



#### **Building Forensics Ltd**

#### Expert Environmental Surveys Tailored to Your Health and Budget

The proper survey depends on **how sick you are** and **your budget**. We're here to guide you to the best option.

We offer **two essential survey options**, plus additional tests if needed. Every client receives **free**, **no-obligation guidance notes** explaining the benefits, limitations, and suitability of each option.

#### **Survey Objective**

Our surveys are designed to:

- ✓ Identify current or historic water damage markers, sources, and hidden reservoirs
- Detect possible bio-contamination risks and hazards
- Pinpoint environmental triggers contributing to your illness or symptoms

✓ Provide clear, data-driven results to assist you, your healthcare provider, and inform remediation and recovery strategies

#### **Survey Options**

**Option 1: Risk Assessment** (Recommended) A comprehensive risk survey is ideal for most cases.

**Option 2: Hazard Assessment** (Recommended for suspected building-related illness)

A deeper investigation focusing on environmental triggers linked to health impacts.

#### Option 3: Specialised Bacteria Testing

Recommended for individuals with **chronic illness or persistent symptoms** where previous mould treatments have failed.

#### Option 4: Envirosope® Real-Time Mobile Lab

A **unique**, **on-site scanning tool** that instantly assesses contamination risks (mould, bacteria, chemicals, particles). Ideal for detecting **hidden or masked risk areas**. *Note: It supports broader assessments but does not replace a full building-related illness investigation.* 







We're committed to empowering you with the correct information:

- ✓ Free expert guidance on sampling, testing, and analysis
- Personal consultation available—book a call or email us anytime

The information may seem overwhelming at first glance. However, selecting Option 1 (ideally with Option 2) provides a strong foundation for most clients.

The more data we collect, the greater the chance your healthcare provider can accurately diagnose and treat your condition, especially if we identify and remove environmental triggers.

**our mission is simple:** We collect the right data and deliver a clear, actionable report so your next steps are guided by evidence, not guesswork.

Jeff Charlton MCIEH, CIEC, CR-WLS, CMH, Hon Fellow BDMA UK's Leading Mould and Biocontamination Expert www.buildingforensics.co.uk

# **Review Report on Building-Related Health Issues**

#### Section 1: Preamble

This report is based on information provided by the client, an inspection of the property, and the analysis of samples and measurements taken during the survey.

While no inspection can be 100% reliable, the accuracy of results increases significantly with intrusive investigations and multiple testing protocols. The scope and depth of any survey are determined by the allocated budget and are influenced by the number and type of samples taken and analysed. All conclusions or recommendations must be substantiated before any remedial action is undertaken.

Building-related illnesses (BRI's) can be challenging to treat if environmental contamination persists. Health improvement is unlikely if exposure to inflammatory triggers continues to exceed the therapeutic benefit of treatment. This survey may represent a crucial first step toward recovery and should be shared with the relevant healthcare professionals. Recommendations should be implemented without delay.

Where biological growth has occurred—mould, bacteria, viable or non-viable, and even microscopic fragments—it continues to pose a health risk. Chemical by-products such as mycotoxins and allergens may trigger inflammatory responses decades after exposure. Dried fragments may be up to 40 times more hazardous (WHO reference) than living colonies. Areas that have experienced







historical water damage, even if now dry, may still present significant health risks and cannot always be fully assessed without intrusive investigation or formal risk assessment.

#### Section 2. Report basis and considerations

The primary objective of this survey is to assess current and historical water damage or contamination that may contribute to health complaints. This includes:

- Identifying evidence of causation
- Assessing possible construction and design defects
- Considering alterations to the building envelope
- Evaluating lifestyle and ventilation issues

#### Section 3, Informed Background

Occupants are reportedly experiencing symptoms consistent with building-related illness.

A urine mycotoxin report provided by the client's healthcare provider has indicated specific concerns requiring environmental correlation. Our initial survey identified areas for targeted testing, aligning with the findings of the urine analysis.

We identified toxigenic mould species likely responsible for the biological markers observed and their likely sources and causation factors.

In some instances, environmental decontamination and exposure risk reduction are essential for any medical treatment to be effective.

#### Section 4. Report Basis and Parameters

This survey assesses current and historical water damage or contamination that may contribute to health complaints. This includes:

- Identifying evidence of causation
- Assessing possible construction and design defects
- Considering alterations to the building envelope
- Evaluating lifestyle and ventilation issues

This is an environmental health investigation with a specific focus on building-related illness. It is **not** a structural survey typically conducted by a RICS (Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors) surveyor, nor would a RICS survey typically include mould or contamination assessments.

Our assessment includes areas of known concern; however, hidden or obscured contamination, particularly in cavities or redecorated areas, may go undetected unless biological sampling or intrusive methods are employed. Such an intrusive investigation is beyond the scope of this basic-level report but may be recommended as a follow-up.

#### Section 5. Dust Monitoring

Airborne dust concentration is measured in g/m<sup>3</sup> or particles per million (ppm), with particle sizes typically ranging from 0.1 to 10 microns. A 6-channel laser particle counter is commonly used for this purpose.

Mould fragments are often found in the 2.5-micron range, although whole spores are generally larger than 10 microns.

Tel: 0208 916 5505 Mob: 07990 500 999







Particle

counts support the development of a sampling hypothesis. Elevated counts in specific size ranges may indicate possible contamination sources and can guide where samples are taken.

The particle count results are presented in Table 1 below.

