Title: Tiered remediation standards for methamphetamine in residences

James E. Dennison*

*Century Environmental Hygiene,
3201 E. Mulberry St., Fort Collins, CO 80524

Keywords: meth, risk assessment, health standards

Word Count: 8,070

ABSTRACT

In states or areas where methamphetamine (meth) remediation is regulated, remediation is required to reduce meth surface concentrations to below a regulatory concentration standard. Standards in the U.S. vary by 30-fold, some being ultra low. In addition, almost all states have a single standard that does not account for the extent of human contact with contaminated surfaces. This study analyzes the exposure/dose impacts and the remedial costs associated with alternate remediation standards (AHSs) for low contact areas. Residences were divided into normal occupancy areas (NOAs), low occupancy areas (LOAs) such as attics, moderate occupancy areas (MOAs) such as exterior hallways, and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems. Raising very conservative remediation standards adopted by some states would reduce the average cost to remediate a contaminated house from $21,000 to $13,000 or $9,000, depending on the selected standard. Additional substantial cost reductions are possible with small and potentially acceptable dose increments by raising conservative remediation standards for LOAs and MOAs. As minimal dermal contact occurs with a HVAC system's interior surfaces, a substantial cost reduction is also possible if HVAC remediation standards are increased. If all recommended AHSs are implemented, an approximate 50% cost reduction is

possible. These AHSs still allow the aggregate exposure to be within the recommended dose levels, which implies that these LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC systems are being over remediated when they are required to be remediated to the same standard as NOAs.

INTRODUCTION

Meth contamination in residential property is a significant on-going problem in the U.S. and in other countries where meth use occurs. The average cost to remediate a property, including associated repair costs, was estimated at $44K and over 5 million residences in the U.S. are estimated to be contaminated above a remediation standard of 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, occupied by an estimated 13 million people (Dennison 2025). Exposure to non-users could be secondhand (during the meth activity), or more often, thirdhand, after activity ceases. Thirdhand exposure occurs because meth contamination persists for extended periods as surface residues and particulates in indoor spaces (Bitter 2017). Approximately 99% of contamination is from meth use (e.g. smoking), not manufacturing, with most states having use rates within twofold of the national average use rate (Dennison 2025). Yet, currently, only 19 states regulate meth contamination in residential properties, and of these states, 14 regulate when there is evidence of manufacturing, not when use occurred (MLCC 2024). One of the most probable reasons for this regulatory gap is the high cost of remediation.

In general, meth regulations specify that residences with reported meth activity must be tested, and areas that exceed a single numerical remediation standard must be remediated until the standard is met, usually expressed as X ug meth/100 cm^2 of surface area. In the 19 states that have meth regulations, 17 have a single remediation standard that applies to all parts of the property (MLCC 2024). The absorbed dose, and therefore risk, from meth exposure is associated with both the 1) concentration of meth residues and 2) the length of

exposure and areal extent of contact with contaminated surfaces. Thus, parts of buildings where occupancy is limited, which are referred to as low occupancy areas (LOAs) and moderate occupancy areas (MOAs), represent a lower contribution to the total absorbed dose. Two states have promulgated a novel approach by developing two-tier standards with alternate higher standards (numerically higher limit; less stringent standards) for LOAs: Colorado and Wyoming. Wyoming set a limit of 3.75 ug/100 cm^2 for attics, crawlspaces, and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems (Wyoming_SERC 2010) with a remediation standard of 0.75 ug/100 cm^2 for the rest of the residence. Colorado established a limit of 4 ug/100 cm^2 for attics and crawlspaces and similar areas and 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 for other areas. It's important to note that these standards were not based on risk calculations to the target population of young children.

In the 19 states that set a remediation standard, the range is 30-fold: 0.05 to 1.5 ug/100 cm^2 (MLCC 2024). Compared with asbestos and residential lead standards, which vary little from state to state, this is a wide range. Part of the reason for this wide range is that some states set standards prior to the development of meth risk assessments and set standards at the minimum detectable level. After Colorado and California published their regulatory standards, 0.5 ug/100 cm^2 and 1.5 ug/100 cm^2 (CDPHE 2005; CalEPA 2009b, 2009a), several states promulgated standards in that range (Wyoming SERC) or raised their lower limit to the same range (Washington 2024), while many other states did not modify their standard. This study analyzes the impacts of raising the low remediation standards to those espoused in the published risk assessments.

All states except Wyoming currently regulate contamination in HVAC systems similarly to dermally accessible surfaces such as countertops (Hammon 2007; CalEPA

2009a). While current published risk assessments deem inhalation exposure to be likely insignificant, the presence of contamination in HVAC systems serves as a concern. These published risk assessments offer a basis for considering a second-tier HVAC-system standard.

Another consideration is the method of averaging meth results before comparing to remediation standards. Risk assessment methodology establishes a surface concentration that would lead to acceptable risk levels after contact, which is assumed to occur 24/7. According to the risk assessment methodology, dermal and ingestion exposure is proportional to surface concentration; thus, exposure could be determined based on the average concentration for all surfaces contacted. However, most meth assessment protocols require sampling rooms separately (e.g. Kentucky 2008; Utah 2025), so each room must test below the standard. Depending on the between-room variance in data, this is a more stringent requirement and results in lower total dose than espoused in the risk assessment. Regulations that require use of multiple discrete samples in one space or room and do not permit averaging of results also produce a more stringent application of risk-based criteria. This issue is also investigated in this study.

There would be no purpose to increasing remediation standards were there not concomitant cost savings. This paper analyzes the effects of increasing remediation standards for different parts of a property where exposure time is lower than in NOAs. Remediation costs are tied to remediation standards in several ways. First, fewer properties would exceed a higher standard and require remediation, and a smaller portion of properties would exceed a higher limit (an entire house may exceed standard A (lower standard) and only half the house may exceed standard B (a higher standard). Second, it is incrementally more difficult to

reduce contaminant levels to lower standards, so the cleanup cost per square foot is less when higher standards apply. In order to put possible higher remediation standards into context, some idea of the cost differential is needed, so this study accompanies the dose estimates with concomitant cost estimates.

