

ASHRAE Standard 62-1989

Energy, Cost and Program Implications



OCT 17 1991

DOE/BP--1657

DE92 000909

ASHRAE STANDARD 62-1989
ENERGY, COST, AND PROGRAM
IMPLICATIONS

Tim Steele
Marilyn Brown

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 3621-RMC
Portland, OR 97208

October 15, 1990

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1.0 Background	1
2.0 Energy Use and Cost Implications	3
2.1 Study Overview	3
2.2 Simulation Test Results	9
2.3 Conclusions	17
2.4 Recommendations	17
3.0 ASHRAE Standard 62-1989 Problems	18
3.1 Number of People	18
3.2 Occupancy Categories	18
3.3 Infiltration	18
3.4 Energy Code vs. Building Code Requirements	19
3.5 Indoor Air Quality Procedure	19
3.6 Outdoor Air Quality	20
3.7 Ventilation Effectiveness	20
3.8 Multiple Spaces	20
4.0 ASHRAE Standard 62-89 Verification Methods	21
4.1 New Buildings	21
4.2 Existing Buildings	22
4.3 Standard 62-89 Verification Costs	22
4.4 Equivalent Energy Savings	25
5.0 Recommendations	26
5.1 Interpretations of Standard 62-1989	26
5.2 Preferred Method for Determining Outside Air Rates	27
6.0 References	31
Appendices	
Appendix A: Prototype Building Minimum Ventilation Req.	A1
Appendix B: Energy Consumption/Prototype Occupancy Density	B1
Appendix C: Energy Consumption/ASHRAE Design Occupancy	C1

1.0 BACKGROUND

ASHRAE Standard 62-1989 (Standard 62-89) "Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality" is the new heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning (HVAC) industry consensus for ventilation air in commercial buildings. Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) references ASHRAE Standard 62-81 (the predecessor to Standard 62-89) in their current environmental documents for required ventilation rates. Through its use, it had become evident to Bonneville that Standard 62-81 needed interpretation. Now that the revised Standard (Standard 62-89) is available, its usefulness needs to be evaluated.

Based on current information and public comment, the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) revised Standard 62-1981 to Standard 62-89. "The revisions, while too numerous to completely describe, include:

- The deletion of the distinction between smoking-permitted and non-smoking spaces.
- An increase in the minimum outside air requirement for most spaces from 5 cfm/person to 15 cfm/person.
- A requirement that the outside air quantities must be delivered to the occupants' breathing zone.
- Design documentation is now required.
- Ready accessibility of HVAC systems is required for inspection, maintenance, and cleaning.
- Outside air used for ventilation must meet federal ambient air quality standards.
- Control of unusual or strong indoor air contaminant sources is required.
- HVAC design and operation must respond to indoor air pollution loads and not just thermal loads."¹

In terms of Bonneville-sponsored commercial building energy conservation programs, the first two revisions are the most important. Removing the smoking/non-smoking distinction greatly enhances the usability of Standard 62. On the other hand, increasing the minimum outside air requirement will increase resistance of contractors and others to acceptance of the Standard.

While not documented in any program evaluation report, several former Bonneville program operators had stated a concern that ASHRAE 62-1981 ventilation rates were excessive. Retrofitting building ventilation systems, they said, would not occur due to, among other things, high ventilation air requirements with the associated high energy penalty. The justification for this concern has not been verified. However, the additional increase in outside air required by Standard 62-89 could increase this concern proportionately.

Even though Standard 62 is clearly the HVAC industry consensus, it is not necessarily the building code industry consensus. Since ventilation is a code issue, as well as a Bonneville concern, it is necessary to understand the implications and the idiosyncrasies of Standard 62. Before Bonneville attempts to enforce Standard 62-89 for both new and existing commercial buildings, it would be worthwhile to answer the following questions:

1. What are the expected energy costs associated with Standard 62-89?
2. Is Standard 62-89 usable as written or, like Standard 62-81, does it need interpretation?
3. Are there practical, low-cost verification methods for assuring that Standard 62-89 has been met?

Minimum ventilation rates have been tripled by Standard 62-89 (for non-smoking spaces). With almost all buildings, increasing the amount of outdoor ventilation air will increase energy consumption. It is important for both Bonneville, on a regional basis, and building owners, on a building basis, to understand how significant outdoor ventilation air is in terms of energy and cost. This paper provides discussion on Standard 62-89 and shows the need for interpretation and evaluation in order for it to be enforceable.

The second and third questions are important based on past experience with Standard 62. As discussed earlier in this Section, Standard 62-81 has been referenced as the ventilation requirement in Bonneville Commercial Building Energy Conservation Programs. This caused problems which, when reviewing Standard 62-89, would be similar to referencing Standard 62-81.

This study was performed with the specific objective of evaluating the energy and cost implications of Standard 62-89 and providing an interpretation and verification procedure for use in Bonneville Commercial Building Energy Conservation Programs.

To evaluate the energy and cost impacts of Standard 62-89, we performed hourly energy simulations on ten building types in two climates using the DOE-2.1D energy simulation program. Results from these simulations estimate the energy and cost impacts associated with Standard 62-89.

To interpret Standard 62-89 we considered only one path of compliance: The Ventilation Rate Procedure. Within that procedure are several provisions, each of which is discussed and interpreted. The costs of verifying compliance with Standard 62-89 are outlined and a verification procedure is given.

2.0 ENERGY USE AND COST IMPLICATIONS

A paper published in the ASHRAE Journal investigated the issue of increased ventilation air on building energy use.² The authors performed a study, similar to that presented here, which found annual energy operating costs increase by less than 5 percent as a result of Standard 62-89. That study doesn't completely satisfy Bonneville for the following reasons:

1. No Pacific Northwest climates were considered.
2. Only one building, a large office, was included in the paper.
3. The building had a gas heating system, which would underestimate any impacts on electric demand.

2.1 STUDY OVERVIEW

Bonneville's study estimated the energy and cost implications of ASHRAE Standard 62-89 using simulations based on DOE-2.1D, a computer simulation program which estimates building use hourly as a function of building characteristics and climactic location. Ten types of prototypical commercial buildings used by Bonneville for load forecasting purposes were examined: Large and Small Office, Large and Small Retail, Restaurant, Warehouse, Hospital, Hotel, School, and Grocery. These building characterizations are based on survey and energy metering data and represent average or typical construction and operation practices and mechanical system types.

For each building type, there is an existing building model and a new building model, totaling 20 building models. Each of the prototypes are all-electric, and exist as files on the DOE-2.1D simulation program.

