University of South Australia

Investigating the correlation between wastewater analysis and roadside drug testing in South Australia

This is the peer reviewed author accepted manuscript (post print) version of a published work that appeared in final form in:

Bade, Richard, Tscharke, Benjamin J, Longo, Marie, Cooke, Richard, White, Jason M & Gerber, Cobus 2018 'Investigating the correlation between wastewater analysis and roadside drug testing in South Australia' Drug and alcohol dependence, vol. 187, pp. 123-126

This output may not exactly replicate the final published authoritative version for which the publisher owns copyright. It is not the copy of record. This output may be used for non-commercial purposes. This version is licensed under a Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

The final definitive published version (version of record) is available at:
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.02.030

Persistent link to the Research Outputs Repository record:
http://researchoutputs.unisa.edu.au/11541.2/132037

General Rights: Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Outputs Repository are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the persistent link identifying the publication in the Research Outputs Repository

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

https://search.ror.unisa.edu.au

Investigating the Correlation between Wastewater Analysis and Roadside Drug Testing in South Australia

Richard Bade[a,1], Benjamin J. Tscharke[a,1,2],Marie Longo[b], Richard Cooke[b], Jason M White[a], Cobus Gerber[a,*]

[a] School of Pharmacy and Medical Sciences, University of South Australia, GPO Box 2471, Adelaide, South Australia 5001, Australia

[b] Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

*Corresponding author: Cobus Gerber, School of Pharmacy and Medical Sciences, University of South Australia, GPO Box 2471, Adelaide, South Australia 5001, Australia

Email: cobus.gerber@unisa.edu.au

Tel: +61 (0)8 83022568 Fax: +61 8 8302 1087

[1] Joint first authorship

[2] Present address: Queensland Alliance for Environmental Health Sciences (QAEHS), University of Queensland, 39 Kessels Rd, Coopers Plains, Queensland, Australia, 4108

Abstract

Background: The societal impact of drug use is well known. An example is when drug-intoxicated drivers increase the burden on policing and healthcare services.

Methods: This work presents the correlation of wastewater analysis (using UHPLC-MS/MS) and positive roadside drug testing results for methamphetamine, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) and cannabis from December 2011 – December 2016 in South Australia.

Results: Methamphetamine and MDMA showed similar trends between the data sources, with matching increases and decreases, respectively. Cannabis was relatively steady based on wastewater analysis but the roadside drug testing data started to diverge in the final part of the measurement period.

Conclusions: The ability to triangulate data as shown here validates both wastewater analysis and roadside drug testing. This suggests that changes in overall population drug use revealed by WWA is consistent and proportional with changes in drug-driving behaviours. The results show that at higher levels of drug use as measured by wastewater analysis, there is an increase in drug driving in the community, and therefore more strain on health services and police.

Key Words: Illicit Drugs, Wastewater, Australia, Roadside Drug Testing

1. Introduction

Wastewater analysis (WWA) has become a standard means of assessing population-scale use of illicit drugs and other substances of interest. (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, 2016) In Australia, the approach has been applied to estimate drug use in several regions over a period of six years (Irvine et al., 2011; Lai et al., 2013, 2011; Tscharke et al., 2016) and, more recently, has been applied nationally. (Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, 2017) Although WWA can reflect the relative scale of drug use in a community, it cannot distinguish between heavy use by a small number of habitual users from occasional use by a large number of drug takers. Consequently, if the scale of drug use changes over time in an area, as measured by WWA, it is not possible to determine whether the change is due to a shift in users in the community, a change in frequency of use, changes in the purity of available drugs or the amount of pure drug consumed.

Increases in the use of an illicit drug in a population are associated with a number of adverse consequences. In general, the precise consequences depend on the nature of the drug, but may include increased harm and increased criminality associated with intoxicated behaviour. (Walters, 2014) One consequence that is associated with use of all illicit drugs is impairment of driving. For a range of drugs, there are a number of epidemiological and experimental studies showing driving impairment as a result of use of the drugs at the doses normally consumed and the epidemiological evidence shows that this impairment results in increased crashes, both fatal and non-fatal. (Elvik, 2013)

Based on this evidence, roadside driver testing (RDT) for a limited range of drugs has been implemented in a number of countries, including Australia. After the compulsory oral swab tests are conducted, confirmatory analyses in a forensic laboratory are performed on oral fluid to establish whether or not the driver had consumed drugs and was driving under the influence.

In Australia, tests are only carried out for methamphetamine, MDMA and cannabis, alongside alcohol.

