#3405

Practical Problems Reducing Radon in Homes

Michael C. Osborne* and Terry Brennann**

Introduction

In a surprisingly short time, the words "radon" and radon mitigation" have been added to the daily vocabulary of many Americans. The job of resolving the radon problem, however, has not been limited to the highly educated few but has quickly become the job of plumbers, electricians, and solar energy salesmen who have had to take on the role of "radon mitigators". In an effort to improve the quality of radon mitigation, EPA's Office of Radiation Programs in 1986 conducted 20 short courses across the country to educate both building tradesmen and government regulators. This training included information on the potential harmful impacts of radon as well as the currently understood ways of alleviating the radon problem in the residential environment.

Along with the national emphasis on resolving the homeowner's radon problem has come an awareness of numerous difficulties that can be encountered which make the task more complicated than one might imagine. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is currently funding several projects aimed at both identifying and resolving some of these problems. The ultimate goal of these projects is to simplify the job of the radon diagnostician and mitigator which, hopefully, will result in more homeowners reducing their radon levels at a lower cost.

Background

Over the past two years, the Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory of EPA has conducted radon mitigation projects in Boyertown, Pennsylvania and Clinton, New Jersey. In September 1986, a new radon reduction effort co-funded by EPA and New York State ERDA was begun in Orange and Putnam Counties of New York. Within the New York project, additional radon mitigation efforts were begun in Albany and Rensselaer Counties of New York early in 1987. Similar efforts will be conducted in other locations across the country as the need for the development and demonstration of radon mitigation alternatives continues to grow.

In each specific radon mitigation project, the first definable task has been the selection of houses in the target area where radon reduction

*Environmental Engineer, Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory, MD-54, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711
**Contractor, Camroden Associates, RD#4, Box 62, Rome, NY 13440

efforts will result in recommendable mitigation techniques which have application to other houses in other localities. The houses which are visited in a screening effort have already been identified as having a measurable radon problem by the State and having a homeowner who is interested in reducing the radon level. Each screening visit includes an assessment of potential radon entry routes, an evaluation of the tightness of the building envelope, a determination of the similarity of the house sub-structure characteristics to other houses, and the applicability of potential radon mitigation alternatives to the structure. From these screening visits and from the experience of attempting to reduce radon levels in the selected homes, several problems which inhibit radon mitigation have become evident. Some of the problems are significant enough that houses being screened are rejected as too costly to mitigate at this stage in our research program. Other houses are rejected because diagnostic techniques have not yet advanced to the point that attempts to identify the radon entry points are conclusive. In some screening efforts houses are selected for mitigation based on data which is questionable due to diurnal and/or seasonal variations. All of these different types of problems are slowing progress in demonstrating viable radon reducing alternatives.

The purpose of this paper is to bring to light what some of these problems are, explain why they are of concern, and, when possible offer ways of approaching solutions.

Radon Mitigation Inhibitors

The types of problems that radon diagnositicians and mitigators encounter generally fall into three classes: diagnostics, radon measurement, and physical mitigation. These three problem categories also encompass the primary steps in the overall radon mitigation process. A problem in one area often impacts the other areas. For example, a problem which results in a faulty diagnosis will often result in inadequate physical mitigation or a problem which prevents adequate or complete physical mitigation may make the interpretaion of post-mitigation diagnoses extremely difficult. Improper interpretation of radon measurements often results in a poor diagnosis of the radon problem and a less than satisfactory mitigation attempt. Any problem which makes radon reduction more difficult or more expensive is viewed as a radon mitigation inhibitor. As radon mitigation research continues, more and more inhibitors will be observed; however, the following list of ten problems are viewed as some of the more significant radon mitigation inhibitors currently being encountered by radon diagnosticians and mitigators today:

A. Diagnostics

Inconsistent Sub-slab Aggregate. From builder to builder and even from house to house no other factor is as important or as inconsistent as the presense, characteristics, and uniformity of the sub-slab aggregate found beneath either slab-or-grade or basement homes. The importance of this construction feature stems from the very common and often quite successful application of the radon mitigation technique called sub-slab suction.

This technique has been observed to be most effective when several inches of crushed stone uniformly cover the area immediately beneath the slab. Unfortunately, in some homes slabs are poured directly on bedrock while in other homes the slab is poured over undisturbed soil.

From the viewpoint of the radon diagnostician, the worst case scenario is when portions of the slab randomly cover crushed stone, hard-packed soil, and bedrock. If there were assurance of solid rock of impermeable soil, another mitigation approach could be recommended. Many diagnosticians make test holes in the slab to verify the presense of sub-slab aggregate; yet, short of making Swiss cheese out of the slab, this approach is not dependable.

What the diagnostician needs is an instrument that measures the depth of the slab and discerns the presence and depth of any aggregate beneath the surface. The instrument must be compact enough to be used inside the home and inexpensive enough to be owned by a radon diagnostician. Such an instrument would be a valuable tool in radon mitigation.