Prototypical building ventilation rates were varied in five steps to estimate the impacts of outside air on building energy use. Input to DOE-2.1D for ventilation air is accomplished in the SYSTEMS portion of the program. Ventilation air can be specified as either a fraction of total supply air, outside air per person, or cfm. For this study, ventilation air was specified as outside air per person. The calculated rate is the minimum outside air rate when the HVAC system supply fans are on and with no economizer control.

2.1.1 Occupancy

Occupancy levels appeared significant when Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values were compared to the assumed values used in the prototypes. Table 2.1 shows the result of this comparison. For all building prototypes, the Standard 62-89 values for suggested occupancy were significantly higher than those assumed in the prototypes. To interpret the relevancy of these higher occupancy values, we compared Standard 62-89 to two other industry standards: 1988 Uniform Building Code (UBC) occupant load factors for building egress and ASHRAE Standard 90.1P Occupancy Density for use in energy calculations.

Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values were comparable to UBC occupant load factors. The prototype-assumed levels of occupancy were comparable to ASHRAE Standard 90.1P Occupancy Density. Thus, we concluded that Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values are specified for sizing the ventilation system and the heating and cooling equipment, since the UBC occupant load factors are meant to represent maximum (not average) peak occupancies while the Standard 90.1P Occupancy Density values represent average conditions.

Although an interpretation of Standard 62-89 was not available at the time of this writing, assuming that occupancy values specified by Standard 62-89 are for sizing building ventilation systems implies that Standard 62-89 requires building ventilation systems to be capable of providing outside air at a rate equivalent to the Estimated Maximum Occupancy values. However, the actual operating outside air rate would be equivalent to the operating maximum number of people. To assess the significance of this assumption, we evaluated both of these occupancy levels (Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values and assumed prototype values) in estimates of energy use and cost.

2.1.2 Utility Rate Structures

In order to estimate the cost to building owners of meeting Standard 62-89, utility rates were applied to estimated energy use. Two utility rate structures were chosen as representative of the climate zones east and west of the Cascades: City of Richland General Service Electric Rate and Seattle City Light Schedule 34. These two schedules are shown in Table 2.2. The weather files used in conjunction with these utility rate structures were Typical Meteorological Year (TMY) hourly weather files for Sea-Tac and Yakima, which are the closest available hourly weather sites.

2.1.3 Energy Simulation Method

DOE-2.1D accounts for occupant density in building areas with two inputs: (1) occupancy schedules and (2) peak occupancy value or Number Of People (NOP). Occupancy schedules are hourly ratios of the specified NOP, as in the following example of the large office prototype:

<u>DAYS</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>HOURLY FRACTION</u>
(WEEKDAYS)..	(1-6)	(0.0)
	(7)	(0.1)
	(8-17)	(1.0)
	(18)	(0.1)
	(19-24)	(0.02)
(SATURDAY)	(1-8)	(0.0)
	(9-12)	(1.0)
	(13-24)	(0.0)
(SUNDAYS, HOLIDAYS)	(1-24)	(0.0)

Most of the prototype buildings have more than one occupancy schedule to account for different areas. NOP is input as a single number; for example, "58" in the Lobby Zone of the Large Office. The hourly occupant density is

then this peak occupancy value times the hourly fraction. The SYSTEMS portion of DOE-2.1D, with outside air specified as OA-CFM/PER (cfm/person), sets the minimum outside air rate equal to the NOP multiplied by the OA-CFM/PER. For prototype buildings with economizer control, the minimum outside air rate is exceeded during pre-specified outside air temperature conditions.

We considered peak occupancy a variable since it isn't clear whether Standard 62-89 is specifying a value or not. This led to two sets of DOE-2.1D simulation runs.

For the first set of simulation runs, we modeled each prototype building, both new and existing, utilizing the assumed prototype peak occupancy densities for sizing the equipment. DOE-2.1D has an autosizing feature which sizes equipment to accommodate the building load. By removing the hard inputs for system equipment in the prototype input files, we enabled DOE-2.1D to size the equipment for the prototype occupancy densities using the Standard 62-89 ventilation rates per person.

Then we varied the specified cfm/person from 5 to 25 in steps of 5. Next, the files were simulated using the two utility rate structures for the corresponding weather files for a total of 20 files/building.

For the second set of simulation runs, we modeled each prototype building, both new and existing, by first creating an "ASHRAE occupancy" equivalent. This was accomplished by increasing the peak occupancy value NOP to the Standard 62-89 specified value and decreasing the hourly fractions so that the hourly number of people would correspond to the prototype assumed values. We used the DOE-2.1D equipment autosizing feature to simultaneously accomplish two effects: (1) keeping the building's heating and cooling loads constant while (2) simultaneously increasing the minimum outside air rates.

We again varied the specified cfm/person from 5 to 25 in steps of 5, and simulated these using the two utility rate structures for the corresponding weather files for an additional 20 files/building.

Within building types, occupancies are further delineated in Standard 62-89 (see Table 2.3). This delineation was included in the simulations by adjusting the specified cfm/person within different occupancies so that both the entire building and each of the different occupancies met Standard 62-89 at the same time. For instance, in the Large Retail building the basement and street level retail areas were specified as respectively having outside air rates at a ratio of .30/.20 times higher than the upper retail areas.

Since Standard 62-89 gives the Estimated Maximum Occupancy in sq. ft./person for retail areas, we assumed that an equivalent cfm/person could be derived by multiplying the Standard 62-89 specified values for cfm/sq. ft. and sq. ft./person. This resulted in an equivalent ventilation rate in retail areas of 10 cfm/person.

From each of the 40 energy simulations per building, five numbers were extracted: annual electric energy consumption, peak demand, annual energy cost, total cfm, and outside air cfm. Based on these numbers, we estimate regional energy impacts of Standard 62-89 and assess the expected costs to individual building owners of implementing Standard 62-89.

Table 2.1
Comparison of Occupant Densities

<u>Occupancy</u>	<u>Prototype</u>	Number of People/1000 ft. ²		
		<u>Standard</u> <u>62-89</u>	<u>UBC</u>	<u>Standard</u> <u>90.1P</u>
Grocery	4.3	8.0	10.0	3.3
Large Office	4.5	7.0	33.3	3.6
Small Office	4.1	7.0	33.3	3.6
Large Retail Sales, Lower Sales, Upper Storage	2.9 2.8 0.6	30.0 20.0 15.0	33.3 16.7 10.0	3.3 3.3 3.3
Small Retail Sales Storage	3.9 3.0	30.0 15.0	33.3 10.0	3.3 3.3
Restaurant Fast Food Kitchen	30.5 7.6	100.0 20.0	66.7 5.0	10.0 10.0
Warehouse Office Warehouse	2.6 0.5	7.0 5.0	33.3 2.0	3.6 0.07
Hospital Rooms Surgery Admin. Other	5.9 7.1 4.4 4.2	10.0 20.0 7.0 20.0	n/a n/a 33.3 12.5	n/a n/a 5.0 5.0
Hotel Rooms Lobby Conf. Rooms	5.1 2.0 13.5	20.0 30.0 50.0	n/a 5.0 66.7	n/a 4.0 n/a
School Classroom Auditorium Office Cafeteria	19.8 7.2 4.3 32.4	50.0 150.0 7.0 100.0	50.0 142.9 33.3 142.9	13.3 20.0 3.6 10.0

