



Evidence-Based Best Practices for IAQ in High Performance Homes

Brett C. Singer bcsinger@lbl.gov



Energy & Environmental Building Alliance High Performance Home Summit 2017 Atlanta GA

Learning Objectives

- Best practices to reduce IAQ risk
 -> IAQ Scoring Tool
- Interim findings IAQ study in new, California homes
- Building America study of IAQ in new US homes
- Low-cost IAQ monitors for residential PM_{2.5}
- Florida Solar Energy Center demonstration of smart ventilation for energy savings and comfort



Acknowledgements





EPA Indoor Environments Division



CEC Public Interest Research Programs



HUD Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control



Rengie Chan



Woody

Delp

Yang-Seon Kim



Brennan

Less



Vi

Rapp





Max Sherman







3 Singer 10/10/2017

What is good indoor air quality?

- Pollutant concentrations at <u>safe</u> levels
- No dampness & mold issues
- Allergens minimized
- No unpleasant odors
- Comfortable temperature and humidity
- Air seems "fresh" and pleasant





Best practices to minimize IAQ risk

- Start with Indoor airPLUS / Energy Star
 - Water tight, robust drainage
 - Robust ventilation for kitchen, bath, laundry, dwelling
 - Low-emitting materials
 - Commissioning and pre-ventilation
- Moisture and comfort managed; dehumidification and humidification as needed
- Airtight and well-insulated envelope
- Filtration for fine and ultrafine particles (≥MERV13)
- Minimize potentially hazardous SVOC*
- Build for changing climate: resilient to storms & floods



Best practices for IAQ performance

Occupants aware, educated, and empowered

- Aware of indoor pollutant sources and controls
- Manuals describing equipment, use, required maintenance

Robust control equipment:

- Minimal maintenance and/or service contracts
- Automated fault detection

Sensors:

- Aid awareness
- Closed loop control
- Fault detection





NOT Best Practices

- Unvented gas heater / fireplace
- Built on a flood plane, former wetland, etc.
- Inattention to radon risk
- Inadequate kitchen exhaust / recirc range hood
- Build tight and leave ventilation to the occupant



IAQ Score – Example New Home



IAQ Score Framework

- Rates the home as found
- Considers typical IAQ hazards and risks
 - Includes typical occupant activities
- Adds house-specific risks
 - Nearby outdoor source, mold contamination, etc.
- Quantifies severity of hazard and effectiveness of control
- Value of each control depends on severity of hazard
- Considers control robustness, ease of use, durability, etc.



Concerns about IAQ in California New Homes

- 2004-5: Surveyed ~1500 new homeowners by mail¹
 - Few opened windows in winter; many did not ventilate all year
 - Kitchen and bath ventilation not used regularly
- 2007-8: Measured pollutants & ventilation in 108 new homes²
 - 9 of 16 homes with ducted mechanical ventilation had grossly insufficient flow
 - Many homes did not use windows for ventilation; 67% below code requirement
 - Majority of homes exceeded formaldehyde health guidelines
- 2008: California Building Code requires mech. ventilation
- 2014: Healthy Efficient New Gas Homes study begins
 - Funded by Public Interest Natural Gas Research program



California New Home Study

Goal: Characterize ventilation equipment and IAQ in homes built to 2008 code, which required mechanical ventilation per ASHRAE 62.2

- Web-based survey to update knowledge about ventilation practices and IAQ perceptions
- Field study in occupied homes:
 - Characterize ventilation equipment, measure flows
 - One-week monitoring of ventilation and indoor air quality; occupants log activities that impact IAQ
 - LBNL designed protocols and analyzing data
 - GTI collecting data with help from PG&E and SoCalGas



Californians* in more satisfied with IAQ than outdoor air quality



12

Californians recognize that recirculating range hoods not as effective as venting hoods





