

Control of air flows to reduce energy use in buildings

Steven J Emmerich

Engineering Laboratory

National Institute of Standards & Technology

WHY GREEN BUILDINGS CANNOT BE BUILT WITHOUT AIR
BARRIER SYSTEMS

NIBS Workshop 2010



Outline

- Background
- Airtightness of U.S. commercial buildings
- Energy impacts
- What about existing buildings?
- Conclusions

Background


- Why do we care about airtightness?
 - Estimation of infiltration rates for IAQ & energy analysis
 - Durability of envelope
 - Protection of building air from external threats
 - Leakage through walls is a bad way to ventilate!
- Size of energy liabilities of air leakage previously unknown – very little study
- Commercial and institutional buildings often assumed to be airtight, especially newer (and **greener**) buildings

Background

- Persily (1998) debunked myth of airtight commercial buildings
- Many energy and IAQ analyses still employ this assumption
- Lack of whole building airtightness or continuous air barrier requirements in U.S. (ASHRAE Standard 90.1, building codes, etc.) but its changing

Airtightness of U.S. commercial buildings

Latest reference: *Emmerich, S.J. and Persily, A.K., Airtightness of Commercial Buildings in the U.S. (2005) AIVC Conference, Brussels, Belgium*



Airtightness of U.S. commercial buildings


- Update 1998 analysis by Persily (re-examine trends)
- Envelope airtightness data for ~200 commercial and institutional buildings in the U.S.
- Additional published and previously unpublished data
- Data from fan pressurization testing (ASTM E779)

Summary of Data


Units	Mean	Std Dev.	Min	Max
$\text{m}^3/\text{h}\cdot\text{m}^2 @ 75 \text{ Pa}$	28.4	35.8	2.7	168
$\text{cfm}/\text{ft}^2 @ 0.3 \text{ in H}_2\text{O}$	1.56	1.97	0.15	9.24

- Persily 1998 reported average of 28.7
- Normalized by **above-grade** envelope surface area
- Around 15 h^{-1} at 50 Pa for a typical house

Airtightness vs Construction Year



Airtightness vs. Building Type




Offices 34; Schools 70; Sports 16; Restaurant 15; Other 66

NIST


National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce



Airtightness vs. Number of Stories



Airtightness vs. Climate



Summary & Discussion

- Airtightness of 201 U.S. commercial and institutional buildings – similar average as 1998 Persily analysis
- Airtightness levels comparable with US homes
- Modest number of buildings & a nonrandom sample
- Still no correlation with year of construction
- Trends suggest that tall buildings are tighter and buildings in hot climate are leakier
- **More data needed** in North, West and for **green** buildings

Energy impacts of air leakage

Reference: *Emmerich, S.J., Anis, W., McDowell, T.P. 2007. Simulation of the Impact of Commercial Building Envelope Airtightness on Building Energy Utilization. ASHRAE Transactions, Vol. 118 (2).*

U.S. air barrier study

- With input from 90.1 Envelope task group, NIST conducted simulation study of potential energy savings due to requirement for continuous air barriers in typical U.S. commercial buildings
- Used CONTAM/TRNSYS coupled multizone airflow & building energy analysis tool
- 3 buildings modeled: 2 story office, 1 story retail and 5 story residential
- CBECS data shows 2 story office building under twenty five thousand sq. ft. most common commercial building.

Know-how exists to build commercial buildings much tighter.

- Use Continuous Air Barrier system
- Many published examples of very tight buildings in Canada and Europe
- Published retrofit studies have shown significant improvement in airtightness of existing buildings
- BSRIA reports that tested buildings have bettered new U.K. standard by 40 % (hundreds of buildings tested)

Model Description


- 2-story office, 1-story retail & 5-story apartment
- 5 cities: Bismarck, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Phoenix and Miami
- Building envelopes and HVAC systems defined to meet Standard 90.1
- Economizers in St Louis, Bismarck, Phoenix
- **Ventilation to meet Standard 62.1**

Airtightness values

		L/s.m ² @ 75 Pa
Baseline	Bismarck	6.6
	Minneapolis	7.2
	St. Louis	9.1
	Phoenix	11.1
	Miami	11.8
Target	All	1.2
Best Achievable	All	0.2

Airtightness values based on data and judgment

Results - Infiltration in St. Louis




Infiltration summary

City // Office	Baseline (ach)	Reduction (%)
Bismarck	0.22	77
Minneapolis	0.23	79
St. Louis	0.26	84
Phoenix	0.17	86
Miami	0.26	89

Infiltration reductions similar for retail building;
Smaller for apartment

Energy Savings


% REDUCTION in ANNUAL ENERGY USE for TARGET vs. BASELINE AIRTIGHTNESS



Savings similar for masonry building;

What about existing buildings?







NIST

National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce





NIST

National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce



Airtightness retrofit

- Previous NIST study estimated that infiltration is responsible for ~33 % of heating load in US office building stock
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performed measurements before and after sealing for 35 civilian buildings
 - Average reduction in air leakage was 47 %
- USACE/NREL simulation study estimated potential energy savings of 5 % to 40 % for army barracks if tightened

Conclusions

- U.S. commercial buildings are **STILL** not airtight
 - No correlation with year of construction
- Significant energy savings are possible
 - Up to ~40 % of heating and cooling energy in new buildings
- Huge potential savings in retrofit market
 - Significant efforts in residential but commercial?

Recommendations

- Extend study to other building categories
- Examine the potential interaction between airtightness and other building parameters
- Collect airtightness data for **green** U.S. buildings
- Analyze the costs and potential energy savings from tightening of existing buildings and develop recommendations for the existing building stock
- Develop diagnostic protocols and tools for failures of building envelopes that deteriorate IAQ and energy efficiency