Table 2.2

Utility Rate Structures Used

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Monthly Energy Charge</u>	<u>Monthly Demand Charge</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

Seattle City Light:

Summer: \$0.0239/kWh	Summer: \$ 0.90/kW
Winter: \$0.0362/kWh	Winter: \$ 2.08/kW
Minimum Monthly Charge: \$22.00	

City of Richland:

0 to 20000 kWh: \$0.03248/kWh	0 to 50 kW: \$0.00
> 20000 kWh : \$0.01688/kWh	> 50 kW : \$4.33/kW
Minimum Monthly Charge: None	

Table 2.3
ASHRAE STANDARD 62 VENTILATION AIR REQUIREMENTS

BUILDING TYPE	VENTILATION AIR REQUIREMENTS	UNITS
Grocery/Supermarket	15	CFM/PERSON
Hospital		
Patient Rooms	25	CFM/PERSON
Med. Procedures	30	CFM/PERSON
Other	15	CFM/PERSON
Hotel		
Rooms	30	CFM/ROOM
Lobby	15	CFM/PERSON
Conf. Rms	20	CFM/PERSON
Office	20	CFM/PERSON
Restaurant		
Dining Rooms	20	CFM/PERSON
Kitchens	15	CFM/PERSON
Retail		
Basement & Street	0.30	CFM/FT ²
Upper	0.20	CFM/FT ²
Storage	0.15	CFM/FT ²
School		
Classroom	15	CFM/PERSON
Library	15	CFM/PERSON
Auditorium	15	CFM/PERSON
Warehouse	0.05	CFM/FT ²

2.2 Simulation Test Results

Simulation test results, shown in Tables 2.4 through 2.11., are as labeled. The following sections, which discuss the test results, are divided into categories for Prototype number of people and Standard 62-89 number of people because of the significance of this parameter to the results.

2.2.1 Prototype Number of People

2.2.1.1 Required Outside Air

As shown in Table 2.4, assuming daily maximum amounts of people (prototype assumptions), Standard 62-89 resulted in outside air rates of from 0.7% to 41.0% of total building supply air (excluding areas requiring 100% outside air). With the exception of the School, these rates should not be considered excessive. In fact, minimum outside air rates of 10% are equivalent to current practice. The School prototype had exceptionally high occupancy density (second only to Restaurant dining areas) which resulted in relatively high outside air requirements.

2.2.1.2 Energy Use Increase

Increasing the outside air from 5 cfm/person to Standard 62-89-required cfm/person resulted in annual energy increases as shown in Tables 2.5 and 2.6. Whether a building is located in Seattle, Washington, or Richland, Washington, the annual energy increase was less than 13%. For prototype buildings, other than the School, the increase was less than 6%. For the Hospital -- the building with the smallest percent increase -- the increase was less than 0.1% in Seattle.

The increase in energy on a kWh/yr basis (see Table 2.6) showed more variability between prototype buildings than when taken as a percent increase. The Large Office prototype building, because of the dominant cooling load, actually saved energy by increasing the minimum outside air. The other prototype buildings all showed the expected increase in annual energy consumption. The largest increase was the Hotel prototype in Richland, Washington, at 307,950 kWh/yr. (Yakima, Washington, TMY weather).

2.2.1.3 Energy Cost Increase

The equivalent increase in annual energy cost, as a percent of total energy cost, is shown in Table 2.7. As with energy use, the average increase in energy cost was less than 5%. The largest increase was the School prototype annual energy cost in Richland, Washington, at 14.6%. The Hospital and Large Office prototypes showed the smallest increases, less than 0.1%.

2.2.1.4 Regional Impacts

The regional increase in energy use (aMW, where aMW is equivalent to the annual energy savings (kWh/yr) divided by 8,760 hrs/yr) is shown in Table 2.8. For all buildings the estimated increase was 115.2 aMW. The building types and floor area estimates were derived from the Bonneville Load Forecast for new commercial buildings built between 1992 and 2010.

2.2.2 Standard 62-89 Number of People

2.2.2.1 Required Outside Air

Assuming the Standard 62-89 occupancy density resulted in outside air rates from 6.0% to 94.2% of total building supply air (excluding areas requiring 100% outside air). Considering any outside air rate in excess of 20% to be excessive, 6 of the 10 prototypes exhibited excessive outside air rates.

2.2.2.2 Energy Use Increase

Increasing the outside air from 5 cfm/person to the Standard 62-89 required cfm/person resulted in prototype building annual energy increases as shown in Tables 2.8 and 2.9. The increases in energy use assuming the Standard 62-89 number of people were substantially more significant for some of the prototype buildings. For prototype buildings like Grocery and Hospital, the impact of ventilation air was masked on a percentage basis due to high energy use in areas other than HVAC. The Large Office had such a small heating energy use that the increase in ventilation air did not cause a significant increase in total energy use.

The increase in energy on a kWh/yr basis (see Table 2.6) showed more variability between prototype buildings than when taken as a percent increase. The Large Office prototype building, because of the dominant cooling load, showed only a small increase in energy use. The other prototype buildings all showed the expected increase in annual energy consumption. The Hospital prototype building showed an increase of 497,200 kWh/yr in Richland, Washington. The largest increase was 2,416,600 kWh/yr for the Hotel prototype building in Richland, Washington (Yakima, Washington, TMY weather).

2.2.2.3 Energy Cost Increase

The equivalent increase in annual energy cost, as a percent of total energy cost, is shown in Table 2.7. As with energy use, the average increase in energy cost was significant with some of the prototype buildings. The School showed the largest increase in energy cost with an increase of 42.2% in Seattle. The Hotel was close behind with an increase of 39.6% in Richland, Washington.

2.2.2.4 Regional Impacts

The regional increase in energy use (aMW) is shown on Table 2.9. The estimated increase in annual energy use is 687.1 aMW. The regional increase in energy use is 3 times greater for Standard 62-89 than when prototype number of people was assumed.

2.2.3 Adequacy of Ventilation Systems Design

Design of new buildings tends to include less oversizing of equipment than existing construction. The prototype building constructions reflect current design practice. Tables 2.10 and 2.11 show the outside air as per cent of supply air for the most extreme case: new construction with the higher

Standard 62-89 occupancy densities. Where outside air reached 100% the building required higher total supply air rates than the system would provide to accommodate the quantity of outside air necessary. The results show that for the ASHRAE occupancy densities, ventilation at the higher rates, although excessive for more than half the buildings, was within the normal system capacity for all buildings except the Restaurant. Here again, the Restaurant and School were at or exceeding the system capacity because of their exceptionally high occupancy densities.

