Reliable DCV methods meet ventilation requirements while simultaneously minimizing energy

By David S. Dougan and Leonard A. Damiano, EBTRON, Inc.
December 20, 2007

Overview

Spaces with high occupant densities and variable populations present a unique challenge to designers struggling to meet the requirements of both ASHRAE Standards 62.1-2007 and 90.1-2007, plus the 2006 International Mechanical Code on Ventilation. Energy, rather than occupant health and productivity, has become the focus of most owners and engineers with respect to HVAC design. Can systems using demand controlled ventilation (DCV) strategies to conserve energy comply with today's ventilation standard for acceptable indoor air quality (IAQ) and our national energy standard? This paper will demonstrate the potential uncertainties associated with several methods of demand controlled ventilation, including traditional CO_2-based DCV, DCV using population estimates from CO_2 and direct occupancy counting systems.

ASHRAE 62.1-2007 Requirements

Standard 62.1-2007[#] specifies outside air ventilation rates based on floor area and population. This requirement is a result of a wholesale change to the *Ventilation Rate Procedure* (VRP) by addendum "*n*" to 62-2001 in 2004.[#] Prior to addendum 62*n*, the outside air ventilation rate required was based primarily on CFM per person.

Although the calculations in the VRP appear cumbersome, the theory is quite simple: provide the required outside air at the breathing zone based on the population size and floor area. Although multi-zone systems may appear to be more complex, the requirement at the breathing zone is the same as with single zone systems. Multiple-zone system calculations simply provide a credit of the unused outside air from the zones that are not critical. DCV for Standard 62.1-2007 compliance should modify the outside air required at the air handling unit (AHU) based on actual conditions. On single zone systems, the population and floor area is required to establish the specified minimum ventilation rate.[#] Multiple-zone systems additionally require that the primary supply airflow and any recirculated return or transfer airflow, if provided to any of the zones, is known. Air distribution effectiveness at the zone level also must be taken into account for both single and multiple zone spaces

ASHRAE 90.1-2004 Requirements

Section 6.4.3.8 *Ventilation Controls for High Occupancy Areas* takes a broad brush to the ventilation control requirements and by definition requires that the system automatically reduce intake rates "when the actual occupancy of spaces served by the system is less than design occupancy" for spaces with occupant densities exceeding 40 per 1,000 ft^2 (90 m^2). The requirement is limited to specific areas and system capabilities.[#]

The *90.1-2004 User's Manual*[#], however, gets very specific regarding appropriate methods to satisfy ventilation standards. Unfortunately, the versions of the ventilation standard referenced in 90.1 are all pre-addendum "*n*." Referencing 62-1999 and 62-2001 in a 2005 document increases the probability of misinterpretations and noncompliance, if relied upon for use in more contemporary projects.

It is understood that over ventilation is not prohibited by either ASHRAE Standard 62.1 or 90.1 for compliance with the minimums that they establish. But does not prudent engineering practice require compliance to both? Should not design practice attempt to satisfy ventilation minimums at the lowest energy cost – not just the minimum required in the code? If over ventilation is not a significant energy concern, than why devote any attention to DCV?

Whether our designs include CAV or VAV air distribution systems, serve single or multiple-zones; the uncertainty in control must be known. Compliant control methods must ensure satisfactory results and be sufficiently effective to justify an implied recommendation within the standards document.

The History and Rationale behind CO_2-based DCV

Before CO_2 DCV was used in HVAC systems, industrial hygienists were monitoring CO_2 levels inside and outside of buildings to determine if ventilation rates were sufficient to adequately dilute body odor. These spaces typically had near constant occupancy and constant outside airflow setpoints. As a result, the steady-state, two chamber CO_2 model could be applied to estimate the outside air CFM per person. The steady-state model, discussed in *Informative Appendix C* of Standard 62.1, is illustrated below.



$$Vo = N/(C_s - C_0)$$

where

V_0	= outdoor airflow rate per person
V_e	= breathing rate
N	= CO_2 generation rate per person
C_e	= CO_2 concentration in exhaled breath
C_s	= CO_2 concentration in the space
C_0	= CO_2 concentration in outdoor air

ASHRAE Standard 62-1989 presented the first real challenge to designers of variable occupancy spaces. Enterprising individuals recognized that the relationship between CO_2 and the ventilation rate per person could potentially be used to modify outside air ventilation rates as conditions or occupancy changed, in order to save energy. Although the relationship had large potential errors from its assumptions, the technique gained considerable popularity over the years.