METHODS

This study evaluates the impact of applying different remediation standards in meth-contaminated properties granularly. A less-detailed approach would calculate the property's average meth concentration to determine the areas that exceed each proposed standard. However, the remediation scope is usually based on area-by-area sampling, where only specific areas that exceed the standard have to be mitigated. Also, to assess the impact of different standards for different occupancy-time categories, an area-by-area analysis is needed. The granular analysis used here also provides cost-savings estimates as standards are raised. This study assesses these impacts for the following scenarios:

- raise a singular remediation standard to a higher singular standard
- apply a base remediation standard (BHS) to NOAs and higher standards to spaces that are less frequently occupied (MOAs and LOAs)
- alter standards applied to HVAC systems
- consider compliance to be based on average concentrations rather than area maximums

A dose-cost model was developed to explore these scenarios. The model calculates the change in the total dose occupants absorb under any chosen remediation standard and is applied to parts of a residence that are defined by occupancy or contact potential. The model calculates the remediation costs as the standards change. The four occupancy or contact categories are NOAs, MOAs, LOAs, and HVAC systems. (In this report, HVAC refers to

forced air systems with a furnace, a fan, and supply and [usually] return ducts.) The model can be modified by users to incorporate state-specific meth contamination levels and remediation cost data and is available in the supplemental materials.

Model

The model consists of a building contamination model linked to a cost model and dose calculations. The model incorporates most types of residences, including single-family homes, condominiums, townhomes, manufactured homes, and apartments in apartment buildings. These residences are hereafter referred to as housing units (HUs).

Building Contamination Model

In most states, and in this study, results for meth assessments are reported for each room and other areas (e.g., attic) in a HU based on the composite or discrete sample results. Each result is then compared to the applicable remediation standard and the room/area is deemed to pass or fail. If any room or area fails, the HU is considered noncompliant but may be out of compliance for all rooms/areas or may have some rooms/areas that pass and some that fail. Obviously, different concentrations exist in different rooms/areas, and this analysis evaluates remediation standards on a gradient (from low to high); fewer and fewer rooms/areas will fail as the remediation standard is raised, which is why a granular model is needed that evaluates compliance in each area. Representative data from meth reports was coded into the model spreadsheet to allow testing of alternate remediation standards (AHSs) and to determine the range of properties that would pass or fail at different standard increments.

The data came from assessments performed in Colorado, which provides online access to reports. Colorado requires properties with suspected meth activity to be tested by a

preliminary assessment (PA) sampling protocol in which a wipe sample from each room and space type is collected. Essentially all PA samples are four-part composite samples where four wipe samples (each sample is called an “aliquot”) are collected from different locations in a room or area and combined into one sample for analysis. In the PAs used in this study, each location was sampled by solvent wipes on cotton gauze of a 100 cm^2 area in accordance with NIOSH methods. Isopropanol is the default solvent in Colorado, but methanol is occasionally used; in some states, methanol is used, but the efficacy of the two solvents is similar (Martyny 2008; Van Dyke et al. 2011). HVAC samples are ordinarily collected as discrete samples in Colorado and are not composited. In some instances, composite samples from HVACs were reported and coded as a single sample under “furnace.” All samples were analyzed by accredited laboratories using either NIOSH 9109 (Methamphetamine and illicit drugs, precursors, and adulterants on wipes by solid phase extraction) or NIOSH 9111 (Methamphetamine on wipes by liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry). Samples from contents (personal property), vehicles, adjacent units (e.g., in apartment buildings), and appliances were not included as they do not affect remediation costs for the building itself.

The data for contamination analysis consisted of 100 PAs randomly selected from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) online repository of PAs (CDPHE 2024). The 100 HUs consisted of 1-story apartments (21), 2–4-unit multiplexes (13; one unit each), single-family homes (52), and townhomes (14). The PAs were conducted by industrial hygienists at 10 certified meth consulting firms in Colorado. Three reports were rejected and replaced with another due to report errors, and all the reports from one consultant were omitted as the consultant collected HVAC samples primarily on the exterior of ductwork and furnace housings, not in the airflow pathway. Different parts of HVAC

systems (supply ducts, return ducts, heat exchanger, fan compartment) were mostly sampled discretely, and up to two samples were collected in supply and return ducts. Non-house "rooms" included attics, crawlspaces (which may be below the house or of the cubbyhole type), garages, sheds, etc. Redundant rooms (e.g. bedrooms) were listed separately, and unique room types were coded as a miscellaneous room. Data for local exhaust systems and separate air conditioners were also reported in some cases.

If data were reported as "Below Reporting Level," the Reporting Levels were used. Sample photographs and drawings were reviewed to confirm locations when sample location descriptions were unclear. Limited report reviews were conducted, primarily to verify that samples noted as HVAC and bathroom fans were collected inside the equipment. As painting over meth can have a significant effect on results, if painting prior to the PA was noted in the report, the data were flagged. Remediation standards can be expressed as "<" or "< or = numeric standard." For this analysis, the "< or = numeric standard" option was implemented; the area failed if the result was greater than the remediation standard. Herein, "rooms" means occupiable rooms in a HU (bedrooms, living room, etc. [NOAs]) and excludes garages, outbuildings, patios, attics, and crawlspaces.

A sample record is provided in Table 1. The Meth Concentration in Rooms/Areas detail the PA results for the HU. The Concentration Summary lists the highest or average result for each space type. The Logic Functions section details whether each space type passed or failed by comparing the highest result for the space type with the remediation standard. Based on the cost model described in the next section, the following space types were needed: rooms (and # of rooms that failed), HVAC, MOAs, attic, and crawlspace.

Cost Model

Remediation cost data were collected from contractors who are certified or specialized in meth remediation in the U.S. Publicly available lists of meth contractors were obtained from the internet, and all listed contractors were sent questionnaires. Fifteen responses were received and averaged (Table 2). There were obvious differences in costs in several states, which may partly depend on state regulations, such as numeric remediation standards and the process for remedial verification, as well as local cost conditions. The table provides the average remediation cost for HUs of a fixed size as well as additional costs/adjustments for affected and unaffected areas. There are many variables taken into consideration for estimating remediation costs, so these costs are strictly considered to be an average. These data were then used to estimate the remediation cost for each HU that failed based on all spaces that failed within the HU. For the analysis of remediation costs with AHSs, the spreadsheet was programmed consider the standard for each space type and re-calculate the overall cost for remediation of each property.

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

removed, and if a crawlspace is remediated, a vapor barrier is normally removed and/or installed. Thus, these costs were added for attic insulation at $2,500 (Bob_Villa 2024) and vapor barriers at $2,600 each (RFR 2024).