#### Table 1

| AREA             | Particle<br>Size u | .3     | .5     | 1.0   | 2.5  | 5.0 | 10  |
|------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|-------|------|-----|-----|
|                  | Size µ             |        |        |       |      |     |     |
| Ambient          |                    | 16255  | 6793   | 1329  | 217  | 25  | 13  |
| Main bedroom     |                    | 116106 | 33871  | 4135  | 636  | 99  | 53  |
| Shower           |                    | 191649 | 54628  | 7869  | 1121 | 183 | 75  |
| Single bedroom   |                    | 209502 | 62960  | 9012  | 1153 | 161 | 85  |
| Kitchen          |                    | 244872 | 77360  | 11163 | 1444 | 184 | 92  |
| Hallway          |                    | 217447 | 65223  | 9033  | 1203 | 172 | 73  |
| Lounge Piano end |                    | 294233 | 103434 | 13935 | 1668 | 256 | 106 |
| Lounge Table     |                    | 297677 | 102064 | 14516 | 1612 | 247 | 93  |

#### **Conclusions of particles**

Elevated particle counts may sometimes be assumed to be sources of contamination. The highlighted readings above are elevated compared to ambient air and comparison areas The colour-coded table is the author's subjective opinion and has no scientific value. The air has a very high particle loading, although the composition and hazard are unknown.

#### Photographic log of particle counts (edited sample)



#### Section 6: Thermal imaging survey

A thermal imaging camera was used to scan the building envelope and internal substrates to assess temperature differentials, known as  $\Delta T$ . These scans can help identify areas of thermal bridging and inadequate insulation, which may contribute to dew point condensation. Such findings can indicate the need for further investigation into potential leaks, penetrating damp, or moisture retention in materials or insulation.

Thermal imaging surveys often serve as the basis for moisture mapping. However, darker areas in thermal images do not automatically indicate wetness; they may represent cooler regions. These



cooler

zones can result from missing or uneven insulation, air leakage, or dampness and should be interpreted cautiously.

#### The ceiling and adjacent external walls may have condensation issues



#### Section 7. Moisture mapping

The moisture content of various targeted substrates is measured using moisture meters calibrated for the specific material, either through impedance (non-penetrative) or conductive pin meters.

The objective is to assess moisture issues that may contribute to current biological amplification.

Even if areas appear dry, previous moisture exposure may have triggered hidden biological growth, which can remain allergenic or irritating until removed. Inflammagens present within cavities can migrate into occupied spaces.

Moisture readings are evaluated against recognised standards or compared to the equilibrium moisture levels of unaffected areas.

For this purpose, 'equilibrium' refers to the' expected consistent moisture level of identical materials. Where elevated readings are found, penetrative measurements may be necessary.

Mould does not need to be visibly wet or saturated for it to grow. A boundary layer of only a few molecules thick moisture can support mould growth. Mould prefers damp, not wet, conditions.

#### Standards of dry

The tables below show typical limits regarding the moisture content of various materials.







| Structural material    | MC  | WME% | ERH   |
|------------------------|-----|------|-------|
| Wood                   | 16  | 16   | N/A   |
| Drywall (plasterboard) | 3.0 | 12   | 2 N/A |
| Plaster                | 0.3 | 15   | N/A   |
| Brick                  | 1.5 | 15   | 75    |
| Concrete               | 3.5 | 15   | 75    |
| Sand cement screed     | 6.0 | 15   | 75    |

The table is taken from British Standards PAS 64, which also follows BS8201, ASTM F2710, and BS12999.



The floor's moisture content is 5.5, with 4.5 being an action point. This concrete floor is confirmed to be wet and may be a significant source of elevated humidity throughout the house.



A non-destructive impedance measurement of the plasterboard behind the tiles showed that water had penetrated the grouting to wet the plasterboard, resulting in hidden mould growth in the wall cavity between the shower and bedroom.









Wet plasterboard wall at 22% wme, with 12% being a trigger point for action.





Infrared scanning identified possible moisture at the room edges. The conductive moisture probe confirmed the floor is wet at 36% and well above the accepted 20% trigger for mould.



Comparison levels indicating lower moisture issues



Comparison levels indicating lower moisture issues with the likelihood of mould in the cavity







#### Note

These are standards, but interpretation may be required, particularly where historic water damage is present. A significant risk is where water damage in high cellulose materials has been allowed to dry naturally.

The measurement of concrete and screed must follow a recognised protocol, which may require consideration of certain environmental factors and monitoring over 48 hours. Building Forensics will adopt an investigative approach to a lesser degree for simplicity and to contain costs. Where certified evidence is required, a separate instruction will be required.

#### Section 8. Humidity ratio, also known as Specific Humidity

Humidity ratio is a function of relative humidity and temperature, calculating the actual weight of water vapour present in the air in grams per kilogram (g/kg) of dry air. Variations between indoor areas and ambient conditions can reveal potential moisture-related issues.

A thermo-hygrometer equipped with a probe measures this parameter. Uncontrolled evaporation can result in moisture being absorbed by porous, hydrophilic materials, potentially leading to biological amplification.