Hidden Pathways in Chimneys. In many cases, chimneys which penetrate the slab or are built on footings below grade are in theory avenues for radon entry into the home. The problem really concerns both the diagnosis and the potential for mitigation. Some diagnosticians look for cracks in the mortar and test them with smoke sticks and grab samples while others opt for flux measurements to determine the actual radon flow through the exposed stone and mortar. In either case, the physical size of the chimney often severely reduces the capability of reliable measurements. Such measurements are also subject to seasonal and diurnal limitations which will be discussed later under the topic of radon measurement. In general, a better way is needed to diagnose radon entry through chimney foundations.

Variations in Porosity of Concrete/Cinder Block and Block Coatings. One of the potential sources of radon in concrete or cinder block basements or houses is directly through the block. Obviously, cracks in the block or in the mortar joints can significantly add to the contribution of radon through the block pores. Because of the large variety of aggregate materials used in the manufacture of blocks across the nation, generalization concerning block porosity is difficult. To properly diagnose a house with a block basement or block walls, the diagnostician must either measure the flow of radon through the block, assume a porosity, or plan to use an impenetrable surface coating regardless of porosity. Each of these alternatives has its drawbacks. Coating the blocks without verifying the need for sealing can be unnessessary and costly. Measurements of radon flow through blocks are subject to seasonal and diurnal variations which can result in order-of-magnitude errors. Moreover, assuming the porosity of blocks could result in equally erroneous results.

What the diagnostician needs is an instrument which measures the porosity of the block with its existing surface treatment. With this information and a list of recommended surface coatings related to block porosity, the diagnostician could recommend whether a block surface treatment is needed and, if needed, the type of surface treatment which would be most cost effective.

Access to Radon Entry Surfaces. The majority of homes receiving radon mitigation to date have been unfinished basement homes. Being able to access and inspect floor slabs and block wall surfaces simplifies attempts to diagnose the potential for radon entry into the home. When applying radon mitigation to finished space, a higher priority goes to those mitigation options that can be applied solely from the exterior of the house.

Such options, however, are primarily limited to slab-on-grade and crawl space houses. Finished basements are particularly difficult when they have wall-to-wall carpets on the floors and paneling or wallboard permanently fastened to the perimeter wall surfaces. Fortunately, most finished basements do have an unfinished workshop, laundry room, etc., where concrete floors and exposed block walls can be examined. Depending on what is observed in the unfinished space, mitigation also might be effectively applied from that space. However, for those houses where access to the block walls or floors is needed, mitigation can require considerable expense. To diagnose the block wall surfaces behind stud walls or other partitians the use of fiber optics is recommended. For wall cavities as large as stud walls, a technique for applying surface coatings should be devised. Although finished basements do present more of a challenge for radon mitigation and more novel ways to access the covered surfaces need to be developed, successful in-expensive mitigation has been demonstrated on some finished houses by using currently available technology.

B. Radon Measurement

Diurnal and Seasonal Variation in Radon Concentrations. Radon measurements are tools of the diagnostician to 1)verify the magnitude of the radon problem, 2)the location of radon entry, and 3)the relative success that mitigation techniques offer. Besides the normal precision and accuracy consideration, the diagnostician needs to weigh two other very significant variables which impact radon measurements. One of these, the seasonal variation, results from temperature difference which exist between the inside of and the outside of a house during the cold winter months. This phenomenon known as the "stack effect" occurs when the house is warmer than the outside air, resulting in the depressurization of the house. The depressurized house tends to suck radon and other soil gases from the ground into the building cavity. Since radon diagnosticians and mitigators are generally unable to use annually averaged numbers each time they measure radon, seasonal variations must be considered. This is particularly important when mitigation work is being conducted during the summer months and houses are not being stressed by depressurization as they would be during the winter.

The other significant variable, which is not as well understood but can be, nonetheless, very important, is the diurnal or day/night variation in radon concentration. This variable is believed to be related to the changes in soil temperature and various meteorological factors. Although not always observed in every location, in some studies the diurnal variation has been extremely notable and predictable. In Clinton, New Jersey, radon measurements were observed to vary by as much as a factor of 20 in each 24-hour cycle over severral days. Based on the wide range of daily radon readings the diagnostician must be extremely careful in drawing conclusions from grab sample data or even short-term continuous monitor data.

A failure to consider either the seasonal or diurnal variations in radon data can be a significant hindrance to radon mitigation.

Impact of Radon-in-Water on Radon-in-Air. In some houses that have their own individual wells or that use water from a community well, a significant percentage of the radon measured in the house air could be coming from the radon found in the water. The rule-of-thumb often quoted is 1 picocurie per liter (pCi/l) in the air for every 10,000 pCi/l of radon found in the water.[1] This is an average concentration assuming normal water usage in a typical household. Unfortunately, this number does not reflect the wide swings in radon levels that occur in some rooms of the house where hot water is being used for showers, dishwashing, or clothes washing. Radon measurements were made in a home in Boyertown, Pennsylvania where radon in water from an individual well measured 37,000 pCi/l. A shower in the bathroom was allowed to run for about 15 minutes at about 100°F(38°C)and for a brief period of time radon increased in the bathroom by a factor of over 100.