Addendum 62*n*, incorporated into 62.1-2004 and now the current 62.1-2007 parent document complicated the use of CO_2-based DCV since it resulted in a variable ventilation rate per person and potentially a variable CO_2 setpoint. Since a given CO_2 level, at best, can only estimate the outside airflow rate per person, the correct CO_2 setpoint would require that the population was known, should one of your objectives be to maintain intake airflow at the lowest minimum allowable value. With this goal in mind, we create a somewhat circular argument; if you know the population, you do not need to know the CO_2 level.

As a result, using traditional CO_2 DCV and expecting to minimize energy while doing so, may be very problematic for Standard 62.1-2007 compliance. Figure 2 shows the ventilation rates associated with a fixed CO_2 setpoint and that required by Standard 62.1. Note that traditional CO_2 DCV will either under or over ventilate the classroom. In this simple illustration steady-state conditions are assumed and all of the occupants are generating CO_2 at a fixed and constant rate. It is also assumes that the CO_2 sensors have negligible error and the outdoor CO_2 level is actually monitored (outdoor levels are typically assumed at a fixed level).



CO_2-based DCV Uncertainties

There are a number of compounding uncertainties when using CO_2 to modify the outside airflow rate.# Steady-state conditions seldom occur in spaces where the population and outside airflow rate is variable. This is significant if the performance of your system is based on the assumptions in the Steady state Equation being valid. The CO_2 production rate changes considerably with the activity level and the measurement error of space CO_2 can be quite large.# As previously stated, the outdoor CO_2 level is typically not measured due to cost implications and temperature limitations in CO_2 sensor technology. When these uncertainties are considered, the potential deviation from Standard 62.1 requirements is alarming with a single CO_2 setpoint. The resulting area of uncertainty is shown in figure 3. The use of variable CO_2 setpoints within system-specific algorithms has been proposed as an alternative method of control but its analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.# It should be sufficient to point out that these methods are mostly theoretical and as yet have not been tested to determine their realistic ability to "maintain" ventilation at rates "not less than" those minimum required by codes and standards.

Calculating Potential CO_2 DCV Uncertainty

Figure 3 data assumes steady-state to simplify calculations. The steady-state model from figure 1 is biased by the CO_2 production rate, sensor error and outdoor air CO_2 level for each combination of uncertainties at various population levels. Uncertainties in this analysis are conservative and consider population activity levels ranging from sleeping to walking (0.2 < N < 0.6 L/min) and a space CO_2 uncertainty of ±50 ppm and an outdoor air uncertainty of ±50 ppm from a nominal level of 400 ppm. In practice, the space CO_2 uncertainty will be much greater due to sensor drift and location.

One should note that the flow rate uncertainty above full design requirements can be minimized by setting a maximum limit on the position of the outside air damper. However, it should also be noted that wind, stack and mixed air plenum pressure variations (VAV systems) will affect the outside air intake flow rate# and still result in the potential for significant over-ventilation.



Improving CO_2 Based DCV

CO_2-based DCV can be improved by one of the following methods:

- Setting an upper and lower outside airflow limits (Threshold Method), or
- Using CO_2 to estimate the population (CO_2 Count Method)

<u>Threshold Method</u>

The Threshold Method (TM) uses an airflow measuring station in the outside air to “clamp” the range of airflow rates provided by traditional CO_2 DCV. The upper limit is based on full design ventilation requirements and the lower limit is established by analysis of IAQ risk or the minimum outside airflow rate required for pressurization.

<u>CO_2 Count Method</u>

Using CO_2 and intake flow rate inputs to calculate or "count" the number of space occupants would take advantage of the relationship between CO_2 and ventilation rates (i.e. CFM/person) and solve for "persons". When combined with airflow measurement, the population can be estimated using an appropriate CO_2-DCV model. This method may also use the non steady-state CO_2 model[#] to improve population estimates when populations change significantly.

The CO_2 Count Method can be used on both single and multi-zone systems. On single zone systems, the zone CO_2 level and the outside airflow rate is required to estimate the population. A straight line approximation of this method was presented by Stanke that simplifies the calculations for adaptation on simple setpoint controllers.[#]

On multiple zone recirculating systems, the outside airflow rate along with the zone supply airflow rate and CO_2 level of each DCV zone is required. Detailed explanations of how these calculations are made on multiple zone recirculating systems are covered in a paper currently being finalized for peer-review.