Elevated humidity ratios can affect even non-porous materials, particularly when condensation occurs due to the dew point. The following readings, including decimal values, are recorded directly from the meter

| Area         | Temp C | RH   | Humidity<br>Ratio |
|--------------|--------|------|-------------------|
| Ambient      | 17.4   | 49.7 | 6.1               |
| Main bedroom | 18.8   | 67.7 | 9.1               |
| Shower       | 18.7   | 69.8 | 9.4               |
| Single bed   | 18.2   | 68.3 | 8.9               |
| Kitchen      | 19.6   | 64.7 | 9.2               |
| Lounge       | 17.6   | 68.5 | 8.6               |

#### All reasonable levels

#### Conclusions

The table above shows that the property has a slightly higher specific humidity compared to ambient air, but at acceptable levels

Elevated specific moisture may be caused by lifestyle and poor ventilation. Typically, a family of four may produce 15 litres of moisture in the air per day from breathing, cooking, showers, etc.

#### **Dew Point Condensation**

Dew point is the temperature at which warm air holding moisture condenses on colder surfaces, leaving droplets that can result in mould growth. It is measured by measuring the temperature of surfaces, usually external walls.



The

measured external walls show temperatures 3 -4 degrees above the dew point, with a condensation risk.



Wall temperatures are generally 15.5 c, and the dew point is around 12 °c

6.4. Conclusion: Low dewpoint risk



**Conclusions:** What are the issues, and where are they **Recommendations:** What to do for risk reduction and remediation

#### End the basic survey and start additional sampling and analysis.

The following sampling and analysis options are optional; each has its benefits depending on your symptoms, and not all are necessary. We will help you decide which is your best option and provide the most helpful information to assist in identifying exposure and illness, as well as a cost guide to suit you and your budget.

The following pages show different types of sampling and analysis. Each has benefits in providing information on the types, forms, and location of exposure. Not essential but worthwhile, budget permitting.





#### Note

While the following Total Spore Count analysis in Option 1 (section 7) is in addition to the preceding introductory survey, we always recommend this analysis as a guide to your exposure to mould.

#### **Option 1: Total Spore Counts for Risk Assessment purposes**

- 7.1. This survey has been developed from our experience of building-related illness and the confirmation of risks identified in the basic study
- 7.2. In this sampling protocol, we collect airborne spores in purpose-made, sealed cassettes for laboratory analysis by qualified mycologists. The results are compared to other areas and outside (ambient) air as a control. This type of sampling identifies the mould genus but not the species. However, the levels are an indicator of risk areas.

| Sample Number | Area collected |
|---------------|----------------|
| 1             | Bed            |
| 2             | Table          |
| 3             | Ambient        |
| 4             | Piano          |

7.3.1. Mycologists cannot distinguish between Penicillium and Aspergillus. Therefore, reports are stated as Penicillium/Aspergillus, and the report is deemed a risk assessment regarding counts and types of mould. It is essential to understand that all forms of sampling and analysis have benefits and shortfalls. While this provides a risk assessment of spore counts, it cannot distinguish species or hyphal fragments.

#### 7.4. Lab result factors

- 7.4.1. The following tables are total spore counts (viable dormant and nonviable)
- 7.4.2. The individual samples should be compared to other areas and the outside (ambient sample)
- 7.4.3. The results may be influenced by debris loading and other factors, and these findings are an integral part of the methodology. Debris loading is dust, including skin, dust mite faeces, dander and general fluff/dirt. The level of dust can obliterate the visual detection of spores when viewed under a microscope.
- 7.4.4. Debris loading is generally rated between 1 and 5, with 5 being dirty air.







- 7.4.5. A simplistic explanation is to consider a plate of peanuts with 1-2 -3 -4 -5 bags of flour dropped on top and see if you can count the peanuts through the flour.
- 7.4.6. The reality is, the dirtier the air, the more the mycologist relies on periphery counts, and this always leads to underestimation

# 7.5. The lab report identifies the percentage of count and the total spore count

The standard report displays a column indicating the percentage of sample fields that have been read. This means that the number of spores counted for each spore type is represented by a certain percentage of fields on which they were observed, not the percentage of the total sample.

#### 7.6. Reporting Limits

The Reporting Limit for a spore type uses the formula listed in the section above and assumes that the lowest raw count that can be detected is one.

#### 7.7. Lab analysis

- 7.7.1. The ambient outside conditions should be compared to inside genus and spore counts (levels), including the percentage identified in the analysis. Our reports provide risk factors from the data collected.
- 7.7.2. Note the high debris loading both inside and outside the property, which may occlude visible identification; therefore, spore counts can be assumed to be higher (see note above, Table 42)
- 7.7.3. Comparison between different locations should also be considered.
- 7.7.4. The spore counts are extremely high
- 7.7.5. The lounge is grossly contaminated, but the bedroom is also bad
- 7.7.6. These identified genera may be considered toxigenic due to levels and environment

#### 7.8. MOST IMPORTANT INFORMATION

The AMB or ambient (outside) count of Aspergillus and Penicillium is essential, as it shows 747 spores per cubic meter of air against the inside property, showing thousands of the same genus. Do not be concerned about the data gathered; we will interpret it.