For the Prototype occupancy densities, the Standard 62-89 rates never exceeded the normal capacity of the ventilation systems.

Table 2.4

Number of People/Required Outside Air

Building Type	Number of People		Required Outside Air (cfm) (% of supply air)			
	Prototype	Std 62	Prototype	Std 62	Prototype	Std 62
Grocery	111	208	1,670	3,130	10.2	17.1
Hospital	1,115	3,685	21,800	65,880	9.8	27.3
Hotel	532	4,845	9,610	58,890	5.5	37.0
Small Office	20	34	400	680	7.7	14.3
Large Office	1,824	2,856	36,480	57,120	0.7	6.0
Restaurant	50	157	800	2,490	30.6	94.2
Small Retail	50	365	500	3,650	4.1	33.9
Large Retail	300	2,730	3,000	27,300	4.3	40.2
School	970	3,603	16,700	34,590	41.0	87.0
Warehouse	14	96	210	1,150	1.7	4.0

Note: Percent outside air column excludes outside air used for process loads, such as kitchen ventilation air, medical procedures ventilation air, etc.

Table 2.5

Average Energy Increase
(Percent of Total Energy)

Building Type	Assumed Number of People		Richland	
	Seattle Proto	Std 62	Proto	Std 62
Grocery	1.5	3.2	1.6	3.5
Hospital	0.0	0.9	0.1	1.4
Hotel	3.9	31.9	4.7	33.6
Small Office	5.5	10.3	5.6	10.5
Large Office	- 0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4
Restaurant	2.5	10.4	2.8	10.7
Small Retail	1.6	11.8	1.5	10.9
Large Retail	0.7	16.5	0.9	15.4
School	12.8	42.3	13.0	40.8
Warehouse	0.4	1.1	0.4	1.1

Note: Percent energy increases are averages between new and existing building configurations and are based on the difference between annual energy consumption at Standard 62-cfm/person and the annual energy consumption at 5 cfm/person.

Table 2.6

Average Energy Increase
(kWh/yr)

Building Type	Assumed Number of People			
	Seattle		Richland	
	<u>Proto</u>	<u>Std 62</u>	<u>Proto</u>	<u>Std 62</u>
Grocery	13,700	53,300	14,600	58,800
Hospital	5,000	335,000	10,600	497,200
Hotel	241,500	2,149,000	307,950	2,416,600
Small Office	5,700	11,000	6,600	12,400
Large Office	-3,100	2,000	9,200	38,700
Restaurant	8,500	35,900	9,900	39,200
Small Retail	8,900	28,200	3,900	31,400
Large Retail	14,600	386,700	22,200	399,400
School	127,000	483,900	135,000	489,400
Warehouse	1,000	2,800	1,200	3,300

Note: Average energy increases are averages between new and existing building configurations and are based on the difference between the energy consumption at Standard 62-required cfm/person and the energy consumption at 5 cfm/person.

Table 2.7

Average Energy Cost Increase
(Percent of Total Energy Cost)

Building Type	Assumed Number of People			
	Seattle		Richland	
	<u>Proto</u>	<u>Std 62</u>	<u>Proto</u>	<u>Std 62</u>
Grocery	1.7	3.9	2.2	4.6
Hospital	0.0	2.7	0.1	3.5
Hotel	4.7	35.8	6.1	39.6
Small Office	5.8	10.7	8.0	14.5
Large Office	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Restaurant	3.1	11.8	3.5	12.4
Small Retail	1.8	13.2	1.7	12.2
Large Retail	0.9	19.8	1.2	18.0
School	13.8	42.2	14.6	38.2
Warehouse	0.5	1.3	0.5	1.9

Note: Percent energy cost increases are averages between new and existing building configurations and are based on the difference between the energy cost at Standard 62-required cfm/person and the energy cost at 5 cfm/person.

Table 2.8

Regional Increase in Energy Use
Assuming Prototype Number of People
(MW)

Building Type	Regional Floor Area (Million Sq Ft)	Prototype Floor Area (Sq Ft)	Base Energy Use (kWh/yr)	Base EUI (kWh/Sq Ft-yr)	Percent Increase (%)	Energy Increase (MW)
Large Office	117.7169	408,000	8,115,521	19.9	-0.05	-0.1
Small Office	85.2433	4,880	97,012	19.9	5.4	10.4
Large Retail	85.3179	120,000	2,069,755	17.2	0.65	1.1
Small Retail	116.3793	13,125	221,314	16.9	1.5	3.4
Restaurant	84.6534	2,624	276,161	105.2	2.1	21.4
Grocery	31.7115	26,050	1,696,155	65.1	1.5	3.5
Hotel/Motel	101.1193	198,500	6,445,550	32.5	3.8	14.2
School	138.2092	62,614	768,725	12.3	15.7	30.4
Warehouse	99.3555	18,025	238,754	13.2	0.4	0.6
Hospital	0	236,620	14,351,413	60.7	0.05	0.0
College	57.6664	N/A				15.8
Health	121.1435	N/A				6.0
Miscellaneous	226.7427	N/A				8.5
		TOTAL				115.2

Notes:

1. Regional floor area is for all buildings built between 1992 and 2010 and is derived from the Bonneville load forecast.
2. Base EUI is the New prototype building energy use at 5 cfm/person for Seattle, Washington, divided by the prototype total square footage.
3. Percent increase in energy consumption is the average prototype value using the assumed value for number of people when ventilating at Standard 62-89 for the new prototype in Seattle, Washington.
4. Energy increase = percent increase (%) x energy intensity (kWh/sq. ft./yr) x regional floor area (sq. ft.) / 8760 hrs/yr.
5. College, Health, and Miscellaneous building categories are derived from combinations of the other prototypes.