Other costs often include some of the following: replacing drywall, carpet, appliances, fixtures, cabinets etc.; post-remedial testing; loss of use; and legal expenses, to name a few. Estimating the incremental cost for these items as standards are raised would be difficult, so they have not been included. Thus, the costs provided here should be considered to be a minimal estimate, and the actual cost savings for AHSs are generally going to be higher than stated.

While there can be more than one attic space and occasionally more than one crawlspace, the average cleanup cost is applied if any attic or crawlspace exceeded the remediation standard. MOAs were similarly grouped, and the estimate included the line-item cost if any MOA was deemed contaminated. The cost to remediate all areas that fail in one HU was totaled to obtain a cleanup cost for that HU, and then the average of cleanup costs for all HUs that failed the AHS was calculated. The total cost to remediate the estimated number of newly contaminated properties in the U.S. per year was based on 2022 data (Dennison 2025). The estimate of total HUs that are contaminated ranged as a function of remediation standards from 7.3% at 0.05 ug/100 cm^2, 4.1% for 0.5 ug/100 cm^2, 2.1 % at 1.5 ug/100 cm^2, and 1.4% at 10 ug/100 cm^2. The U.S. cost for remediation is hypothetical, assuming all contaminated units are remediated every year, even as it is understood that only a fraction are actually remediated. The cleanup cost for a non-apartment (NOTAPT) was based on 10 rooms in an average house. As the number of rooms vary widely, the contractors' estimates for add/deduct per additional/fewer rooms was calculated.

Estimate of Incremental Dose and Selection of Base Remediation Standards

Two health risk assessments have been published for thirdhand exposure to methamphetamine. The Colorado risk assessment (Hammon TL 2007) used a deterministic model based on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Standard Operating Procedures for Residential Exposure Assessment. The assessment assumed that only dermal and ingestion routes of exposure were significant and the inhalation route was not. The operative equation for calculating dermal exposure is in Equation 1:

$$\text{PDR (mg/kg/day)} = \text{ISR*TC*ET*ABSD/BW}, \qquad (1)$$

where PDR is the potential dose rate (mg/kg/day), ISR = indoor surface transferable residue (mg/cm^2), TC = transfer coe□cient (cm^2/h), ET is the exposure time (h/day), ABSD = dermal absorption fraction (unitless), and BW = body weight.

Note that the dose rate is proportional to the ISR and the exposure time. The ISR is the surface contamination concentration that can be expressed in $\mu g/100\ cm^2$. When evaluating various remediation standards, the remediation standard is the ISR and the exposure time is normally set to 24 hours to obtain a daily dose. As the dose is proportional to these parameters, if a remediation standard or exposure time was doubled, the dose would double as well. The ingestion dose calculation in the Colorado risk assessment follows an analogous equation and is likewise also proportional to concentration and exposure time.

California EPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment published a risk assessment based on the same pathways for exposure (CalEPA 2009a). The CalEPA assessment utilized a sophisticated USEPA exposure model: the Stochastic Human Exposure and Dose Simulation Model for Multimedia, Multipathway Chemicals (USEPA 2008). This is a non-deterministic model that uses a range of values for input variables. For example, the

variable “Mean # hand washes/day per person” was a lognormal distribution with a geometric mean of 3.74 and geometric standard deviation of 2.63/day. The model was then run numerous times via Monte Carlo simulation to obtain a statistical average dose calculation. The operative equation for dermal dose is similar to the one used by CDPHE, and the ingestion equation is also similar with time and concentration proportionality:

$$E_{r,j,e} = SR_e * A_{j,e} * CR_{j,e} * TE_e * T_e, \quad (2)$$

where $E,_{r,j,e}$ = dermal residue exposure for a given event e for body part j [µg], SR_e = available loading of chemical on the surface contacted [µg/cm^2], A_{je} = surface area of body part j (uncovered) [cm^2], $CR_{j,e}$ = surface contact rate for body part j [1/hr], TE_e = transfer efficiency [-], and T_e = duration of diary event [hr].

One purpose of a risk assessment is to establish a reference dose (RfD). In EPA parlance, the RfD is “An estimate (with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude) of a daily oral exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects during a lifetime” (USEPA 2024). Dermal contributions to dose can be combined into an oral+dermal RfD as was done in both risk assessments. California and Colorado evaluated health literature and derived differing RfDs for meth. Colorado’s RfD was a range from 5–70 ug/kg/day and CalEPA published an RfD of 0.3 ug/kg/day (CalEPA 2009b). Even while California’s RfD was much lower than Colorado’s, California’s remediation standard (1.5 µg/100cm^2) is actually higher than Colorado’s (0.5 µg/100 cm^2) due to differences in the exposure models.

This paper analyzes the effects of increasing remediation standards for different parts of a property where exposure time is lower than in NOAs. To assess the magnitude of dose for higher remediation standards, the “incremental dose” experienced by an occupant was

calculated. The existing standard is referred to as the BHS and higher AHSs were then analyzed. The incremental dose would be the percent increase in dose from

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

Using Equation 1, the transfer coefficient (TC), absorption fractions (ABSD), and body weight (BW) cancel out because dose is proportional to the contaminant concentration (allowed by the BHS and AHS) and the exposure time (ET). The incremental dose is calculated according to Equation 3:

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

where AHS_i = alternate health standard (µg/100 cm^2) for space type *i*, BHS = base health standard (µg/100 cm^2), and ET = exposure time spent in space type *i* (hrs).

Note that ET is the time spent in each type of space. Where only a BHS is used, the ET (ET_{bas}) is set to 24 hours. Where there is more than one space type, the duration of daily exposure in each space is used, and the exposure time (ET_{adj}) used for dose calculation for the base standard is 24-$\sum ET_i$.

For this analysis, LOAs are defined as attics, crawlspaces, and analogous spaces that are not intended or used for purposes other than storage or utilities. Also, MOAs are defined as garages, outbuildings, porches, interior hallways, and exterior balconies and stairwells. Data were not located for the range and average amounts of time occupants spend in LOAs and MOAs; the length of assumed time in such spaces is shown in Table 3. The LOA duration was based on 10 hours per year and the MOA duration was based on 1 hour per day.