| Sample ID:                   | 50/         | 4964-01              |                | 50         | 4964-02              |        | 50         | 4964-03              |    | 50          | 4964-04              |    |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|------------|----------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|----|-------------|----------------------|----|
| Client Sample ID:            |             | Bed                  |                |            | Table                |        |            | Amb                  |    | /           | Piano                |    |
| Volume Sampled (L):          |             | 75                   |                |            | 75                   |        |            | 75                   |    |             | 75                   |    |
| Media:                       | Air         | r-O-Cell             |                | Ai         | r-O-Cell             |        | Air        | r-O-Cell             |    | Air         | r-O-Cell             |    |
| Percent of Trace Analyzed:   | 100% at 60/ | 0X Magnification     |                | 100% at 60 | 0X Magnification     |        | 100% at 60 | 0X Magnification     |    | 100% at 60/ | 0X Magnification     | 1  |
| Spore Types                  | Raw Count   | Count/m <sup>3</sup> | %              | Raw Count  | Count/m <sup>3</sup> | %      | Raw Count  | Count/m <sup>3</sup> | %  | Raw Count   | Count/m <sup>3</sup> | %  |
| Alternaria                   | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | 1          | 13                   | 1  | 4           | 53                   | <1 |
| Arthrinium                   | -           | -                    | $\overline{a}$ | Ξ          | -                    | -      | -          | -                    | -  | -           |                      | -  |
| Ascospores                   | 2           | 27                   | <1             | 11         | 147                  | <1     | 17         | 227                  | 9  | 21          | 280                  | 1  |
| Aspergillus/Penicillium-Like | 485         | 6,467                | 83             | 1,553 #    | 20,707               | 66     | 56         | 747                  | 31 | 2,914 #     | 38,853               | 72 |
| Basidiospores                | 72          | 960                  | 12             | 735 #      | 9,800                | 31     | 62         | 827                  | 34 | 945 #       | 12,600               | 23 |
| Bipolaris/Dreschlera         | _           | _                    | -              | 1          | 13                   | <1     | 1          | 13                   | 1  |             | 2                    | -  |
| Botrytis                     |             |                      | -              |            | -                    | -      | -          | -                    | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Chaetomium                   | -           | -                    | -              | 7          | 93                   | <1     | -          | -                    | -  | 8           | 107                  | <1 |
| Cladosporium                 | 17          | 227                  | 3              | 24         | 320                  | 1      | 38         | 507                  | 21 | 99          | 1,320                | 2  |
| Curvularia                   | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | -          | -                    | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Epicoccum                    | 2           | 27                   | <1             | 1          | 13                   | <1     | 1          | 13                   | 1  | 2           | 27                   | <1 |
| Fusarium                     | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | -          |                      | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Ganoderma                    | 1           | 13                   | <1             | 1          | 13                   | <1     | _          | -                    | -  | 10          | 133                  | <1 |
| Memnoniella                  | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | -          | 1-1                  | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Nigrospora                   | _           | _                    | -              |            |                      | -      | _          | <u> </u>             | _  | 2           | 2                    | -  |
| Oidium/Peronospora           |             |                      | -              |            |                      | -      |            | (77)                 | -  | _           | Ξ                    | -  |
| Pithomyces                   | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | -          | -                    | -  | 1           | 13                   | <1 |
| Rust                         | 2           | 27                   | <1             | 1          | 13                   | <1     | <u></u>    | -                    | -  | 1           | 13                   | <1 |
| Scopulariopsis               | -           | -                    | -              | -          | -                    | -      | -          | -                    | -  | 2           | 27                   | <1 |
| Smut/Myxomyces/Periconia     | 77          | _                    | 7              | 1          | 13                   | <1     | 3          | 40                   | 2  | 4           | 53                   | <1 |
| Stachybotrys                 | -           | -                    | -              | 1          | 13                   | <1     | -          | -                    | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Torula                       | _           | _                    | -              | 2          | 27                   | <1     | 1          | 13                   | 1  | 13          | 173                  | <1 |
| Ulocladium                   | -           |                      | -              | -          |                      | -      | -          | -                    | -  | -           | -                    | -  |
| Unidentified Spores          | _           | _                    | -              |            |                      | -      | _          | _                    | -  |             | -                    | -  |
| Total Spores                 | 581         | 7,747                |                | 2,338      | 31,173               |        | 180        | 2,400                |    | 4,024       | 53,653               |    |
| Hyphal Fragments             | 6           | 80                   |                | 31         | 413                  | $\Box$ | 4          | 53                   |    | 31          | 413                  |    |
| Pollen                       | 5           | 67                   |                | 22         | 293                  |        | 37         | 493                  |    | 24          | 320                  |    |
| Debris Rating                |             | 3                    |                |            | 3                    |        |            | 3                    |    |             | 3                    |    |
| Detection Limit              |             | 13                   |                |            | 13                   |        |            | 13                   |    |             | 13                   |    |

# Estimation performed due to high count.





#### Fungal Glossary (Sample page only)



Typically found growing outdoors, considered a water damage indicator



Potential allergen, Potential to produce mycotoxins

| Alternaria  |                |
|---|----------------|
| Description   | Characteristic |
| These are a common plant pathogen involved in the decomposition of plants. In the indoor environment they are found growing on a variety of substrates including sheetrock and other building materials. They are common allergens causing hay fever or hypersensitivity reactions. |                |

| Anthrinium   |                |
|--|----------------|
| Description  | Characteristic |
| These are a plant pathogen found in soil and decomposing plant<br>material. Not typically found growing indoors. One species has<br>been determined to be an allergen. | *              |

| Ascospores  |                |
|---|----------------|
| Description   | Characteristic |
| These are a very large group of spores that are found<br>everywhere in nature. They are commonly found outdoors and<br>associated with rain and moisture. Some species grow well<br>indoors on damp materials. Ascospores have allergenic<br>potential, however, it is species dependent. |                |

| Aspergillus/Penicillium – Like  |                |
|---|----------------|
| Description   | Characteristic |
| These are two of the most common genera in the world. They<br>can be found everywhere in nature, both indoors and outdoors.<br>Indoors they can be found on water damaged wallpaper, carpet,<br>and other organic materials. They can also grow well in<br>conditions of high humidity. Many species are allergens and a<br>common cause of respiratory irritation. Some species are human<br>and animal pathogens and can cause infection. |                |