Table 2.9

Regional Increase in Energy Use
Assuming Standard 62-89 Number of People
(MW)

Building Type	Regional Floor Area (Million Sq Ft)	Prototype Floor Area (Sq Ft)	Base Energy Use (kWh/yr)	Base EUI (kWh/Sq Ft-yr)	Percent Increase (%)	Energy Increase (MW)
Large Office	117.7169	408,000	8,452,790	20.7	0.0	0.0
Small Office	85.2433	4,880	98,461	20.2	10.3	20.2
Large Retail	85.3179	120,000	2,188,533	18.2	39.8	70.7
Small Retail	116.3793	13,125	240,994	18.4	24.2	59.0
Restaurant	84.6534	2,624	346,544	132.1	10.3	131.5
Grocery	31.7115	26,050	1,697,227	65.2	3.1	7.3
Hotel/Motel	101.1193	198,500	6,382,278	32.2	32.9	122.1
School	138.2092	62,614	919,095	14.7	52.0	120.4
Warehouse	99.3555	18,025	239,579	13.3	1.1	1.7
Hospital	0	236,620	13,463,012	56.9	1.6	0.0
College	57.6664	N/A				82.4
Health	121.1435	N/A				27.6
Miscellaneous	226.7427	N/A				44.2
TOTAL						687.1

Notes:

1. Regional floor area is for all buildings built between 1992 and 2010 and is derived from the Bonneville load forecast.
2. Base EUI is the New prototype building energy use at 5 cfm/person for Seattle, Washington, divided by the prototype total square footage.
3. Percent increase in energy consumption is the average prototype value using the Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy value for number of people when ventilating at Standard 62-89 for the new prototype in Seattle, Washington.
4. Energy increase = percent increase (%) x energy intensity (kWh/sq. ft./yr) x regional floor area (Sq. Ft.) / 8760 hrs/yr.
5. College, Health, and Miscellaneous building categories are derived from combinations of the other prototypes.

Table 2.10

Adequacy of Ventilation System
(outside air as per cent of supply air)

Building Type	Seattle New Construction (outside air cfm/person)				
	5	10	15	20	25
Restaurant	37.7	74.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
School	53.5	87.2	92.4	94.9	96.4
Large Retail	28.7	57.4	86.2	100.0	100.0
Small Retail	22.6	45.0	67.6	90.1	100.0
Hotel	12.4	24.8	37.3	49.7	62.3
Hospital	11.0	17.7	24.4	31.0	37.7
Grocery	8.1	16.3	24.4	32.6	40.7
Large Office	5.0	9.6	14.4	19.1	23.8
Small Office	4.2	7.7	11.1	15.0	18.4
Warehouse	1.7	3.2	4.8	6.4	8.0

Note: Outside air is based on Standard 62-89 occupancy densities and cfm/person. At 100%, outside air requirements forced increase in total supply air.

Table 2.11

Adequacy of Ventilation System
(outside air as per cent of supply air)

Building Type	Richland New Construction (outside air cfm/person)				
	5	10	15	20	25
Restaurant	32.0	63.6	95.6	100.0	100.0
School	53.5	83.8	91.0	93.8	95.5
Large Retail	24.9	49.7	74.6	99.4	100.0
Small Retail	18.5	36.8	55.3	73.6	92.1
Hotel	11.5	23.0	34.5	46.0	57.6
Hospital	10.6	17.0	23.4	29.9	36.3
Grocery	6.8	13.7	20.5	27.3	34.2
Large Office	4.5	8.8	13.1	17.3	21.6
Small Office	3.5	6.4	9.2	12.5	15.3
Warehouse	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0

Note: Outside air is based on Standard 62-89 occupancy densities and cfm/person. At 100%, outside air requirements forced increase in total supply air.

2.3 Conclusions

From the results presented in this chapter we conclude the following:

1. Standard 62-89 has a minimum impact on energy use and energy cost, regardless of building type or location when assuming prototype number of people.
2. Interpreting Standard 62-89 as specifying the occupancy density results in significant energy use and energy cost impacts.
3. Two high density occupancy types, Restaurant and School, account for 45% of the expected regional increase in energy use, though these two types total less than 20% of the regional floor area.
4. No prototype building ventilation system was undersized at Standard 62-89 required ventilation rates; all prototype ventilation systems were able to meet Standard 62-89 ventilation requirements easily at the prototype occupancy densities.

2.4 Recommendations

Based on our investigation, we recommend that Bonneville incorporate Standard 62-89 into its programs as follows:

1. Adopt the new ASHRAE Standard 62-89 Outdoor Air Requirements for cfm per person rates.
2. Continue to design equipment based on assumed occupancy or ASHRAE Standard 90.1 Occupancy Density.

In program design or evaluation, the estimated potential energy savings should be adjusted to account for the slight increase in energy use.

Further study should look at ways to minimize impacts of Standard 62-89 on high density building types, e.g., schools and restaurants.

3.0 ASHRAE STANDARD 62-1989 PROBLEMS

Standard 62-89 allows two paths for compliance: Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Procedure and Ventilation Rate Procedure. In the first path, compliance is reached when 80 percent of a building's occupants don't complain about air quality. Therefore, no designed ventilation system can completely assure compliance simply based on its design. The second path prescribes ventilation rates, which should assure adequate indoor air quality.

It is assumed that only the Ventilation Rate Procedure will apply to Bonneville's commercial sector energy conservation programs. The remainder of this section discusses problems and confusion with the Ventilation Rate Procedure.

3.1 Number of People

Using the Ventilation Rate Procedure of Standard 62-89 requires that the minimum outside air rate be established. As defined by Standard 62-89, this requires the use of Table 2, contained in the Standard. For most occupancies, Table 2 lists required outdoor air in cfm/person and "where appropriate, the table lists the estimated density of people for design purposes."¹ Further, Standard 62-89 states: "Where occupant density differs from that in Table 2, use the per occupant ventilation rate for the anticipated occupancy load." These two statements appear to be in conflict with one another. On the one hand, it says the Table 2 values for occupant density should be used for design purposes; and on the other hand, it says, better estimates of occupant density should be used (although it isn't specified what they should be used for).

As noted earlier, Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values are excessive when compared to building average peak occupancy. It would therefore seem logical that they are meant exclusively for design purposes. However, Standard 62-89 does not explicitly state what "design purposes" means.

Our interpretation is that the ventilation system has to be capable of providing the design amount of outside air (cfm/person x Estimated Maximum Occupancy); the building supply air (outside air + return air) should be equal to or greater than cfm/person x Estimated Maximum Occupancy. In operation, however, the ventilation system only need provide outside air at the specified rate to the actual number of people.

3.2 Occupancy Categories

Standard 62-89 provides ventilation air requirements which vary by occupancy category. Within buildings it can be difficult to distinguish between different occupancy categories or where one category begins and another ends. It therefore becomes difficult to meet and consequently to enforce Standard 62-89 in practice.

3.3 Infiltration

Standard 62-89 requires ventilation systems to be either mechanical or natural. With natural ventilation systems the ventilation rates must be demonstrable. Infiltration of outside air into commercial buildings is considered to be natural ventilation. Mechanical ventilation is fan-forced air supplied into a building.