The effect of AHSs depends on the base case (i.e., the existing remediation standard for a jurisdiction). As mentioned previously, existing standards vary 30-fold and every

iteration cannot be reported here. For this analysis, we selected the base case of 0.5 μg/100 cm^2, which is near the middle of existing standards.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To provide a sense of what parts of HUs typically have the highest meth contaminant levels, concentrations of meth in all room and space types were averaged for the 100 assessments used in this study (Table 4). The average contaminant concentrations were also normalized by setting the lowest room average to 1. Components of the HVAC system and bathroom vents typically had the highest concentrations, and garages, outbuildings, and porches were among the lowest.

Regulatory Gap Analysis

Twelve states regulate meth only after cooking and not after use, although in some localities if a property tests positive, remediation may be required through local codes or similar mechanisms. Currently, 31 states have no public health regulations concerning meth in residences. An estimated 4% of all U.S. housing is currently contaminated with meth at a concentration above 0.5 μg/100 cm^2 and ~99% of newly contaminated housing is contaminated by use rather than cooking (Dennison 2025). As meth health risk is not based on the contamination method, but based on the presence of meth regardless of the manner of contamination, these regulatory gaps deserve consideration.

Analyzing the Cost Implications of Low Remediation Standards

Currently, state remediation standards exist in 19 disparate states and have a 30-fold range: 0.05 to 1.5 μg/100 cm^2. Many of the 10 states that set standards at the lowest levels (0.05–0.1 μg/100 cm^2) did so prior to Colorado's and California's publications of health risk assessments in 2007 and 2009, respectively, and set standards at method limits of detection

(Hammon 2007), which were 80–90% lower than the lowest risk-based standards. Nine other states regulate meth at 0.5–1.5 μg/100 cm^2. Most of these states set or modified their standards after the risk assessments were published. Thus, setting remediation standards to equal method detection limits is 5-to-10–fold more conservative than the lowest remediation standard based on risk assessments.

Figure 1a shows the cost for remediation using BHSs between 0.05 and 10 μg/100 cm^2 and no AHSs. The highest current standard is 1.5 μg/100 cm^2, but 3 and 10 μg/100 cm^2 were also analyzed for future reference. At the lowest extant standard of 0.05 μg/100 cm^2, 98% of the HUs required some remediation, so 98 was retained as the basis for average project costs. As remediation standards increase, there is a substantial decrease in the percentage of houses that fail and the cost for remediation. The cost per remediation project decreases from $21K at 0.05 μg/100 cm^2, $13K at 0.5 μg/100 cm^2, and $9K at 1.5 μg/100 cm^2, and decreases further at higher standards. For a standard of 1.5 μg/100 cm^2, the failure rate declines from 98% to 70%. Figure 1b shows the specific cost reduction per remediation project for different remediation standards.

Use of Remediation Standards That Account for Occupancy Durations

As previously discussed, the dose received by occupants is proportional to the amount of time an occupant spends in a room/area. The RfDs for meth assume that occupants spend 100% of their time at home, as at least some of the sensitive population (young children) reside in the home nearly exclusively. Children or other occupants may spend time and have contact with contaminated surfaces in various rooms of the house, but a much smaller proportion of time is spent in LOAs and MOAs, such as attics. If the remediation standard does not distinguish between occupancy time, it is implicitly assuming that the amount of

time spent in a space such as an attic is $1/n^{th}$ of the amount of time spent in NOAs, where *n* is the number of rooms in the house +1. So, if the HU is a six-room house with an attic space, the single limit approach assumes that the occupant could spend $1/7^{th}$ of their time in the attic to receive an equal fraction of total dose from all spaces.

Of the 19 states that regulate meth-contaminated HUs remediation standards, all but two set one remediation standard for all parts of a property. Thus, all rooms that are tested, including HVAC systems, attics, or other spaces, must meet the single standard or be remediated to that standard. The BHSs promulgated by Colorado and California were intended to prevent occupants receiving more than the RfD recommended in their health risk assessments. There is considerable uncertainty in setting the RfD, which is compensated for with uncertainty factors that reduce the RfD, and with sampling data. Under this paradigm, an incremental dose of a few percent might be considered acceptable. Moreover, as detailed below, actual thirdhand doses in remediated houses are lower than required, so the RfD is still not exceeded even with these increased AHSs. The increased dose was calculated based on the assumed exposure time in LOAs along with the failure rates and remedial cost reductions as the AHS was increased. Calculated incremental doses were made for AHSs ranging from 0.75–40 μg/100 cm^2 for LOAs and 0.75–10 μg/100 cm^2 for MOAs. Calculations were discontinued when those spaces that exceeded the AHS reached 0%.

Results of the LOA calculations are shown in Figures 2a and 2b. The calculations use a BHS of 0.5 μg/100 cm^2 and a failure percentage of 86%. LOAs have an assumed occupancy of ten hours per year. When the AHS for LOAs is also 0.5, this is actually the base scenario. Remedial costs decline ~$4K per project when the LOA standard is set to 4 μg/100 cm^2. Further reductions with yet higher LOA standards are modest as at 4

μg/100 cm^2, only 4% of crawlspaces and 15% of attics fail. The overall HU failure rate is not affected very much because other parts of the HUs still fail. The incremental dose reaches 1% at 4 μg/100 cm^2 and is 2.2% at 10 μg/100 cm^2. As the 0.5 μg/100 cm^2 remediation standard was used for this calculation, these incremental doses can be expressed as occurring at eight-fold and 20-fold above the BHS. Also, as the calculation of incremental dose is the ratio of the AHS to BHS adjusted for exposure time, the same incremental dose occurs with respect to any BHS for the same-fold increase. For example, if the BHS was 1.5 μg/100 cm^2 (as in some states), an eight-fold increase of the LOA standard would also result in a 1% increase to total dose.