If drug use increases in a population, and particularly when that increase in total use is due, in part, to an increase in number of users, then this may be reflected in the rate of positive detections in RDT for that drug. It would therefore be expected that for each drug, rates of use measured by WWA would correlate with RDT detections. However, a limitation of RDT is that targeted policing capture drug 'hotspots', creating the risk of sampling bias, although the number of drug tests and sites covered over a year provides a sample that is close to random. In Finland, driving under the influence of drugs and drug seizure information was compared to results from WWA from 2008-2015, with relatively good correlations for the drugs investigated. (Kankaanpää et al., 2016) In Norway, methamphetamine and amphetamine use were compared across drug seizures, RDT, WWA, forensic autopsies and urine from prisoners, with similar trends observed in all data sources. (Bramness et al., 2015)

Currently, there is limited data showing positive correlations between driver test positive numbers and WWA trends. (Bramness et al., 2015; Kankaanpää et al., 2016, 2014; Reid et al., 2012) These included a significantly lower number of tests compared to the present study, and were limited to comparisons between data of different time scales; one or two-week periods of WWA compared to the overall positive-test rate in each year. In this paper, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the first to investigate the potential complementarity of WWA and RDT outside Europe, the correlation between the temporal trends for these two measures of drug use was evaluated for methamphetamine, cannabis and MDMA in bimonthly sampling from December 2011 - December 2016.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Wastewater analyses

Wastewater samples from four wastewater treatment plants in Adelaide, Australia were collected and analysed for methamphetamine, MDMA and cannabis. Seven consecutive days of wastewater samples were collected every two months during the first week of the month (or the second week to avoid public holidays) from December 2011 to December 2016. All information regarding sample preparation and analysis is described elsewhere. (Irvine et al., 2011; Tscharke et al., 2016)

2.2 Roadside drug testing

The manner of roadside drug testing is similar to that of roadside testing for alcohol, and can be conducted simultaneously. A police road block is set up on arterial roads, with cars randomly selected for testing. After the initial presumptive roadside test, all oral swabs are sent to the laboratory for confirmatory testing, regardless of the result. Confirmed positive tests are recorded for the month of the oral screening. The specific sites of police testing and the reasons for site selection were not divulged. Overall, the roadside drug testing results covered the same Adelaide metropolitan area as the four wastewater catchments under study. These data were provided by South Australia Police and did not require ethical approval. Tests covering the same month as the WW collections were selected to capture the same populations. To compare proportional change between datasets, the WWA and confirmatory RDT measures were converted to percentage change from the initial period. WWA data are weekly totals, while RDT are monthly totals. Offenders caught with RDT were not necessarily excreting drug residues in the catchment areas under investigation.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results of Wastewater analysis

Bimonthly analysis of four wastewater treatment plants of Adelaide has been carried out since 2011. In the period up to the end of 2016 clear trends have been observed: methamphetamine use has increased significantly, MDMA has steadily declined and cannabis has remained relatively stable, albeit with seasonal fluctuations each year, coinciding with the growing/harvesting seasons. (Tscharke et al, 2016)

3.2 Roadside drug testing

All data pertaining to the roadside drug tests are presented in **Table S1**. The number of RDTs carried out between December 2011 - December 2016 has been relatively constant, with an average of 4000/month. In terms of the positive detections, methamphetamine is by far the most commonly detected drug, almost double that of cannabis, with much lower detections for MDMA. When looking at the percentage change over the months analysed, methamphetamine increased, cannabis showed similar fluctuations to WWA and MDMA decreased. In view of the number of monthly tests remaining largely constant, the increase in methamphetamine and cannabis detections would appear to suggest increasing numbers of people using these drugs.

Some individuals tested positive for more than one drug, with annual data (from 2010/11 – 2014/15) shown in **Table 1**. Although it was most common for users to be found with one drug in their system as shown in **Table S1**, the combination of methamphetamine and cannabis seemed to be on the increase, while co-consumption with MDMA was less common.

3.3 Comparison between WWA and RDT

To make for a more coherent and direct comparison between WWA and RDT, only the months that coincided with WWA were included in this section. The comparison between all RDT data and WWA is presented in Figure S1. Since RDT and WWA data were expressed in different units, both were transformed to the units of percentage change from the initial reading to compare the datasets (mass loads per week per 1000 people for WWA, and percentage test-positive rate for RDT). This maintained the scale of change between months within each dataset, while also allowing a direct comparison of proportional changes between datasets. The trends for methamphetamine, MDMA and cannabis use via WWA and the percentage test positive rate via RDT are shown in **Figure 1**. Spearman's Rank Correlation analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel to determine the statistical significance of the correlation between RDT and WWA. It was found that the correlation for the entire period studied was only statistically significant for methamphetamine and MDMA (with $\rho \geq 0.368$ deemed statistically significant based on Table of Critical Values for Spearman Coefficient Significance Levels).