Commercial buildings with mechanical ventilation systems still experience infiltration. It has been found that envelope infiltration rates are often the same order of magnitude as the rates of intentional outdoor air intake.^{8,11} One study⁸ also found that building ventilation rates (including infiltration) are variable depending on outdoor air intake controls, envelope air tightness, and HVAC system operation schedules. Not recognizing infiltration as a source of outside air for mechanically ventilated buildings results in Standard 62 over-specifying required ventilation rates. Combining this with the Number of People specified by Standard 62 results in over-designing the system by several factors of safety in the required mechanical ventilation rates.

3.4 Energy Code vs Building Code Requirements

The 1989 Model Conservation Standards Code (MCS) is the basis for most energy codes in the Pacific Northwest. The MCS is based on ASHRAE Standard 90.1. As jurisdictions adopt the new MCS, they will likely incorporate it as amendments to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). UBC provides "minimum standards to safeguard life or limb, health, property, and public welfare by regulating and controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, use and occupancy,..."⁶

The 1989 MCS references ASHRAE Standard 62-89 for ventilation rates and occupancy densities, in lieu of Standard 90.1. The 1988 Uniform Building Code specifies mechanical ventilation rates for health and safety based on ASHRAE Standard 62-73. Therefore, within one jurisdiction's code, two ventilation rates could be specified. UBC ventilation rates are typically specified as a total circulated air flow of 15 cfm/person of which at least 5 cfm/person is outdoor air. Standard 62-89 ventilation rates are higher than UBC's rates. Because of this, one might assume that a ventilation rate falling between the two rates "met code".

Having the energy code specify higher ventilation rates than the building code causes confusion. Higher ventilation rates usually relate to higher energy usage. Therefore, one could assume that the lower UBC ventilation rates meet the MCS's limits to energy use. However, the MCS specifies ventilation rates as a minimum to assure adequate indoor air quality, since higher ventilation rates are usually associated with better air quality. Therefore, the building which falls between the two rates actually does not meet code.

3.5 Indoor Air Quality Procedure

Compliance with Standard 62 can be shown by using the Indoor Air Quality Procedure. In addition to specifying acceptable contaminant levels and exposure times, this procedure requires that at least 80 percent of a panel of at least 20 untrained observers find the indoor air to be not objectionable under representative conditions of use and occupancy. The procedure does not provide a method of measuring specified indoor contaminants.

For existing buildings, using this procedure would require that pollutants be measured and that occupant exposure times be established. It is referenced in the Ventilation Rate Procedure as the means for providing cleaned, recirculated air in lieu of outside air. This procedure would be both more difficult and more costly to enforce than the Ventilation Rate Procedure.

For new construction, compliance would require obtaining detailed information on finishes, floor and wall coverings, partitions and other materials to be installed. Using manufacturer's data on contaminant outgassing rates, the designer could calculate necessary rates to meet IAQ limits. In practice, many of these materials are selected long after mechanical design is complete. This is especially true for speculative construction, where the building shell is completed, but the interior is built to suit a tenant at a later date. Therefore, this procedure is unworkable for new construction.

3.6 Outdoor Air Quality

Standard 62 requires outdoor air to be treated or reduced when certain contaminants exceed air quality standards. Reducing outdoor air requires compliance with the Indoor Air Quality procedure. This requirement for using only clean outdoor air was in ASHRAE Standard 62-81, but compliance was rare.⁹ We doubt if this requirement will be enforceable or met with compliance in Standard 62-89 either.

3.7 Ventilation Effectiveness

Standard 62 states that a ventilation effectiveness approaching 100 percent is assumed for the required rates. The Standard defines ventilation effectiveness as the fraction of outdoor air delivered to the space that reaches the occupied zone. Therefore, if only 50 percent of the outdoor air mechanically introduced into a building reaches the occupied zone the ventilation effectiveness would be 0.5 and the required ventilation rates would be doubled. Given that a method to measure effectiveness does not exist, 100 percent will be the value assumed in the field.

3.8 Multiple Spaces

Standard 62 adjusts ventilation air requirements for multiple spaces with the following provision: "Where more than one space is served by a common supply system, the ratio of outdoor to supply air required to satisfy the ventilation and thermal control requirements may differ from space to space. The system outdoor air quantity shall then be determined using $y = x/(1+x-z)$, where y is the corrected fraction of outdoor air in the supply system, x is the uncorrected fraction of outdoor air in the supply system, and z is the fraction of outdoor air in the space with the greatest required fraction of outdoor air in its supply."⁴ With this provision, compliance with Standard 62-89 should be easier to verify. For each set of multiple spaces served by a common supply fan, the percentage of outdoor air need only be established once.

This provision "makes sense for applications where supply air for bathrooms or kitchens might come from adjacent spaces. However, many other situations exist where applications of the reduction allowance results in some unreasonable results."¹

Percent outdoor air is a design value which is fixed for all occupancies served by a given air supply system. It is reasonable to adjust percent outdoor air so that occupancies requiring more or less outdoor air are not penalized by other occupancies.

4.0 ASHRAE STANDARD 62-89 VERIFICATION METHODS

4.1 New Buildings

4.1.1 Plan Review

Building code enforcement officials review design documents for new buildings at the time of code review. Within the design documents, designers specify the amount of outside air to be delivered at each outside air intake. Actual measurements of outside air are not performed.

4.1.2 Test and Balance Report

A qualified company tests the building HVAC system and equipment, usually linked to a system start-up procedure. The company then develops a report which documents measured airflow, pump and fan performance data, and temperature. On smaller buildings, testing and balancing is usually not performed because of cost. Testing and balancing to determine the amount of outside air could conceivably be done by either zonal air flows or whole building outside air flows.

4.1.2.1 Zonal Air Flow Measurements

For each independent fan system which supplies outside air, the amount of outside air (on a percentage basis) is determined by the following formula: $\% \text{ OA} = (T_S - T_R) / (T_O - T_R)$, where T_S = supply air temperature, T_R = return air temperature, and T_O = outside air temperature. The system has to be set to deliver minimum air (e.g., for a VAV system to deliver minimum air the thermostat has to call for full heating).

4.1.2.2 Whole Building Outside Air Flow Measurements

To reduce time, effort, and costs, another less conclusive method would be to measure the total outside air being introduced at the fan system inlet. This could be done by the following procedures: (1) measuring total supply air and total return air (outside air equals supply air minus return air); (2) measuring percent outside air as above assuming supply air is equivalent to manufacturer's data; or (3) measuring the outside air at the intake. Each of these procedures assumes that the outside air ultimately reaches the building occupants.

4.1.2.3 Tracer Gas Measurements

This procedure is not commonly performed in commercial buildings, due to high cost. "In this procedure, a harmless and non-reactive tracer gas is released into the building and mixed thoroughly with the interior air. Once the tracer gas concentration within the building is uniform, one monitors the decay in tracer gas concentration over time. The rate of decay of the logarithm of concentration is equal to the air exchange rate of the building during the time of the test."⁸ This procedure includes the measurement of infiltration air which makes it somewhat incomparable with the previously described methods. It results, however, in time-averaged overall building air-exchange rates. Using this procedure, it has been demonstrated that natural ventilation is an important component in overall building ventilation.