The same analysis was conducted for MOAs, which were assumed to be occupied for one hour per day. While this could underestimate exposure time for adults, it may reasonably estimate exposure time for young children, for which the remediation standards were established. An adult RfD published by Colorado is higher at 4 μg/100 cm^2 (Goyal 2014), so the exposure time for adults is not necessarily an issue. Modest decreases in remedial costs per project and in failure rates are found after varying MOA AHSs from 0.75 to 10 μg/100 cm^2, where the failure rate for MOAs reached 0% (Figures 3a and 3b). However, this assessment ignores important additional costs that are difficult to quantify but can be easily described. From an industrial hygiene standpoint, meth testing is done to define the extent of a building that exceeds the remediation standard. If meth activity occurs in an apartment, some meth may migrate through the unit door to the exterior stairwell or interior hallway (outside the apartment but inside the building), so hallway testing is frequently performed. Sampling may be performed immediately outside the source unit's door and can exceed a standard such as 0.5 μg/100 cm^2. This situation triggers a need to test the hallway again to

determine how far the contamination plume migrated, and several additional tests may be needed before the plume is defined. If the plume extends to the hallway near other units, testing may be needed inside those units as well. This culminates in repeated site visits, notifications to tenants, and inevitable anxiety. In the case of condominiums, homeowner association permission is required for testing hallways and other owners' or tenants' permission may be needed. When the testing is actually necessary, all of this may be justifiable, but if not necessary, it is costly. Based on the data in 12 PAs with such hallways, the average concentration was 0.61 μg/100 cm^2, and only 33% exceeded the remediation standard (0.5 μg/100 cm^2). The average concentrations in the hallway were 25-fold lower than in the source unit. Based on the ratio between hallways and units (25:1), the potential for significant exposure going into other units is small. Typically, the zone of contamination ends before other units' doors, so the potential for other units to be contaminated is low. Moreover, if the concentration in a hallway is 0.5–1 μg/100 cm^2, after it migrates into a clean unit, the potential to exceed the remediation standard in the other unit is also very low. In summary, a remediation standard for hallways equal to the BHS sometimes creates additional testing costs, inconveniences, delays, anxieties and other psychosocial costs, legal involvement, and other issues, while there is limited potential for any significant migration. The same issues may occur with exterior stairwells, which also get scarcely contaminated. These factors make it advisable to base an AHS for MOAs on an appropriate increment to dose (Figure 3b). The incremental dose is 4.2% at 1 μg/100 cm^2, and the hallway failure rate is reduced to 17%. At 4 μg/100 cm^2, the failure rate is 0% but the incremental dose rises to 29%. As shown in Figure 3a, the cost savings is negligible because the re-testing costs and lower remediation costs are not included, but based on the author's professional judgment, raising the MOA

AHS to 1 μg/100 cm^2 would save a ballpark of $1,000 per project along with a reduction in disruption to occupants.

HVAC Systems

For the purposes of this analysis, “HVAC systems” refers to central heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning systems that have a heater (usually a furnace), a fan to move air through supply ductwork, return ducts (which may be very short in smaller apartments), and possibly cooling equipment. Non-ventilating hydronic systems, wall unit heaters, or air conditioners are not included in this analysis. Auxiliary local exhaust systems such as bathroom exhaust fans or whole house fans are discussed separately. In the dataset used here, 84% of the HUs had central HVAC. Contaminated HVAC means the meth concentration inside the ducts and equipment, and any contamination on the exterior is considered as “room contamination” just like contamination on cabinets or fixtures.

It is clear that meth exposure from HVAC contamination does not follow the same paradigm as dermal and ingestion exposure in the occupied portion of HUs. The dose from surface contamination depends on dermal contact area, duration, and concentration. Both dermal contact area (cm^2 of skin exposed) and duration of contact to the interior of HVAC is very limited and perhaps entirely insignificant. At most, an occupant may change a furnace filter up to four times per year with total dermal contact only for a few minutes. Dose calculations were made under a worst-case total exposure time assumption of one hour per year. Dermal and ingestion dose for a remediation standard of 10 μg/100 cm^2 would only result in a negligible 0.1% additional dose. For standards based on the two health risk assessments that considered inhalation exposure to be insignificant, a higher limit appears well justified based on dermal and ingestion exposure.

The normal process for cleaning HVAC ducts is to use a mechanical duct cleaning system (brushes, whips, etc.) connected to a HEPA-filtered vacuum system to collect the particulates re-entrained from agitation equipment. EPA-approved detergents may be used sparingly to avoid corrosion or water damage to the house. Hand cleaning of the reachable sections of supply and return ducts (the terminal sections), which represent less than 5% of the total system, is then usually conducted. Post-remedial sampling is normally performed but is usually heavily or exclusively limited to terminal sections that can be reached from vents, as most state regulations do not require random sampling. It is difficult to sample randomly selected locations in ducts in the majority of HUs where the ducts are enclosed in drywall (see Figure 4). Thus, the majority of post-remediation sampling is not representative of what contaminant concentrations are throughout the ductwork, but only at the double-cleaned terminal sections. Nevertheless, it is common for the HVAC to require two or more rounds or cleaning and testing before it meets remediation standards, which suggests that the inaccessible sections of ducts are likely still contaminated since they are only cleaned once. Statistically representative data were not identified to compare the concentrations after remediation in random locations in duct interiors and terminal sections. However, three projects were identified where a comparison could be made. The concentrations after remediation were 80-fold (+/- 32) higher in the middle of ducts as compared to terminal sections. Thus, absent requirements to actually test middle sections of ducts, the assumption that entire duct runs are as clean as duct ends is questionable. Therefore, it is not clear if the high cost invested in cleaning the duct ends is beneficial.

Calculations are based on the 84 HUs out of the 100 PAs that had HVAC systems. The cost of remediating HVAC systems to the BHS and AHS and the resultant failure rates

are shown in Figure 5. These data indicate that, for a BHS of 0.5 μg/100, increasing the HVAC remediation standard to 4 μg/1 or 10 μg/10 would reduce costs by ~$900 and ~$1,800, respectively, per remediation project if the HVAC maximum discrete sample concentrations are used.

The cost estimates in Figure 5 do not include some ancillary costs. HVAC systems are likely the most recalcitrant part of the house to remediate to a base standard. Thus, it typically requires two additional cleanings to meet base standards (three total cleanings) and three verification samplings. Consequently, a lot of the contractor's contingency budget is used by HVAC re-cleanings, and if the HVAC remediation standard is increased, the contingency cost would be reduced. Also, the added cost for re-testing have not been included in the cost estimate, so an additional $500–$1,000 per project may be saved were higher standards applied and the temptation to remove and replace the system would be lower.