California New Home Study

Data from first 21 homes	Mean	Range
Size (ft ²)	2818	1363 – 4975
# of Bedrooms	3.8	3 – 5
# of Full Bathrooms	3.0	2 - 5
Year Built	2014	2011- 2015
Number of Occupants	3.1	1 - 8
Density (ft ² / occupant)	1149	387 - 2127







Dwelling unit mechanical ventilation meets code in most homes, exceeds in many





Range hood exhaust flows have sufficient flow*



*Also code requirement for sound

BERKELEY LA

Measured bath & toilet exhaust fans meet code



Master Bathroom

Toilet

Bathroom 2



Mean of first 17 homes (5 ACH50) is slightly higher than homes in LBNL Air Leakage Database (resdb.lbl.gov)*





18 Singer 10/10/2017

*Reported in Chan et al., LBNL-5967E

Nitrogen dioxide very low in first 21 homes



NO₂ Concentration (ppb)

<u>Mullen et al. 2016</u> Mean outdoor = 17 Mean Kitchen = 23



Formaldehyde lower than in prior CA study



BERKELEY LA

Formaldehyde decreases with air exchange rate





Formaldehyde may not decrease over time





Collect baseline data

 Measure indoor air pollutants and humidity, characterize mechanical system designs and performance in a diverse sample of new homes (2013 or later) and climates.

Inform standards and technology development

 Analyze data to assess impacts of current building practices, codes and standards on IAQ, to inform future standards and technology development needed to ensure acceptable IAQ in new homes.



Study Scope

• Target 32 homes per CZ:

~50% with 62.2-compliant mechanical ventilation (MV)



- Characterize home, mechanical equipment
- Survey occupants about activities, satisfaction
- Monitor

 ventilation, IAQ,
 activities for 1
 week; repeat for
 2nd week in 8
 homes / CZ



Project Team

DOE Building America

Project direction and management for impact

Lawrence Berkeley National Lab

- Design field study procedures
- Create & manage database
- Analyze data to inform standards & technology development
- Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC), Pacific NW National Lab (PNNL)
 - Recruit and collect field data
 - Quality assurance and upload data
 - Analysis by climate zone
 - Enhancements



Measurements

- Diagnostic testing
 - Envelope & duct airtightness
 - Mechanical ventilation equipment rated and measured flows
- One-week monitoring
 - Use of ventilation equipment and activities
 - Pollutants & environment

(Outdoor, Indoor, Bedroom)

- PM_{2.5}[:] O, I*, B*
- CO₂: I, B
- NO₂, NO_X: O, I, B
- Formaldehyde: O, I, B
- T, RH: O, I, B, baths
- 26 Singer 10/10/2017 *Low-cost monitor used in this location

- Dwelling unit ventilation system
- Most frequently used bath fans
- Kitchen exhaust
- Clothes dryer
- Water heater in conditioned space
- Heating/cooling equipment
- Standalone (de)humidification equipment
- Standalone air cleaner

U.S. Department of Energy

- Cooktop, oven, and toaster oven use
- Fireplace use

Low-Cost / Consumer Grade Indoor Air Quality Monitors



What's available to measure PM?



Packaged devices ~\$200

- A pleasing box that may have a display or glow according to the perceived IAQ
- May have additional sensors (CO₂, VOC, ...)
- Cloud storage



Possibility of controlling things





Low Cost Devices Evaluated ~ \$200-300



PM, T, RH

<u>AirVisual Node</u>



PM2.5, PM10, T, RH, CO2

AirQualityEgg V2



PM, T, RH

<u>AWAIR</u>



PM, T, RH, CO2, VOC





Counts (Small, Large)



PM, T, RH, CO2, VOC

PurpleAir V2



PM1, PM2.5, PM10, T, RH Speck V2





For what do we need IAQ monitors?

• Measure things we can't see or smell

- Hazard identification
- Closed loop control

- Assess benefits of controls or retrofits
- Track performance over time
- Quantify IAQ



For what do we need IAQ monitors?