### Option 2 (Hazard Assessment) is known as ERMI

#### Settled dust and QPCR-DNA dust analysis for mould speciation

- 8.1. The ERMI score should not be considered a risk or hazard assessment, as we usually collect dust from different areas. The risk score is derived from the presence of Group 1 moulds, which are likely to produce mycotoxins and are known as potentially toxigenic
- **8.2.** These moulds are usually present at detection levels in ambient air and are considered markers of water damage and potential health hazards.
- **8.3.** While some may interpret the levels of ERMI score as a health risk, the reality is we have shown adjacent areas can have differing levels and scores (see our paper on mould sampling failures) in free advice <u>Professional Letter</u> (wpdesign.website)
- 8.4. The ERMI score has no significant value, but we interpret the actual species as a risk factor. The information regarding group 1 mould species may be of significant benefit to your medical practitioner
- **8.5.** The "Environmental Relative Mold Index" table below (ERMI) shows the typical results from 1096 homes analysed by the Environmental Protection Agency.



- **8.6.** The EPA developers of ERMI categorically state its use is for professional research use only, and no significance as to risk or hazard can be gained from scores
- **8.7.** No health assessments can be concluded from the ERMI score. Still, the lab results may provide important information regarding restoration and medical treatment, as well as the overall risk and hazards faced in the sampled areas.
- 8.8. An ERMI score of 0 would represent the average level of mould contamination (50%) of homes investigated. It should be pointed out here that a minus score does not mean there is no health hazard or low risk. We have assessed the species, particularly in the group one section.
- **8.9.** We do not advocate using the score as a risk assessment. Building Forensics assesses species from group 1 only, as a hazard assessment
- 8.10. We have included the risk table below for those needing information on the ERMI score.
- 8.11. After sampling over 1000 homes in the UK, we can provide a baseline of high or low, although this is not a hazard or risk assessment







| Level | ERMI<br>Values   | Interpretation                   | Comment  |
|-------|------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Q 1   | Less than<br>- 4 | Low Relative<br>Moldiness Index  | Further investigation is not needed to<br>determine the sources of the mold.   |
| Q 2   | -4 to < 0        | Low - Medium<br>Relative         | Further investigation may be needed to determine the sources<br>of the mold if occupants have been reactive, sensitized, |
| Q 3   | 0 to < 5         | Medium- High<br>Relative         | genetically predisposed or otherwise<br>immuno-compromised.  |
|       | 5 to < 20        | High Relative<br>Moldiness Index | Source and cause of mold should be determined and  |
|       | > 20             | Very High<br>Relative            | Q2.  |

#### Lab analysis Results - Lounge and bedroom

- 8.11.1. There are several very toxic mould species at levels over 1000-fold higher than normal
- 8.11.2. The species identified can reduce your immune system, and the species in Group 1 are potentially toxigenic
- 8.11.3. The species in group 1 are most likely to be a concern to healthcare professionals who may link your symptoms to exposure.
- 8.11.4. We do not recommend using the ERMI score to assess health risks. However, the species loading is an extremely important factor in hazard assessme**nt**
- 8.11.5. Your score of 31 is in Q4 and well above the tigger of 15







| Species                          | Level   | SE/m   | g     |
|----------------------------------|---|--------|-------|
| Aspergillus flavus/oryzae        |   | 235    | * *   |
| Aspergillus fumigatus            | and the second se | 61     | *     |
| Aspergillus niger                |   | 218    | *     |
| Aspergillus ochraceus            |   | 4      |       |
| Aspergillus penicillioides       |   | 12,537 | *     |
| Aspergillus restrictus           |   | 9,311  | * * * |
| Aspergillus sclerotiorum         |   | 8      |       |
| Aspergillus sydowii              |   | N.D    |       |
| Aspergillus unguis               |   | N.D    |       |
| Aspergillus versicolor           |   | 7,071  | * *   |
| Aureobasidium pullulans          |   | 5,264  | *     |
| Chaetomium globosum              |   | 51     | *     |
| Cladosporium sphaerospermum      |   | 199    |       |
| Eurotium (Asp.) amstelodami      |   | 12,436 | * *   |
| Paecilomyces variotii            |   | N.D    |       |
| Penicillium brevicompactum       |   | 4,319  | * *   |
| Penicillium corylophilum         |   | 139    | *     |
| Penicillium crustosum            |   | 355    | *     |
| Penicillium purpurogenum         |   | 17     | *     |
| Penicillium Spinulosum           |   | 52     |       |
| Penicillium variabile            |   | 22     |       |
| Scopulariopsis brevicaulis/fusca |   | 19     |       |
| Scopulariopsis chartarum         |   | 224    | *     |
| Stachybotrys chartarum           |   | 5      |       |
| Trichoderma viride               |   | 2,937  | * *   |
| Wallemia sebi                    |   | 11,003 | *     |

#### Note

Although not as toxic as Group 1, the species identified in Group 2 are still potentially allergenic and have some toxicity.