The actual concern with HVAC contamination is not for dermal or ingestion exposure from contaminated HVAC interior surfaces, but with the potential for exposure to occupants after remediation is complete from HVAC emissions. Thus, a remediation standard for HVAC systems can be based on the concept of potential to re-contaminate a HU. In the 100 PAs analyzed here, for the 84 HUs with HVAC, the HVAC systems were on average 9.8-fold more contaminated than the NOAs. At some point after meth activity has ceased, the system would reach a quasi-equilibrium with the HU, with contaminant concentrations approximately 10 times higher than in the HU. One implication of this is that after remediation, it appears plausible that the HVAC system that was cleaned to a BHS would become re-contaminated. In the post-remediation datasets examined, the average meth

residual in the HU was ~0.3 μg/100 cm^2. Based on the 10-fold higher equilibrium concentrations in HVAC, one would expect the ducts to regain a concentration of ~3 μg/100 cm^2 and thus, be "re-contaminated," which could become a compliance issue upon testing at a later date.

An alternative method for defining acceptable concentrations in HVAC systems is to consider the potential for HU recontamination from HVAC after remediation is complete. This is done by calculating the concentration in an HVAC that would potentially add a defined amount of additional HU contamination. In a representative house, the interior surface area of the HVAC system was ~2.5% of the surface area in the house. Given that HUs averaged 0.3 μg/100 cm^2 in residual contamination after meeting standards, it would be reasonable to limit recontamination from subsequent emissions for the system to a maximum of 0.1 μg/100 cm^2. If all the meth contamination in the HVAC system was to migrate back into the house, this criterion would not be exceeded when the HVAC system contained ≤4 μg/100 cm^2. Thus, a remediation standard of 4 μg/100 cm^2, eight-fold above the BHS, would not lead to significant HU contamination at a later date, using worst-case assumptions. If it was assumed that no more than 50% of the contaminants in the HVAC would re-emerge, a standard of 8 μg/100 cm^2 would be supported.

Another aspect of considering HVAC remediation standards is the choice of using composite sample results versus discrete sample results. Composite sample results are an average of the contaminant concentrations in the locations sampled. Discrete samples could be averaged to compare to remediation standards, but in Colorado and possibly some other states, the highest sample determines compliance, so the system is deemed noncompliant when any discrete sample exceeds the remediation standard even if average results do not. In

15 post-remediation sample sets, four discrete samples were collected in each HVAC system. The results ranged from 0.03–0.47 μg/100 cm^2, with an average of 0.15 μg/100 cm^2, compared to a BHS of 0.5 μg/100 cm^2. In effect, the remediation contractor had to re-clean the system down to a level of 0.15 μg/cm^2 before all discrete samples were below the standard. As there is no differential exposure resulting from sections of the system with higher concentrations, and the exposure that can occur is related to the average concentration, the use of "highest discrete" result leads to over-remediation. Figure 5 provides estimates of lower failure rates and costs associated with using both the highest discrete sample versus averaged data.

Exhaust Vent Systems

The most common exhaust vent in residential HUs is the bathroom system, consisting of a louvered cover, with a fan motor behind or above it, connected to a duct that usually exits the building through a wall or through an attic and/or roof. Bathroom exhaust fans tend to become very contaminated. In the PA dataset, the average concentration in a bathroom fan system was 50 times higher than the average in the house. Similarly to HVAC systems, however, occupants rarely if ever have dermal contact or ingestion exposure from the system's interior. If a composite sample is collected in a bathroom, and one aliquot is from the exhaust system, the exhaust aliquot would increase the resulting concentration by approximately 13-fold and would make the room fail even when the room itself is 13 times lower than the remediation standard. There are instances where the only area that failed in a house was the bathroom, and the bathroom only failed due to an aliquot collected from inside the fan system. Fan and duct remediation adds approximately $500–$1,000 to remediation cost, and it could be significantly more if the exhaust ducts are enclosed in drywall. A

sampling professional may feel compelled to sample inside the fan so they do not “miss” a likely location that could fail or want to perform “worst-case” sampling. As the exhaust systems likely contribute very little to occupant exposure, they could simply be excluded from testing and remediation requirements. Guidance documents could recommend that if the bathroom fails and the exhaust duct is accessible, the duct can be removed as an extra precaution. Remediating exhaust ducts in-place is likely a false panacea, as they are rarely if ever tested after remediation.

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

Averaging of Results

In most states, any part of a property that exceeds the remediation standard is required to be mitigated. Yet, health risk is based on average exposure to occupants. An argument can be made for defining contamination under regulations based on the average concentration in the normally occupied part of HUs. In the PA dataset, 71 properties were defined as contaminated when one or more NOAs exceeded the remediation standard of 0.5 $\mu g/100\ cm^2$ (15 failed in LOAs and/or MOAs). If the average of test data were applied for the NOAs, only 54 failed, resulting in a substantial reduction in costs. However, one must consider the possibility that an occupant could spend more time in rooms that were more contaminated

than the average. Taking this into account, the global coefficient of variation on NOAs is ~100%, meaning that if the average concentration in an “area” was 0.5 μg/100 cm^2, most other areas would be all in the range of 0.5 +/- 0.5 μg/100 cm^2.

Rationale for allowing incremental dose

The small incremental exposures or doses that would occur if AHS were established for LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC systems could raise some concern as they would be “on top of” the exposure in NOAs. However, the dose occupants receive is already less than the dose correlated with the remediation standard in almost all cases. For example, in the 14 HUs in the PA dataset that passed, the average concentration in the occupied portion of the HU was 0.04 +/- 0.04 μg/100 cm^2 as compared to a remediation standard of 0.5 μg/100 cm^2. This means that over 99% of the occupants were exposed to concentrations of ~0.12 μg/100 cm^2 or less, and a 2–6% incremental dose from exposure in LOAs and MOAs would not cause the total dose to exceed or even approach the dose allowed by the BHS. The same is true with remediated properties. A survey of 15 remediated properties from the CDPHE online database found the average post-remediation concentration in the NOA parts of HUs was 0.1 +/- .07 μg/100 cm^2 (CDPHE 2024). This means that over 99% of future occupants would be exposed to ~0.3 μg/100 cm^2 or less, so total exposure would remain under 70% of the BHS. This provides more than enough of a margin of safety to permit small increases in dose if AHSs were increased for LOAs, MOAs, and HVACs.

A second rationale that some incremental dose is acceptable is based on the RfDs established by California and Colorado. At its remediation standard of 1.5 μg/100 cm^2, California estimated a total dose of 0.278 μg/kg/day (at a 95% confidence interval), 8% lower than the California RfD (CalEPA 2009a, 2009b). Thus, adding AHS that would not

exceed 8% of additional dose would not exceed the RfD. In Colorado, an even wider margin exists, as they estimated that a 0.5 μg/100 cm^2 remediation standard would result in a dose of 0.2 μg/kg/day as compared to an RfD of 5-70 μg/kg/day. Therefore, an increase in the dose with higher AHS would be reasonable.