• Measure things we can't see or smell

- Hazard identification
- Closed loop control

Reliable: see every important event Some "false positives" OK. Reversible: recovers after a spike Quantitative not essential Drift okay if relating rise to recent



For what do we need IAQ monitors?

• Measure things we can't see or smell

- Assess benefits of controls or retrofits
- Track performance over time
- Quantify IAQ

Quantitative; Limited drift Not varying with environmental conditions



What do we want to measure?

	Parameter	Identify hazard	Activate controls	Evaluate benefits	Track over time
Satisfaction	T/RH/CO ₂				
Smell it	Odors				
Smell or see it	Dampness and mold				
Misleading	TVOC				
Mostly indoor sources	Formaldehyde, Radon				
	Carbon Monoxide (CO)				
	Acrolein, NO ₂				
Indoor and	PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀				
outdoor	Ultrafine particles				
sources	Irritants / Allergens				
Mostly	Diesel PM / Black carbon				
outdoor sources	Ozone				

AMERILA

U.S. Department of Energy

BERKELEY LAB

What do we want to measure?

	Parameter	Identify hazard	Activate controls	Evaluate benefits	Track over time
Satisfaction	T/RH/CO ₂		v	~	v
Smell it	Odors		 ✓ 	~	✓
Smell or see it	Dampness and mold	~		 ✓ 	v
Misleading	TVOC	 V 	~	~	✓
Mostlv	Formaldehyde, Radon	~	~	~	v
indoor	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	~	~	~	v
sources	Acrolein, NO ₂ (\$\$)	~	 ✓ 	 V 	 V
Indoor and	PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀	~	~	 V 	 V
outdoor	Ultrafine particles	✓	✓	✓	4
sources	Irritants / Allergens	✓	✓	✓	4
Mostly	Diesel PM (\$\$)	~	 ✓ 	 V 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
outdoor sources	Ozone (\$\$)	~	 ✓ 		 /
Mostly outdoor sources				AIVIENILA 21 U.S. Department	of Energy BERKELEY

BERKELEY LAB

Some information on the web

- EPA: mostly focusing on outdoors https://www.epa.gov/air-sensor-toolbox
- South Coast AQMD: outdoor and chamber tests
 http://www.aqmd.gov/aq-spec/home
- Carnegie Mellon (chambers)
 https://explorables.cmucreatelab.org/explorables/air-quality-monitor-tests/
- Air quality in China (outdoors)
 http://aqicn.org/sensor/



Low-cost IAQ monitors for residential PM_{2.5}

- Most of the existing evaluations of low-cost particle monitors done outdoors or with ideal aerosols
- Particles emitted in homes vary with the source, and may differ greatly from outdoor aerosols

Question:

Do any of the available low-cost IAQ monitors provide quantitative data or reliably track reference monitors?

Study:

In lab, generate particles from typical indoor activities and compare low-cost to research and reference monitors.



Evaluation of low-cost particle monitors

Experiments conducted in a 120-m³ room





Sources to evaluate low-cost particle monitors







Burning / Heated











Sources to evaluate low-cost particle monitors







40 Singer 10/10/2017

Reference Instruments ~ \$35000 each

Thermo-Scientific TEOM-1405DF



Direct Mass readings PM_{2.5}, PM_{Coarse}

Aerosol Spectrometer Particle size distribution in 41 channels from 10nm up to 35μ m





Grimm miniWRAS

Research Instruments ~ \$4000-7000

Light scattering devices $PM_{2.5} \sim 1\mu g \cdot m^{-3}$ to 100+ mg $\cdot m^{-3}$







Ratio of Reference to Low-Cost Response



Ratio of Reference to Low-Cost Response



Low-cost particle monitors for indoor PM

- None of the devices were quantitative across all or even most of the sources.
 - If sources vary, cannot use low-cost monitors to quantify pollutant exposures.
- Several "saw" most of the sources; could be used to control filtration and ventilation to reduce in-home exposures.
- All of the low-cost devices failed to see sources dominated by ultrafine particles.
 - Need another way to detect UFP for control.
 - VOC sensors *could* partially fill this gap.