1,000 fold higher than normal.

| pecies            | Level   | SE/n  | ng  |  |
|-------------------|---|---|---|--|
|                   |   | 191   | *   |  |
|                   |   | 6   |   |  |
|                   |   | 23  | *   |  |
| orioides1         | 8,751   |   |   |  |
| orioides2         |   | 317   | *   |  |
| m                 | 1,983   |   |   |  |
|                   | 1,693   |   |   |  |
|                   |   | 96  |   |  |
| um                |   | 7,711   | * *   |  |
|                   |   | 72  | *   |  |
| Sum of logs (     | G2  | 25.   | 1   |  |
| Ermi Results = (0 | G1-G2)  | 31.   | 31.1  |  |
|                   | orioides1<br>orioides2<br>m<br>um<br>Sum of logs (<br>Ermi Results = (0 | crioides1<br>orioides2<br>m<br>um<br>Sum of logs G2<br>Ermi Results = (G1-G2) | Level SE/n   191 6   0rioides1 8,751   orioides2 317   m 1,983   1,693 96   um 7,711   72 Sum of logs G2 25.   Ermi Results = (G1-G2) 31. |  |



Logs

ND

= Logarithms

= None Detected

#### 8.12. Significant results

Building Forensics has analysed over 750 ERMI scores in the UK

- Your score is almost 2.5 times higher than the UK national average ٠
- This HERTSMI score is 4 times the level considered safe for CIRS patients to be • exposed to. (See note)







#### 9. HERTSMI 2

9.1. This is a risk assessment of hazards identified in the QPCR-DNA sample analysis. This calculation is based on thousands of patients with varying exposures and their responses to medications, as recorded by their practitioners. The higher the HERTSMI 2 score is, the less likely the CIRS patient is to respond to treatment while those contaminants remain at high levels

#### **HERTSMI 2 Score - Lounge and bedroom**

| HERTS                      | MI-2 Species | Spore E./mg       | Weighting |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Aspergillus penicillioides |              | 12,537            | 10 *      |
| Aspergillus versico        | lor          | 7,071             | 10 * *    |
| Chaetomium globo           | sum          | 51                | 6 *       |
| Stachybotrys chart         | arum         | 5                 | 4         |
| Wallemia sebi              |              | 11,003            | 10 *      |
| Sample Size                | 5.0 mg       | HERTSMI-2 Score = | 40        |

#### 9.2. HERTMI 2 Table of risk

The HERTSMI -2 score of 40 in this property is likely unsafe for persons with CIRS, or an inflammatory response and treatment of any sort is unlikely to have any benefit. With elevated exposure in the home, the intake of toxins and inflammagens is likely to surpass the benefits of treatment. We have free information papers on guidance if you request.

| Color-coded interpretation <sup>10</sup> |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| If 10 or below                           | In only 1.7% of cases, re-occupancy of building following mold<br>remediation has led to relapse of CIRS-WDB symptoms |  |  |  |
| If between 11 to 15                      | Borderline. Further remediation and re-assessment is indicated  |  |  |  |
| If greater than 15                       | Re-occupancy is ill-advised until further remediation and re-<br>assessment are conclusive.                           |  |  |  |

9.3. Genetically close-related species may be detected in the indicator assay





| As reported                      | Includes   |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Eurotium (Asp.) amstelodami      | E. chevalieri, E. herbariorum, E. rubrum and E. repens.                                  |
| Penicillium spinulosum           | P. glabrum, P. lividum, P. pupurescens, and P. thomii.                                   |
| Trichoderma viride               | T. koningii and T. atroviride.   |
| Aspergillus restrictus           | A. caesillus and A. conicus.   |
| Mucor amphibiorum                | M. circinelloides, M. hiemalis, M. indicus,<br>M. mucedo, M. racemosus, M. ramosissimus. |
| Rhizopus zygosporus              | R. homothalicus, R. microsporus, R. oligosporus, R. oryzae.                              |
| Penicillium crustosum            | P. camembertii, P. commune, P. echinulatum, P. solitum.                                  |
| Aspergillus niger                | Know called Aspergillus basiliensis  |
| Scopulariopsis brevicaulis/fusca | Has been renamed as species of Microascus <sup>10</sup>                                  |
| Wallemia sebi                    | W. mellicola, W. canadensis <sup>11</sup>  |

#### **Option 3: Actinomyces (Edited from 5 pages)**

Actinomycosis are believed to play a significant part <u>in</u> building-related illnesses and may be responsible for many symptoms, which are sometimes misdiagnosed as mould illness and CIRS. Generally, bacteria grow before mould; some studies suggest bacteria may be a higher risk factor in mould illness (inflammatory response) than mycotoxins.





#### Lounge and bedroom

|                                | Pathogen Score (Q Leve)     | Q4 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----|
| Black Water Score (A Level) Q1 | Black Water Score (/ Level) | Q1 |

BILE INS

| ACTIVE           | Score interpretation (water Damage)     |
|------------------|---|
| 20 or below      | Indicative of a Healthy Building        |
| Between 21 to 23 | Further investigation needed            |
| Greater than 24  | Suggestive of Building Related Illness. |

|          | Total Species | Pathogen Species | Be/mg Total | Q Level |
|----------|---------------|------------------|-------------|---------|
| Bacteria | 3,074         | 214              | 8,583,513   | Q 4     |
| Actino   | 708           | 61               |             |         |