Combined AHS

Potentially, different AHSs could be simultaneously promulgated for NOAs, LOAs, MOAs, and HVACs. The combined assessment for these recommended AHSs appears in Table 5 with respect to BHSs of 0.5 and 1.5 μg/100 cm^2. The LOA and HVAC AHS levels were varied up to 20-fold of the BHS. However, the MOA AHS was only varied up to 1.5 μg/100 cm^2. Relative to the BHS of 0.5 μg/100 cm^2, a cost reduction of 43% was obtained if the MOA standard is 1.5 μg/100 cm^2 and the HVAC and LOA standard was raised to 10 μg/100 cm^2. The estimated average remediation cost for a remediation standard of 1.5 μg/100 cm^2 was $10K and was reduced by 49% if the MOA standard is 1.5 μg/100 cm^2 and the HVAC and LOA standard was raised to 30 μg/100 cm^2.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

1. States that do not regulate meth contamination or only apply regulations to manufacturing sites may want to consider regulations on both cooking and use, considering the substantial number of contaminated properties that appear to exist and the prevalence of contamination caused by use.
2. BHSs should be based on the published risk assessment values. In particular, remediation standards of 0.1 and 0.05 μg/100 cm^2 should be increased to one of the risk assessment–

based standards. The average remedial cost would be reduced from ~$19-21K to $13K or $9K, depending on which risk assessment is used. The additional cost to remediate to low standards is unnecessary if the risk assessments are valid.

3. AHSs for LOAs should be established at 20-fold higher than the BHS, where the incremental dose is 2.2% and the cost reduction is ~$5K per project.
4. AHSs for MOAs should be established at two-fold higher than the BHS, which carries an incremental dose of 4.2%. While this is a very small change in the remediation standard, it would obviate the need for a lot of additional testing, including in properties owned by others.
5. HVAC systems do not contribute to dermal and ingestion exposure to a significant extent, and if biased cleaning and sampling is performed focusing on the reachable ends, the ducts are likely not effectively decontaminated anyway. AHSs for HVAC systems should be established at a concentration eight-fold higher than BHS or more to prevent re-contamination of remediated properties.
6. Local exhaust systems should be exempted from testing and remediation requirements to avoid confounding with samples of rooms themselves. Remediation guidance may suggest that if they are in rooms that are contaminated and are practicable to remove or clean, optional efforts could be made in that regard.
7. Increases to the remediation standard should be considered for LOAs, MOAs, and HVAC systems simultaneously. The increase in dose to occupants for scenarios evaluated herein are modest, and considering that HUs already average ~40% below the existing BHS and somewhat below the RfD as well, a 5–10% incremental dose is justifiable. This would allow remediation costs to be reduced by 50% or even potentially more.

8. As meth use is increasing throughout the U.S. and more and more properties are becoming contaminated, it is critical to re-evaluate standards so that the remediation costs are kept in balance with health risk. The high cost of remediation has reduced the frequency of testing in many sectors, so redefining remediation standards for space types that are not occupied like NOAs may enhance public health by facilitating the testing and remediation of more properties suspected of possible contamination.

LIMITATIONS

This study only used contamination data from Colorado, so failure rates could vary in other states. However, use rates only vary over a four-fold range throughout the U.S., and since Colorado's use rate is close to the national average, Colorado contamination data may be a reasonable average. The cost data was obtained from contractors throughout the U.S. and cost savings would be greater or lower in other states. Some simplifications were used in determining remediation cost estimates which in general understate what the actual cost reductions would be. However, the intent was to provide a sense of costs so that risk management professionals could decide whether considering AHS is worthwhile.

Acknowledgments: This work was funded in part by Colorado Public Housing Authorities.

The author declares he has no competing interests but is engaged in meth consulting activities. A preprint is available at TBD.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Supplemental data are available at TBD.

REFERENCES

Bitter JL. 2017. The persistence of illicit drug smoke residues and their recovery from common household surfaces. Drug Test Anal. 9(4):603-612.

Bob_Villa. 2024. How much does attic insulation cost. [accessed]. https://www.bobvila.com/articles/attic-insulation-cost/.

CalEPA. 2009a. Assessment of Children's Exposure to Surface Methamphetamine Residues in Former Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs, and Identification of a Risk-Based Cleanup Standard for Surface Methamphetamine Contamination.

CalEPA. 2009b. Development of a Reference Dose (RfD) for Methamphetamine. California Environmental Protection Agency.

CDPHE. 2005. Support For Selection of A Cleanup Level For Methamphetamine At Clandestine Drug Laboratories. Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

CDPHE. 2024. Meth Reports. [accessed]. https://cdphe.colorado.gov/hm/records-review.

Dennison J. 2025. Methamphetamine-contaminated residences in the United States: assessment of the environmental health significance of third-hand exposure. J. Occup Environ Hyg (in press).

Goyal R. 2014. Alternate Adult Methamphetamine Cleanup goal for Limited Access Areas. Memoranda to Colleen Brisnehan.

Hammon TL GS. 2007. Support for selection of a methamphetamine cleanup standard in Colorado. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 48(1):102-114.

HomeGuide. 2024. Central Air Conditioning Installation. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://homeguide.com/costs/hvac-cost.

Kentucky. 2008. Kentucky Administrative Regulations. TITLE 401 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT CABINET DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

Martyny JW. 2008. Methamphetamine Sampling Variability on Different Surfaces Using Diffferent Solvents (unpublished report).

MLCC. 2024. Meth Lab Cleanup Standards. Meth Lab Cleanup Company [accessed 2024 March 17]. https://www.methlabcleanup.com/Meth-Lab-Cleanup-Standards.html.

RFR. 2024. Regional Foundation Repair. Average Cost of a Vapor Barrier. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://www.regionalfoundationrepair.com/crawl-space/average-cost-of-vapor-barrier/.

USEPA. 2008. Stochastic Human Exposure and Dose Simulation Model for Multimedia, Multipathway Chemicals. SHEDS-Multimedia Model Version 3 Technical Manual. EPA 600/R-08/118.

USEPA. 2021. Voluntary Guidelines for Methamphetamine and Fentanyl Laboratory Cleanup. EPA-540-B-21-002.