Considering how quickly and dramatically radon levels can change with water usage, evaluating the effectiveness of non-water related radon mitigation options without taking into consideration the proximity and frequency of water usage is likely to lead to false conclusions. Using a phased approach to mitigation, making certain that the radon-in-water problem is resolved first, may prevent potential problems in the interpretation of measurement data.

C. Physical Mitigation

Sealing the Top Row of Concrete Blocks. One of the most commonly observed variables in block-wall basement construction is how the builder chooses to leave the top row of concrete blocks. The range of possibilities goes from using solid blocks which totally seal the top void to using hollow core blocks with a wood sill plate only partially covering the block openings. Since the block wall usually penetrates the slab and is exposed to soil gas from beneath the lowest block and from the side exposed to the soil, sealing the void in the top row of block is by itself a radon reducer. In addition, if block-wall suction is contemplated as a radon mitigation option, the void in the top row of blocks must be sealed to obtain adequate suction. Mortar and urethane foam have been recommended as materials to use in sealing these voids[2].

The experience of radon mitigators has shown that to fill large voids by this method requires first packing the void with newspaper or other material which acts as a support surface for the mortar or urethane to rest on. Due to the proximity of the top row of blocks to the basement ceiling, visual examination of the quality of the sealing effort is often prohibited. Unfortunately, attempts to seal the top row of blocks by this method are often time consuming, costly, and inadequate. A major contribution to future attempts to reduce radon levels in block wall basement houses would be the refinement of an effective method of quickly and cheaply filling the large voids in the top row of concrete blocks.

Isolating Half-Basements Many older basement homes have large areas of the basement space which have direct soil exposure. Often these areas are separated by block wall partitions and tend to resemble crawl spaces more than basements. The simplest radon mitigation alternative for these areas is to treat them as crawl spaces and use natural or forced ventilation. Care must be taken to prevent freezing of water pipes when ventilating crawl spaces. If ventilation is used, the area with exposed soil must be isolated from the rest of the basement. Unfortunately, the concrete block walls which often separate these areas from the true basement portion are only layed to the vicinity of the overhead floor joists creating a very difficult sealing problem. If the walls are not load bearing, it is necessary to seal between the top block and the floor joist and to seal the space between the block and the sub-floor between each two floor joists. A simple low-cost solution to this very common sealing problem is needed.

Sealing Large Thermal By-Passes. The "stack effect" caused by the severe depressurization of houses during the cold winter months is often exaggerated in houses with large thermal by-passes which short circuit the basement to the attic. These thermal by-passes are usually found around water and soil pipes and especially around chimneys. Plumbing chases can often be adequately sealed by normal insulating procedures but thermal by-passes around chimneys pose a significant problem. In some localities building codes prevent sealing these openings with wood or insulation due to the potential fire hazard; yet, ignoring them may result in the failure of an otherwise successful mitigation option during periods of significant house depressurization. A safe, inexpensive effective method of sealing thermal by-passes around chimneys would help assure long-term success of many radon mitigation options.

Coping with Direct Rock Exposure. Although uncommon in many parts of the country, rock outcroppings are more common in radon prone regions. Until recently, EPA radon mitigation efforts have avoided houses with direct soil or rock exposure within an established living space; however, currently several houses with rock outcroppings in basements are slated for radon mitigation in New York. Slightly elevated gamma readings on the surface of these rocks indicate that they will also be a potential radon source. Since these rocks are actually large boulders of granite, simply removing the rocks is not considered a viable alternative.
Preventing emissions from the rocks by coating them with an impermeable

material may be the preferred mitigation alternative. The problem is finding an asthetically acceptable coating which is durable and offers adequate radon protection without giving off other undesirable in-door air emissions. The search for such a coating is currently underway.

Summary

The ten radon mitigation inhibiting problems identified in this paper represent only a few of the many daily problems encountered by diagnosticians and mitigators. Nonetheless, these are some of the current common problems that need to be considered and hopefully resolved in the near future. Researchers and practitioners of radon mitigation are encouraged to develop workable solutions to these and other radon related problems. EPA's Air and Energy Engineering Research Laboratory is interested in receiving information concerning diagnostic, measurement, and mitigation alternatives that have been demonstrated to work or have shown potential of working.

References

[1]Becker, A.P.; et al., Evaluation of Waterborne Radon Impact on Indoor Air Quality and Assessment of Control Options. U. S. Environmental Projection Agency. EPA-600/7-84-093 (NTIS PB84-246404). September 1984.

[2]Radon Reduction Methods - A Homeowner's Guide, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OPA-86-005, August 1986.