#### Summary of Bacteria's Order

| Orders Detected     | Abundance<br>B.E/mg | Families | Abundance | Fold 🛦 | Diversity | Fold 🛦 | Pathogen |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|
| Actinomycetales     | 1,106,585           | 41       | 23 %      | 0.9    | 15.7 %    | 0.9    | 61       |
| Bacillales          | 857,964             | 14       | 18 %      | 1.4    | 5.4 %     | 0.8    | 24       |
| Clostridiales       | 373,495             | 25       | 8 %       | 2.5    | 9.6 %     | 1.2    | 36       |
| Rhizobiales         | 190,651             | 13       | 4 %       | 1.5    | 5.0 %     | 1.1    | 1        |
| Rhodospirillales    | 172,874             | 3        | 4 %       | 0.8    | 1.1 %     | 0.7    | 0        |
| Acidimicrobiales    | 122,831             | 3        | 3 %       | 5.8    | 1.1 %     | 0.9    | 0        |
| Rhodobacterales     | 116,230             | 1        | 2 %       | 0.9    | 0.4 %     | 0.6    | 0        |
| Sphingomonadales    | 115,543             | 2        | 2 %       | 1.8    | 0.8 %     | 0.8    | 0        |
| Gaiellales          | 112,873             | 1        | 2 %       | 1.7    | 0.4 %     | 0.3    | 0        |
| Solirubrobacterales | 94,334              | 3        | 2 %       | 6.0    | 1.1 %     | 1.0    | 0        |

Fold over normal top orders

Table only list 10





|                 | _  |      |                  |
|-----------------|--|------|------------------|
| B.E             | = Bacteria Equivalents   | Logs | = Logarithms     |
| B.E/mg          | = B.E/miligrams of sample                                      | ND   | = None Detected  |
| (***)<br>(****) | 100 fold higher than normal.<br>1,000 fold higher than normal. | P    | = Human Pathogen |

|   | Actino                              | Species Dete | cted     |                             |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|
|   | Genus & Species                     | B.E/mg       | Comments | Q Level                     |
| 1 | Actinomyces funkei                  | 343          | P        |                             |
| 2 | Actinomyces massiliensis            | 343          |          | -                           |
| 3 | Actinomyces naesłundii              | 343          | P        |                             |
| 4 | Actinomyces nasicola                | 86           |          | -                           |
| 5 | Actinomyces odontolyticus           | 1,803        | P        | -                           |
| 6 | Actinomyces viscosus                | 172          | P        |                             |
| 9 | Corynebacterium amycolatum          | 5,751        | P        |                             |
| 0 | Corynebacterium appendicis          | 28,669       | *        |                             |
| 1 | Corynebacterium aurimucosum         | 4,893        |          |                             |
| 2 | Corynebacterium capitovis           | 515          |          |                             |
| 3 | Corynebacterium glycinophilum       | 343          |          |                             |
| 4 | Corynebacterium imitans             | 5,064        | P        |                             |
| 5 | Corynebacterium jeddahense          | 601          |          |                             |
|   | Cyanobacter                         | ia Species D | etected  |                             |
|   | Genus & Species                     | B.E/mg       | Comments | Q Level                     |
|   | Aerosakkonema funiforme             | 343          |          | -                           |
|   | Anabaena cylindrica                 | 1,030        |          | -                           |
|   | Anabaena flosUnclassifiedaquae      | 515          |          | Microcystin                 |
|   | Anabaena sp                         | 2,232        |          | Anatoxin-a, Microcystin     |
|   | Aphanizomenon flosUnclassifiedaquae | 2,918        |          | Cylindrospermopsins, Saxito |
|   | Brasilonema bromeliae               | 3,262        |          |                             |
|   | Brasilonema terrestre               | 4,206        |          |                             |
|   | Calochaete cimrmanii                | 773          |          | -                           |







#### ACTINO INDEX

#### Human Habitat (HH)

#### Soil Habitat (SH)

| Species                            | Species B.E/mg Species |   | B.E/r | ng                             |         |      |     |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------|--------------------------------|---------|------|-----|
| Actinomadura chibensis             | ND                     | 1 |       | Arthrobacter creatinolyticus   | ND      |      | _   |
| Actinomyces canis                  | ND                     |   |       | Arthrobacter crystallopoietes  | 86      | P    |     |
| Actinomyces europaeus              | 86                     | Ρ | *     | Brevibacterium mcbrellneri     | 258     | Ρ    | *   |
| Actinomyces meyeri                 | ND                     |   |       | Brevibacterium paucivorans     | 3,691   | Ρ    | **  |
| Actinomyces neuli                  | 86                     | P |       | Clavibacter michiganensis      | 1.288   | P    | *   |
| Actinomyces odontolyticus          | 1,803                  | P | *     | Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens  | 2,403   | P    | *   |
| Actinomyces turicensis             | 2,146                  | P | **    | Gordonia terrae                | 86      | Р    |     |
| Corynebacterium accolens           | 14,077                 | P | **    | Nocardia higoensis             | ND      |      |     |
| Corynebacterium amycolatum         | 5,751                  | Ρ | *     | Rathayibacter tritici          | ND      |      |     |
| Corynebacterium argentoratense     | ND                     |   |       | Rhodococcus equi               | ND      |      |     |
| Corynebacterium coyleae            | 429                    | Ρ | *     | Rhodococcus fascians           | ND      |      |     |
| Corynebacterium falsenii           | 172                    | P |       | Saccharopolyspora rectivirgula | 1,202   | Ρ    |     |
| Corynebacterium glucuronolyticum   | ND                     |   |       | Sanguibacter suarezii          | 429     | P    | *   |
| Corynebacterium hansenii           | ND                     |   |       |                                |         | 5. V |     |
| Corynebacterium imitans            | 5,064                  | Ρ |       |                                |         |      |     |
| Corynebacterium jeikeium           | 23,004                 | Ρ | **    |                                |         |      |     |
| Corynebacterium kroppenstedtii     | 4,034                  | P |       |                                |         |      |     |
| Corynebacterium matruchotii        | 86                     | Р |       | B E = Bacteria Equivale        | nts     |      |     |
| Corynebacterium minutissimum       | ND                     |   |       | BE/mg = BE/milligrams of       | sample  |      |     |
| Corynebacterium propinquum         | ND                     |   |       | ND = None Detected             |         |      |     |
| Corynebacterium resistens          | ND                     |   |       | P = Human Pathogen             | -       |      |     |
| Corynebacterium riegelii           | 172                    | Ρ | *     | (*) 5 fold higher that         | n norm  | al.  |     |
| Corynebacterium simulans           | 6,094                  | Ρ | **    | (**) 50 fold higher the        | an norr | nal  | 1   |
| Corynebacterium striatum           | 86                     | Ρ |       | (***) 500 fold higher t        | han no  | rma  | al. |
| Corynebacterium sundsvallense      | ND                     |   |       | Normal values is based of      | n bact  | eria |     |
| Corvnebacterium tuberculostearicum | 255.617                | P | **    | distribution on 1 000 US       | Shome   | ag . |     |