Both methods improve CO_2 DCV but are still subject to numerous uncertainties associated with CO_2 measurement (even when the transient model is used). The resulting uncertainty for our single zone classroom example is indicated in figure 3. Although there is significant reduction of uncertainty with the improved methods, the uncertainty using CO_2, even as a counting technique, is suspect.[##]



Direct Counting Methods

Direct counting methods eliminate the uncertainties associated with CO_2 measurement. A counting device located in each space is used to determine the actual ventilation requirements specified by

ASHRAE 62.1-2007. Examples of counting devices include: video and/or thermal imaging counters, infra-red counters, radio frequency identifiers (RFIDs), turnstiles, time based schedules (if accurate) or any other device/method that can estimate the actual population of the space. Multi-zone systems require that zone supply airflow is measured to calculate the multi-zone requirements of the VRP. When compared to CO_2 DCV, the performance of direct counting methods is considerably better. In our classroom example, a counting uncertainty of +/- 3 persons over the entire population range results in significantly improved performance over CO_2-based methods.



Conclusions

DCV is required by energy codes on high density variable occupancy spaces. However, uncertainties associated with traditional CO_2-based DCV may not result in the desired result in both energy conservation and occupant well-being.

Use of direct outside airflow measuring devices to constrain intake flow rates between upper and lower threshold limits can improve the performance of traditional, single setpoint CO_2-DCV. The method can be improved further using the same sensors to estimate the actual population and calculate the outside air intake flow rates specified by ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2007. One must keep in mind, however, that these techniques are still limited by the inherent uncertainties associated with the use of CO_2.

Perhaps the most promising method of DCV may be to directly measure the population to determine the requirements of actual “real-time” requirements of 62.1-2007. Emerging, cost effective, technologies in population measurement may make this demand controlled ventilation strategy commonplace in the not so distant future.

References (sequential)

ASHRAE. 2007. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2007, *Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality. At*lanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers*, Inc.*

ASHRAE. 2004. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62-2001, *Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality.* Including addendum “n,” approved by the ASHRAE Standards Committee on June 28, 2003; by the ASHRAE Board of Directors on July 3, 2003; and by the American National Standards Institute on January 8, 2004. *At*lanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers*, Inc.*

ASHRAE. 2004. ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2004, *Energy Standard for Building*s *Except Low-Rise Residential Building*s, including proposed addendum “v,” pending approval. Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.

ASHRAE. 2005. *90.1 User’s Manual - ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2004.* Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.

ASHRAE Standards Policies, 2007. PASA 6.5 Criteria for Approval, 6.6.2a “Withdrawal for Cause,” and PC MOP 6.1.9d “Criteria for Approval.” Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. Downloaded June – November 2007.

ICC. 2006. 2003 and 2006 International Mechanical Code, *§403 – Mechanical Ventilation*. International Code Council, Washington, DC.

ASTM. 1998. Standard D 6245-98. *Standard guide for using indoor carbon dioxide concentrations to evaluate indoor air quality and ventilation*, American Society for Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA

Dougan, D. S. and L. A. Damiano 2004. “CO2-Based Demand Control Ventilation Do Risks Outweigh Potential Rewards?“ *ASHRAE Journal* 46: 47-53, October, 2004.

Mumma, S.A., Ke, Y.P. 1997. “Using carbon dioxide measurements to determine occupancy for ventilation controls.” ASHRAE Transactions 103(2):365–374

Mumma, S.A. 2004. “Transient Occupancy Ventilation by Monitoring CO2,” *IAQ Applications - Winter 2004* Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers*, Inc.*

Emmerich, Steven J. and Andrew K. Persily 2001. “State-of-the-Art Review of CO2 Demand Controlled Ventilation Technology and Application” NIST - Building and Fire Research Laboratory, Publication # NISTIR 6729, March 2001. Prepared for: Architectural Energy Corporation Boulder, Colorado

Solberg, D., D. S. Dougan and L. A. Damiano 1990. “Measurement for the control of fresh air intakes.” *ASHRAE Journal* 32(1): 45-51.

Stanke, Dennis 2006. “Standard 62.1-2004 System Operation: Dynamic Reset Options,” *ASHRAE Journal* 48:18-32.