Office of ENERGY EFFICIENCY & RENEWABLE ENERGY



Variable Capacity Comfort Systems and Smart Ventilation Systems in High-Performance Homes

Panelists

Eric Martin, Chuck Withers, Danny Parker, and Karen Fenaughty – Florida Solar Energy Center

October 3, 2017





Smart Mechanical Ventilation Systems

- Systems optimize energy consumption and comfort while maintaining IAQ by varying fan operation.
- Systems ventilate more during periods that provide energy, comfort, and/or IAQ advantages and less during periods that provide a disadvantage.
- System operation controlled in response to differing control variables, such as outdoor temperature, outdoor moisture, occupancy, etc.



ASHRAE 62.2-2016 Appendix C

- Procedures for evaluation of time-varying ventilation
- Occupant exposure to pollutants relative to continuous ventilation
- Average (annual) relative exposure = 1 (chronic exposure)
- Peak exposure < 5 for any time step (acute exposure)
- No existing system varies flow rate while maintaining relative exposure



Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality in Residential Buildings

See Appendix D for approval dates by the ASHRAE Standards Committee, the ASHRAE Board of Directors, and the American National Standards Institute.

This Standard is under continuous maintenance by a Standing Standard Project Committee (SSPC) for which the Standards Committee has established a documented program for regular publication of addenda or revisions, including procedures for timely, documented, consensus action on requests for change to any part of the Standard. The change submittal form, instructions, and deadlines: may be obtained in electronic form from the ASHRAE website (www.ashrae.org) or in paper form from the Senior Manager of Standards. The latest edition of an ASHRAE Standard may be purchased from the ASHRAE website (www.ashrae.org) or from ASHRAE Customer Service, 1791 Tullie Circle, NE, Atlanta, GA 30329-2305. E-mail: orders@Bahrae.org, Fac: 678-539-2129. Telephone: 404-636-6400 (worldwide), or toll free 1-800-527-4723 (for orders in US and Canada). For reprint permission, go to www.ashrae.org/permissions.

© 2016 ASHRAE ISSN 1041-2336

STANDARD









Vary mechanical ventilation airflow with an algorithm that interprets measurements of current and 24-hour historical outdoor temperature and moisture.

 $RSS = \sqrt{(\Delta T * X \downarrow T) 12} + (\Delta W * X \downarrow W) 12$

Hourly Fan Flow = (Target Fan Flow * (Average $RSS_1:RSS_{23}/RSS_{24}$)

Period (defined by hourly outdoor T)	Parameter	Phase I Scheme Values
Cooling	Outdoor temp range for cooling period target Cooling period target fan flow	> 71.5°F 55 cfm
Heating	Outdoor temp range for heating period target Heating period target fan flow	< 60°F 75 cfm
Floating	Outdoor temp range for floating period target Floating period target fan flow	<= 71.5°F; >= 60°F 138 cfm (fan limit)
All	Indoor temperature Delta-temperature weight (X⊤) Indoor moisture (W) Delta-moisture weight (Ww)	64.4°F 2 12g/m ³ 1





Phase I Simulated Results





Phase II

	Period	Parameter	Phase I Scheme	Phase II Scheme	
			Values	Values	
	Cooling	Outdoor temp for cooling period target	> 71.5°F	> 71.5°F	
	U U	Cooling period target fan flow	55 cfm	75 cfm	
		Outdoor temperature for fan override	n/a	>= 88°F	
	Heating	Outdoor temp for heating period target	< 60°F	< 50°F	
	C C	Heating period target fan flow	75 cfm	75 ctm	
	Floating	Outdoor temp for floating period target	<= 71.5°F; >= 60°F	<= 71.5°F; >=50°F	
	-	Floating period target fan flow	138 cfm (fan limit)	209 cfm (fan limit)	
		Outdoor W to adjust floating period target	n/a	>= 15g/m3	
		Floating period target adjusted for W	n/a	75 cfm	
	All	Indoor temperature (T)	64.4°F	64.4°F	
		Delta-temperature weight (X⊤)	2	2	
		Indoor moisture (W)	12g/m3	12g/m3	
		Delta-moisture weight (Xw)	1	1	
				Constant Flow	
		Phase II Scheme Simulated Smart Ventilation	Algorithm, TMY3 Orlando		
		Fan Flow (96 CFM) and Relative Ex	kposure (1.01)	 Daily Avg. RF 	v
					3.0
200					25
175					2.5
150					2.0 NSO
125					
100		والمحالي المحالي المحالي المحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمحالي والمح			ivel
75					1.0 lat
50					0.5
25	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			The second se	0.5