For cannabis, the datasets of RDT and WWA initially followed quite closely, with the overall trend remaining fairly stable, albeit with some fluctuations.. Interestingly, the apparent "seasonality" of cannabis seen in WWA was only evident from RDT until the start of 2014, when the two data sets started to diverge (**Figure 1, TOP**). For methamphetamine, the scale and general direction of change was similar for WWA and RDT trends (**Figure 1, MIDDLE)**. Similarly, the direction of the overall trend and slope seems to be quite similar for WWA and RDT for MDMA (**Figure 1, BOTTOM**), both showing a gradual decline.

One important observation from the above figure is the approximate two-fold increase in methamphetamine from December 2011 – December 2016. Several reasons have been proposed for this increase – increasing user numbers, increase in use frequency and an increase in methamphetamine purity. (Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, 2015; Scott et al., 2015) WWA, however, does not distinguish between these factors. Increasing test-positive rates for RDT is due to an increase in the number of users being detected driving, which is due to an increase in the number of users of the drug and/or an increase in the frequency with which users consume the drug. Thus, the parallel increase of both WWA and RDT for methamphetamine suggests that the actual number of methamphetamine users increased over the measurement period or a significant number of people were using the drug more often.

The difference in matches between WWA and RDT for the stimulants and cannabis could be a reflection of the police sampling strategy, particularly considering the rise in cannabis use that plateaued after 2014. Unlike methamphetamine and MDMA, THC is only detectable for a relatively short period of time in oral fluid after last use. (Lee and Huestis, 2014) Thus, targeting times of day when cannabis is used and locations where rates of use are higher will have much more impact on THC detections than on detections of methamphetamine or MDMA. Factors that affect the detection of cannabis by RDT would include a change in police strategy or sensitivity of testing equipment. These may partly account for the difference in trends for cannabis use that is apparent over the last two years of the measurement period.

The result is important from a social perspective, as an increase in drug-intoxicated drivers will result in an increase in morbidity and mortality and a burden on healthcare services due to road accidents (**Figure S2**). This increased burden can be accounted for by a greater number of people using the drug and/or users consuming it more frequently as well as changing police sampling strategy. The results also show that an important benefit that can be gained by

decreasing the total amount of a drug being used in the community is a decrease in drug driving and, as a result, a decrease in road accidents, injuries and deaths.

Contributors

RB, BT, JW and CG planned and designed the study. BT performed wastewater analysis. ML and RC acquired roadside drug testing data. RB and BT interpreted the results from both sets of data with contribution from all co-authors. RB and BT wrote initial draft with input from JM and CG, which was critically revised by all co-authors.

All authors are aware of the content, and accept responsibility, for the manuscript.

Role of Funding Source

This work was supported in part by Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, SA Health

Conflict of Interest

No conflict declared

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from SA Health, South Australia Police and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission. We would also like to thank the wastewater plant operators for their assistance in sample collection.

References

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, 2017. National Wastewater Drug Monitoring Program 2017.

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, 2015. Illicit Drug Data Report 2015-16.

Bramness, J.G., Reid, M.J., Solvik, K.F., Vindenes, V., 2015. Recent trends in the availability and use of amphetamine and methamphetamine in Norway. Forensic Sci. Int. 246, 92–97. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2014.11.010

Elvik, R., 2013. Risk of road accident associated with the use of drugs: A systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence from epidemiological studies. Accid. Anal. Prev. 60, 254–267. doi:10.1016/j.aap.2012.06.017

European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, 2016. Assessing illicit drugs in wastewater. doi:10.2810/6622

Irvine, R.J., Kostakis, C., Felgate, P.D., Jaehne, E.J., Chen, C., White, J.M., 2011. Population drug use in Australia: A wastewater analysis. Forensic Sci. Int. 210, 69–73. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2011.01.037

Kankaanpää, A., Ariniemi, K., Heinonen, M., Kuoppasalmi, K., Gunnar, T., 2016. Current trends in Finnish drug abuse: Wastewater based epidemiology combined with other national indicators. Sci. Total Environ. 568, 864–874. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.060

Kankaanpää, A., Ariniemi, K., Heinonen, M., Kuoppasalmi, K., Gunnar, T., 2014. Use of illicit stimulant drugs in Finland: A wastewater study in ten major cities. Sci. Total Environ. 487, 696–702. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.11.095

Lai, F.Y., Bruno, R., Hall, W., Gartner, C., Ort, C., Kirkbride, P., Prichard, J., Thai, P.K., Carter, S., Mueller, J.F., 2013. Profiles of illicit drug use during annual key holiday and control periods in Australia: wastewater analysis in an urban, a semi-rural and a vacation area. Addiction 108, 556–565. doi:10.1111/add.12006