4.1.2.4 Carbon Dioxide Measurement

Standard 62-89 ventilation rates are based on an assumption of 1,000 ppm of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂). The measurement of CO₂ is a relatively easy and simple procedure. It is valuable for buildings which are amenable to a one-time spot measurement of CO₂. The technique requires an assumption of CO₂ generation rates per person and measurements of CO₂ concentration in outside and return air. If the calculated outdoor air flow rate, in cfm per person, is above the required rate the ventilation system meets the Standard. (NOTE: This "method" is contained in Appendix D of the Standard and as such is not a part of the Standard. It was suggested that Bonneville consider this approach due to its low cost and because it seemingly meets the Standard's intent.)

4.2 Existing Buildings

4.2.1 System Test

Outside air in existing buildings is not routinely measured, except at times when the HVAC system undergoes a major renovation or remodel. Then the outside air is measured as a commissioning requirement, in similar fashion to that previously described, using zonal air flows and/or whole building outside air flows.

4.2.2 Tracer Gas Measurements

This procedure is identical to that described above for new buildings. Due to high cost (both equipment and personnel) this procedure is not employed by any firm or individual on a regular basis.

4.3 Standard 62-89 Verification Costs

4.3.1 Costs of Zonal Air Flow Measurements

The cost of performing a total HVAC system test and balance in addition to the cost of establishing design air flows, can include the cost of balancing HVAC water flows and pressures. Considering only the cost of testing and balancing air flows, the costs can vary from as little as \$1,000 for a small single zone HVAC system to over \$25,000 for complex multi-system buildings. These costs are representative of what could be expected when attempting to establish outside air delivered to a particular zone or occupancy category within a building. When delivery of outside air on a percentage basis for each HVAC system is measured, and air delivered from each diffuser is measured, outside air is equal to percent outside air times diffuser cfm. Using the building definitions considered in Chapter 2, the study on energy costs, Table 4.1 shows the costs to perform detailed estimates of outside air following the zonal air flow measurement procedure. These costs are summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.1: Estimated Air Testing and Balancing Costs

BUILDING TYPE	SYSTEM TYPE	SUPPLY CFM	O.S.A. CFM	NUMBER OF DIFFUSERS	COST (\$)
Grocery	Single zone	21,200	2,420	20	\$1,200
	Unit heater	1,960			
Hospital	Const. volume	38,000	6,080	TOTAL 100	\$1,200 \$4,400
	Const. volume	2,800	2,800	10	\$800
	Const. volume	20,000	4,000	50	\$2,400
	Const. volume	17,000	17,000	40	\$2,000
	Const. volume	32,700	32,700	80	\$3,600
	Const. volume	10,000	10,000	30	\$1,600
	Const. volume	54,000	21,060	140	\$6,000
	Const. volume	27,200	17,680	70	\$3,200
	Const. volume	30,000	22,950	80	\$3,600
Hotel	VAV	24,500	2,450	TOTAL 60	\$27,600 \$3,200
	VAV	22,200	2,220	60	\$3,200
	VAV	5,400	5,400	10	\$1,200
	VAV	13,750	13,750	30	\$2,000
	VAV	17,100	1,710	40	\$2,400
	2-Pipe fan-coil -- 250 ROOMS			0	\$5,000
	Single zone	53,200	5,320	130	\$5,600
Large Office	VAV	174,660	26,200	TOTAL 440	\$22,600 \$18,450
Large Retail	Single zone	42,000	4,200	TOTAL 110	\$18,450 \$4,800
	Single zone	6,000	6,000	20	\$1,200
	Single zone	10,800	1,620	30	\$1,600
Restaurant	Single zone	4,460	450	TOTAL 10	\$7,600 \$800
	Single zone	4,460	3,224	2	\$480
School (4 ea)	Unit ventilator	9,374	1,850	TOTAL 20	\$1,280 \$4,800
	Unit ventilator	19,824	835	50	\$2,400
	Unit ventilator	5,880	740	10	\$800
	Unit ventilator	12,240	2,630	30	\$1,600
	Unit ventilator	9,979	715	20	\$1,200
Small Office	Single zone	2,000	400	TOTAL 10	\$10,800 \$800
	Single zone	2,000	325	10	\$800
Small Retail	Single zone	11,156	1,116	TOTAL 30	\$1,600 \$1,600
	Single zone	1,969	0	0	\$400
Warehouse	Single zone	2,000	300	TOTAL 10	\$2,000 \$800
	Unit heater	13,000	0	0	\$0
				TOTAL	\$800

Notes:

1. Building and HVAC system data is from Bonneville load forecasting prototypes.
2. Cost data from "MEANS Mechanical Cost Data": \$40 to balance a diffuser, \$400 to balance const. volume system, \$1000 to balance VAV system.

Table 4.2: Zonal Outside Air Testing Costs

<u>Building type</u>	<u>Air Testing Cost</u>
Grocery	\$ 1,200
Hospital	\$27,600
Hotel	\$22,600
Large Office	\$18,450
Large Retail	\$ 7,600
Restaurant	\$ 1,280
School	\$10,800
Small Office	\$ 1,600
Small Retail	\$ 2,000
Warehouse	\$ 800

These estimates are based on R.S. Means Cost Data.¹⁰ They are specific to the building type considered. The costs are based on \$40.00/diffuser and \$400.00/system; VAV systems are estimated to cost \$800.00. For all buildings except the Grocery, it is assumed that there are 400 cfm/diffuser; for the Grocery, it is assumed that there are 1000 cfm/diffuser. The air flow (cfm) assigned to each building is based on design data. Table 4.3 shows the amount of air and number and type of HVAC systems assigned to each building type.

4.3.2 Costs of Whole Building Outside Air Flow Measurements

If less costly methods were used, such as measuring outside air at the HVAC system inlet and assigning that outside air to the entire building, then air flow would not be measured at diffusers; costs would be a function of number of HVAC systems/outside air inlets and would be approximately that shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Simplified Outside Air Testing Costs

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Air Testing Cost</u>
Grocery	\$ 500
Hospital	\$ 4,500
Hotel	\$ 8,000
Large Office	\$ 1,000
Large Retail	\$ 1,500
Restaurant	\$ 1,000
School	\$ 4,000
Small Office	\$ 1,000
Small Retail	\$ 1,000
Warehouse	\$ 500

Only the outside air method is referenced in standard testing and balancing manuals.⁷ Historically, the determination of outside air has not been a primary purpose of testing and balancing. The absolute accuracy of either the zonal or whole building method has not been established. Companies which specialize in testing and balancing of HVAC systems will quote an accuracy of +/- 10%. This is based on experience rather than empirical data. Fluctuating outside environmental conditions make the measurement of mechanical ventilation difficult.