#### **Bacterial analysis results**

The lab's colour-coded report shows this home in the fourth quantile, which means its contamination is above 75% worse than average.

The bacteria present are associated with cancer, including Liver and respiratory paralysis. Another bacterial species is also associated with cancer and can cause protein phosphatase inhibition. The levels identified from this sample are NOT very high, but you should know their presence if symptoms and/or treatment have been unsuccessful.







#### **Option 4: AI Robot**

#### About Enviroscope® Technology

Enviroscope® instantly detects and identifies the biological portion of airborne particulate matter, including:

- PM2.5 and PM10
- Mould spores
- Bacteria and viruses
- Pollen
- Relative Humidity and Temperature
- Optional: CO2 and Total Volatile Organic Compounds

# This cutting-edge system interprets results using advanced algorithms and particle analysis and provides a real-time indoor air quality profile

#### See more about this revolutionary technology

#### **Enviroscope report**

As the unit and wand are moved, the contamination component levels are displayed on the iPad screen on the handle. This allows areas of high concentration to be further risk assessed by other analyses. This reduces sampling costs and improves accuracy

#### Scan-by-Scan Mould Comparison

The <u>Scan by Scan</u> Mould Comparison shows all the particle readings per cubic meter (p/m<sup>3</sup>) in one chart, for each area, and can be used to compare rooms to each other and to the baseline scan (if present).







# Scan-by-Scan Total PM Comparison

The Scan-by-Scan PM Comparison chart shows each area's PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> Bio, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>Bio levels as they compare in micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup>).





#### Scan-by-Scan Total PM Comparison

The Scan-by-Scan PM Comparison chart shows each area's PM2.5, PM2.5 Bio, PM10 and PM10Bio levels as they compare in micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>).



#### Scan-by-Scan CO2 Comparison

The <u>Scan by Scan</u> CO<sub>2</sub> Comparison chart shows each area's CO<sub>2</sub> levels in parts per million (ppm) as they compare to other areas assessed.





# Scan-by-Scan VOC Comparison

The Scan-by-Scan VOC Comparison chart shows each area's VOC levels per billion (ppb) compared to other areas assessed.



#### Hall Summary

| AREA STAT    | S                             |            |                       |           |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|
|              | VOC 716 <sub>ppb</sub>        | CO2 856ppm | Humidity 51%          | Temp 20 c |
| PARTICULA    | TE MATTER (P/M <sup>3</sup> ) |            |                       |           |
|              | MOLD 🕎                        | POLLEN     | <b>BACTERIA/VIRUS</b> | TOTAL BIO |
| Quiescent    | 11K                           | 800        | 8K                    | 20K       |
| Resuspension | —                             | —          | —                     | _         |
| OBSERVATI    | ONS                           |            |                       |           |
| —            |                               |            |                       |           |
| SOURCETRA    | ACKING MOLD                   |            |                       |           |
| —            |                               |            |                       |           |
|              |                               |            |                       |           |

#### Main bed rachael Summary

| AREA STAT    | 5                             |            |                |           |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|
|              | VOC 798 <sub>ppb</sub>        | CO2 955ppm | Humidity 53%   | Temp 20℃  |
| PARTICULA    | TE MATTER (P/M <sup>3</sup> ) |            |                |           |
|              | MOLD 🚫                        | POLLEN     | BACTERIA/VIRUS | TOTAL BIO |
| Quiescent    | 18K                           | 0          | 8K             | 26K       |
| Resuspension | —                             | —          | —              | _         |
| OBSERVATI    | ONS                           |            |                |           |
| —            |                               |            |                |           |
| SOURCETRA    | ACKING MOLD                   |            |                |           |
| —            |                               |            |                |           |
|              |                               |            |                |           |

Tel: 0208 916 5505 Mob: 07990 500 999







#### **Report Conclusions**

27

All lab analysis is produced into actionable, understandable information to enable you and your healthcare professional to make sensible data-based decisions.

#### **Report Recommendations**

Our recommendations will revolve around industry best practices and standards. Most importantly, as an award-winning specialist in remediation, decontamination and risk reduction, where or if necessary, we will provide you with sensible solutions

Please don't worry about understanding the data; that's our job, and we will interpret it into understandable actions and meanings, and we're here to answer your questions (by email, please).