5/29 6/8

6/20 6/30

7/11

7/20 8/1 8/12 8/22 9/13 9/23 10/4 10/13 10/25

9/1

12/16 12/28

BERKELEY LAB

11/5 11/14 11/26 12/7

AMEK

U.S. Department of Energy

1/1 1/11 1/22 2/1 2/12 2/12 3/5 3/15 3/15 4/17 4/17 5/7 5/7

Fan Flow (CFM)

Laboratory Evaluation





FSEC FRTF Labs

- 1,536 ft², 2.2 ACH50
- Supply ventilation
- ASHRAE 62.2-2016

 $Q_{total} = Q_{fan} + \varphi Q_{inf} = 76.1 \text{ cfm}$ $\varphi = 1, Q_{fan} = 66 \text{ cfm}$ $\varphi \neq 1, Q_{fan} = 75 \text{ cfm}$



Key findings





- Accurate sensing of local outdoor temperature is
 - Air temperature higher near ground & varies w/ time of day
 - Ideal summer ventilation outdoor target temp not 75, but ~65^{oco} Fs chart by amCharts
- Hi-outlet to interior temps emphasize
 SV comfort potential

Ч

70





Phase I Experimental Results





Phase I vs. Phase II Experimental Results

Phase I:
Summer

Month	Cooling Energy (kWh)			(kWh) Fan Energy (kWh)				Tota	al (kWh)	/	
	Fixed	Smart	Savings	Fixed	Smart	Savings	Fixed	Smart	Savings	/ %	
										Saving	ł
Aug	1,312	1,295	16	29	18	11	1,340	1,313	27	2%	
Sep	1,011	1,013	(2)	29	18	10	1,039	1,031	8	1%	Γ
Oct	671	624	47	29	21	8	700	645	55	8%	/

Phase II: Summer

	Month	Cooli	ng Energ	y (kWh)	Far	ı Energy (kWh)		Total Energy (kW			
1.		Fixed	Smart	Savings	Fixed	Smart	Savings	Fixed	Smart	Savings	<u>%</u>
r											Saving
-	May	719	630	89	29	36	(7)	748	666	82	11%
	Jun	822	749	73	29	20	8	851	770	81	9.5%
	Jul	1,011	924	87	29	26	2	1,040	950	89	8.6%

FSEC[®]

Buildin

U.S. Department of Energy

.....

BERKELEY LAB



Smart Ventilation (SV) Conclusions

- <u>10% summer cooling energy savings can be achieved</u>
 - Potential for greater savings with enthalpy heat recovery and optimization of fan energy (var. speed motor)
 - <u>Certainty of improved comfort</u> & likely acceptability
 - Reduction in fan power critical to positive ann. savings
 - Need evaluation of SV control method across climates

For more information: <u>www.fsec.ucf.edu</u> <u>www.bapirc.org</u>

Eric Martin: martin@fsec.ucf.edu



Thank You!

PDF copy of the FSEC presentation available:

http://energy.gov/eere/buildings/building-americameetings#current

Visit: www.buildingamerica.gov





Visit the Meetings page at: http://energy.gov/eere/buildings/building-americameetings#current

Subscribe to notices about webinars and other news at:

http://energy.gov/eere/buildings/subscribe-building-americaupdates