USEPA. 2024. Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Glossary. [accessed 2024 Dec. 2]. https://sor.epa.gov/sor_internet/registry/termreg/searchandretrieve/glossariesandkeywordlists/search.do%3Bjsessionid%3DVlwqcwYyLhUo1oDvgiO0TvQRBc0DnFfnaT0N8nvQPdtRKQaPCtCF!1236830639?details&vocabName=IRIS%20Glossary&filterTerm=reference%20dose&checkedAcronym=false&checkedTerm=false&hasDefinitions=false&filterTerm=reference%20dose&filterMatchCriteria=Contains.

Utah. 2025. R392. Health, Disease Control and Prevention, Environmental Services. R392-600. Illegal Drug Operations Decontamination Standards.

Van Dyke MV, Serrano KA, Kofford S, Contreras J, Martyny JW. 2011. Variability and specificity associated with environmental methamphetamine sampling and analysis. J Occup Environ Hyg. 8(11):636-641.

Washington. 2024. Decontamination Of Illegal Drug Manufacturing Or Storage Sites. Chapter 246-205 WAC.
Wyoming_SERC. 2010. State Emergency Response Commission CHAPTER 2 Clandestine Lab Testing and Remediation.

Table 1: Concentration and cost model

Meth Concentrations in Rooms/Areas, ug/100 cm2											
Fan Box	Heat Exchanger	Return	Return2	Supply	Supply2	Kitchen	Living Room	Bath 1	Bath 2	Bath 3	Bath 4
25	5.1	110	--	0.8	--	1.8	1.6	0.098	0.15	--	--
Bath 5	Bath 6	Hallways/ stairs	Bedroom 1	Bedroom 2	Bedroom 3	Bedroom 4	Bedroom 5	Family/ Rec	Utility	Laundry	Base-ment 1
--	--	--	4	0.73	0.3	--	--	--	1.1	--	0.22
	Basement 2	Misc Room	Misc Room 2	Garage	Outbldg	Porch	Attic	Attic 2	Crawl space		
	0.19	--	--	0.50	--	--	4.5	--	--		

Concentration Summary (ug/100 cm2)					Logic Functions						
Maximum in Rooms	Average in HVAC	Maximum in Attic	Maximum in HVAC	Maximum in MOA	Pass/ Fail on Rooms?	Pass/Fail on HVAC?	Pass/Fail on Attic?	Pass/Fail on Crawlspace?	Pass/Fail on MOA?	Overall Pass or Fail?	# of rooms failed
4	35.2	4.5	110	0.50	F	F	F	P	P	F	9

Cost Table								
Type	Cleanup Cost APT	Cleanup Cost SFH, MP, TH	Adjust for # Rooms Failed	Cleanup Cost HVAC	Cleanup Cost Attics	Cleanup Cost Crawl spaces	Cleanup Cost MOAs	Total Cleanup Cost
NOTAPT	0	$11,020	-$1,200	$5,408	$8,173	$0	$0	$23,401

All concentration values in ug/100 cm2. F=Fail. P=Pass

"Rooms in House" means parts of the house that are continually normally occupied, excluding rooms listed separately

MOA includes garages, outbuildings (such as barns or sheds), exterior stairwells or hallways, or similar spaces

NOTAPT means Not an apartment. APT means Apartment

SFH=single family home; MP means one unit of a multiplex; TH means townhome

Table 2: Average remediation costs

Remediation Costs (U.S. Average)	Cost (US$)
Apartment, 2 bedroom 1 bath	$6,088
SFH ranch style house, 3 bedroom, 3 bath, attached garage	$11,020
Additional cost if HVAC is contaminated	$5,408
Additional cost if an attic is contaminated	$8,173
Additional cost if a crawlspace is contaminated	$7,436
Additional cost if garage, outbuildings, porches etc contaminated	$1,657
Adjust per additional/fewer rooms	$1,200

Table 3: Estimate of time spent in NOAs, LOAs, and MOAs

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

Table 4: Meth concentrations in 100 HUs

Space Type	Average, ug/100 cm2	Standard Deviation	Normalized
Outbuildings	0.2	0.4	1
Porch	0.6	1.9	3
Garage	0.9	1.8	4
Crawlspace	1.3	2.0	6
Family/ Rec Room	1.5	2.5	7
Bathrooms	2.1	6.2	10
Bedrooms	2.1	8.9	10
Hallways/stairs	2.1	4.1	10
Other Vents	2.2	N/A	11
Attic	3.1	5.5	15
Miscellaneous Room	7.0	29	34
Kitchen Vent	7.0	14	34
Living Room	10.0	57	48
Kitchen	11.3	52	54
Supply Ducts	11.3	30	54
Laundry Vent	11.5	12	55
Laundry	12.1	54	58
Utility	16.7	66	80
Basement	19.0	85	91
Furnace Fan Chamber	23.2	49	112
Furnace Heat Exchanger	26.6	93	128
Return Ducts	62.9	226	303
Air Conditioner	71.5	75	344
Bathroom Vents	298.0	1386	1434

Table 5: Failure rates and remediation costs for increased AHS

AHS (LOA/HVAC), ug/100 cm^2	Overall Fail %	Average Remedial Cost ($)	Cost Reduction ($)
Base Standard 0.5 ug/100 cm2			
0.5	86	15,328	
1	82	13,397	1,931
1.5	80	12,316	3,012
5	75	10,035	5,293
10	72	8,600	6,728
Base standard 1.5 ug/100 cm2			
1.5	70	10,423	
7.5	59	7,236	3,188
15	58	5,950	4,473
30	57	5,226	5,197

Figure 1a: Failure frequency and remediation costs for different remediation standards.



Figure 1b: Cost reductions associated with increasing remediation standards.



Figure 2a: Average remedial costs per project and total U.S. remedial costs



Figure 2b: Percent of HUs that fail and incremental dose calculations to AHSs for LOAs



Figure 3a: Average remediation costs per project and, total U.S. remediation costs

Figure 3b: Percent of HUs that fail and incremental dose calculations for AHSs in MOAs



Figure 4: Random sampling of a supply duct in ceiling joists. Drywall had to be removed, which required asbestos testing and subsequent repairs.

Figure 5: HVAC Remediation costs and failure percentages using the maximum discrete sample result (MAX) and averaged (AVG) discrete sample results