and treatment for foods. *Archives of Otolaryngology* 90: 87-94.
241. Dennis D, Robertson D, Curtis L, Black J. Fungal exposure endocrinopathy in sinusitis with growth hormone deficiency: Dennis-Robertson syndrome. *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 25(9-10) 669-680.
242. Reinagle M, Torelli J(Editor). *The Inflammation Free Diet Plan*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill. 2006. ISBN 0-07-148061-1.
243. "Resveratrol." Wikipedia, n.d. Web. June 2011.
244. Wood JG, Rogina B, Lavu S, et al. Sirtuin activators mimic caloric restriction and delay ageing in metazoans. *Nature* 430 (7000): 686-9. doi:10.1038/nature02789. PMID 15254550.
245. Valenzano DR, Terzibasi E, Genade T, Cattaneo A, Domenici L, Cellerino A (February 2006). Resveratrol prolongs lifespan and retards the onset of age-related markers in a short-lived vertebrate. *Current Biology* 16 (3): 296-300. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.12.038. PMID 16461283.
246. Li ZG, Hong T, Shimada Y, Komoto I, Kawabe A, Ding Y, Kaganoi J, Hashimoto Y, Imamura M (2002). Suppression of N-nitrosomethylbenzylamine (NMBA)-induced esophageal tumorigenesis in F344 rats by resveratrol. *Carcinogenesis* 23 (9): 1531-6. doi:10.1093/carcin/23.9.1531. PMID 12189197.
247. Vinitsky AR. *Enlightened Medicine*. *Enlightened Medicine*, n.d. Web. June 2011.
-
-

-
-
248. Vinitzky AR, Golos N. Energy-the Essence of Environmental Health. Bloomington, In: AuthorHouse. 2004. ISBN 1-4184-7019-8.
 249. Wright HW. A More Excellent Way: Be in Health: Spiritual Roots of Disease: Pathways of Wholeness. Thomaston, GA: Anchor Distributors. 2004-5 Edition. pp 127-170. ISBN 1603741011.
 250. Aziz NM, Vasey FB, Leaverton PE, et al. Comparison of clinical status among women retaining or removing gel breast implants. Presented at the American College of Epidemiology, 1998.
 251. Hooper DG, Bolton VE, Guildford FT, Straus DC. Mycotoxin Detection in Human Samples from Patients Exposed to Environmental Molds. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2009, 10, 1465-1475; doi:10.3390/ijms10041465.
 252. Shoemaker RC, House DE. A time-series of sick building syndrome; chronic, biotoxin-associated illness from exposure to water-damaged buildings. Neurotoxicology and Teratology 2005; 27(1) 29-46.
 253. Environment & Human Health, Inc. The Green Building Debate: LEED Certification—Where Energy Efficiency Collides with Human Health. 2010.
 254. American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). 1999. Bioaerosols: Assessment and Control. 1999; 24-3.