Lai, F.Y., Ort, C., Gartner, C., Carter, S., Prichard, J., Kirkbride, P., Bruno, R., Hall, W., Eaglesham, G., Mueller, J.F., 2011. Refining the estimation of illicit drug consumptions from wastewater analysis: Co-analysis of prescription pharmaceuticals and uncertainty assessment. Water Res. 45, 4437–4448. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.05.042

Lee, D., Huestis, M.A., 2014. Current knowledge on cannabinoids in oral fluid. Drug Test. Anal. 6, 88–111. doi:10.1002/dta.1514

Reid, M.J., Langford, K.H., Grung, M., Gjerde, H., Amundsen, E.J., Morland, J., Thomas, K. V, 2012. Estimation of cocaine consumption in the community: a critical comparison of the results from three complimentary techniques. BMJ Open 2, 1–9. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001637


Scott, N., Caulkins, J.P., Ritter, A., Quinn, C., Dietze, P., 2015. High-frequency drug purity and price series as tools for explaining drug trends and harms in Victoria, Australia. Addiction 110, 120–128. doi:10.1111/add.12740


Tscharke, B.J., Chen, C., Gerber, J.P., White, J.M., 2016. Temporal trends in drug use in Adelaide, South Australia by wastewater analysis. Sci. Total Environ. 565, 384–391. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.183

Walters, G.D., 2014. Drugs, Crime, and Their Relationships: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy. Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Percentage change in use (WWA, grey line with circle markers) and in the percent test positive rate (RDT, black line with square markers) for cannabis (THC, top), methamphetamine (middle) and MDMA (bottom). The statistical significance of the correlation between RDT and WWA was also tested and indicated with "*", with $\rho \geq 0.368$ deemed statistically significant (based on Table of Critical Values for Spearman Coefficient Significance Levels). Dotted lines show the linear trend of RDT (black) and WWA (grey)


THC RDT vs WWA
Percentage change (%)
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
Dec 11- Jun 14 ρ = 0.455
Aug 14- Dec 16 ρ = 0.101
Overall ρ: 0.054
Dec-11 Feb-12 Apr-12 Jun-12 Aug-12 Oct-12 Dec-12 Feb-13 Apr-13 Jun-13 Aug-13 Oct-13 Dec-13 Feb-14 Apr-14 Jun-14 Aug-14 Oct-14 Dec-14 Feb-15 Apr-15 Jun-15 Aug-15 Oct-15 Dec-15 Feb-16 Apr-16 Jun-16 Aug-16 Oct-16 Dec-16
THC RDT
THC WWA


Methamphetamine RDT vs WWA
Percentage change (%)
250
200
150
100
50
0
-50
-100
ρ = 0.772*
Dec-11 Feb-12 Apr-12 Jun-12 Aug-12 Oct-12 Dec-12 Feb-13 Apr-13 Jun-13 Aug-13 Oct-13 Dec-13 Feb-14 Apr-14 Jun-14 Aug-14 Oct-14 Dec-14 Feb-15 Apr-15 Jun-15 Aug-15 Oct-15 Dec-15 Feb-16 Apr-16 Jun-16 Aug-16 Oct-16 Dec-16
Meth RDT
Meth WWA



MDMA RDT vs WWA
Percentage change (%)
80
60
40
20
0
-20
-40
-60
-80
-100
-120
ρ = 0.768*
Dec-11 Feb-12 Apr-12 Jun-12 Aug-12 Oct-12 Dec-12 Feb-13 Apr-13 Jun-13 Aug-13 Oct-13 Dec-13 Feb-14 Apr-14 Jun-14 Aug-14 Oct-14 Dec-14 Feb-15 Apr-15 Jun-15 Aug-15 Oct-15 Dec-15 Feb-16 Apr-16 Jun-16 Aug-16 Oct-16 Dec-16
MDMA RDT
MDMA WWA

Table 1: Annual comparison of number of positive RDT detections for each drug and drug combination from 2010/11 – 2014/15

Year	Screened	THC[a]	Meth[b]	MDMA	Meth[b]/ THC[a]	Meth[b]/ MDMA	THC[a]/ MDMA	All	Total
2010/11	43838	605	636	0	469	2	0	1	1713
2011/12	42312	527	1286	21	841	45	18	40	2778
2012/13	50409	619	1541	25	959	66	21	31	3262
2013/14	49865	969	1868	22	1131	41	22	29	4082
2014/15	52939	1123	2499	13	1177	48	8	23	4891

[a] THC = cannabis
[b] Meth = methamphetamine
Meth/THC, Meth/MDMA, THC/MDMA and All indicate the situations where the drugs were simultaneously detected