4.4 Equivalent Energy Savings

For costs of either zonal or whole building verification of Standard 62-89 to be acceptable, the equivalent energy savings of a retrofit conservation measure would have to be on the order of 2.5 times the air testing cost (assuming a program overhead rate of 40%, a fifteen year measure life and a cost-effective limit of 50 mills/kWh). Depending on the method used to establish outside air rates and whether whole building rates are acceptable, the required energy savings would be as shown in Table 4.4. Any increase in energy savings beyond that shown or further decrease in outside air would be cost-effective, in general.

As shown in Table 4.4 at least two of these building types would not likely find a cost-effective retrofit: Hospital and Large Office. The assumptions used for HVAC system(s) are the reason. The Hospital would require a reduction in outside air equivalent to 260 cfm/person if the HVAC systems were tested on a zonal basis; the Large Office would require a reduction of 160 cfm/person. If the whole building approach were used instead, the Hospital would require a reduction of 42 cfm/person the Large Office would require 8.6 cfm/person.

The remainder of the building types could realistically absorb the cost of testing for minimum outside air regardless of the methods considered. Using the whole building approach results in minimal outside air reductions for all other building types.

Table 4.4:
Cost-Effective Limits

Building Type	Zonal Testing kWh/yr Savings	Testing cfm/Person Reduction	Whole Building Testing kWh/yr Savings	Testing cfm/Person Reduction
Grocery	3,000	1.2	1,300	0.52
Hospital	69,000	260.	11,300	42.
Hotel	56,500	2.2	20,000	0.77
Large Office	46,100	160.	2,500	8.6
Large Retail	19,000	7.8	3,750	1.5
Restaurant	3,200	3.7	2,500	2.9
School	27,000	2.1	10,000	0.78
Small Office	4,000	11.	2,500	6.6
Small Retail	5,000	7.3	2,500	3.6
Warehouse	2,000	20.	1,300	13.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Interpretations of Standard 62-1989

5.1.1 Number of People

Standard 62-89 Estimated Maximum Occupancy values should only be used as a sizing criteria for design of ventilation systems, if at all. In operation, the average peak number of people encountered in the building should be used. When this value is not available or difficult to determine, ASHRAE Standard 90.1 provides a number that should be used.

5.1.2 Indoor Air Quality Procedure

This procedure is valuable when building air quality problems are of concern. It is not viable for use with new buildings not yet occupied or for major retrofit projects where post-conditions have not yet been established. In evaluating air quality problems in operating buildings, this procedure should be used as part of the regulatory functions of OSHA, UBC, or other regulatory agencies that evaluate building air quality problems.

5.1.3 Outdoor Air Quality

This provision is not enforceable because it requires that pollutants be measured at the outdoor air intake for compliance. This provision should not be included in the interpretation.

5.1.4 Ventilation Effectiveness

Ventilation effectiveness cannot be measured and therefore should not be a part of our adopted interpretation. Its reference in the Standard should be considered a design constraint: Design the system so that the outdoor air is delivered to occupied zones.

5.1.5 Ventilation Standards

UBC is written for public health and safety. It should be the source for minimum indoor air quality/ventilation standards. The energy code (MCS) should limit maximum ventilation rates for energy reasons but should not take precedence over UBC. The purpose of MCS ventilation requirements should be clarified and the differences between MCS and UBC ventilation rates should be resolved.

5.1.6 Multiple Spaces

The allowance for the adjustment of outside air based on varying occupancies served by the same HVAC system should be adopted. This would allow easy verification of multiple spaces, such as conference rooms and lobbies, for compliance.

5.1.7 Energy Codes and Building Codes

The energy codes should prescribe the maximum ventilation rate. The minimum ventilation rates would be more appropriate in the health and safety codes, because the minimum is for the purpose of ensuring adequate indoor air quality.

5.2 Preferred Method for Determining Outside Air Rates

The following conditions have been shown: (1) Building ventilation systems are affected by ambient temperature and wind conditions and (2) Infiltration is a non-negligible contributor to overall building air-exchange. These facts, coupled with the problem of identifying peak numbers of people, make the usefulness of a detailed measurement of outside air suspect. Therefore, a high value should not be placed on particular mechanical ventilation rate numbers. Instead, the intake and distribution of outside air should be verified, either visually or through measurement techniques. The quantification of air quality in the building should be established through subjective measurements or visually identifiable problems.

Considering the cost and accuracy of the two general methods for determining outside air rates, the preferred method is the "Whole Building" method. This method at least assures that an appropriate amount of outside air is being introduced into the building and is not so difficult that its use would be restricted to testing and balancing companies; utility auditors should be able to use it to adequately determine outside air rates. In summary, this procedure requires the following steps:

A. Minimum Outside Air Requirements Calculation

1. Determine peak number of occupants
 - i. This should be the highest number of people usually encountered during the average workday. If the peak number of occupants is difficult to determine, use Standard 90.1 occupancy values.
 - ii. Where requirements are in cfm/sq ft or cfm/room, calculate the square feet or rooms served by the mechanical ventilation system, as appropriate.
2. Calculate amount of outside air to be provided each occupancy served by each mechanical ventilation system. (Multiply peak number of occupants by the required outside air rate (cfm/person)).
3. Adjust outside air rate to account for different occupancies served by the same ventilation system using equation IAQ-1.
 - i. Calculate the uncorrected outdoor air fraction (X) by dividing the sum of all the branch outdoor air requirements (V_{ot}) by the sum of all the branch supply flow rates (V_{on}).
 - ii. Calculate the critical space outdoor air fraction (Z) by dividing the critical space outdoor air requirement (V_{oc}) by the critical space flow rate (V_{sc}).
 - iii. Use equation IAQ-1 to find the corrected fraction of outdoor air (Y) to be provided in the system supply.

Equation IAQ-1

$$Y = X / [1 + X - Z]$$

Where,

$Y = V_{ot}/V_{st}$ = corrected fraction of outdoor air in system supply
 $X = V_{on}/V_{st}$ = uncorrected fraction of outdoor air in system supply
 $Z = V_{oc}/V_{sc}$ = fraction of outdoor air in critical space¹
 V_{ot} = corrected total outdoor air flow rate
 V_{st} = the sum of all supply air quantities for all branches of the system
 V_{on} = sum of outdoor air flow rates for all branches on system
 V_{oc} = outdoor air flow rate required in critical spaces
 V_{sc} = supply flow rate in critical space

B. Ventilation System Inspection (not applicable to new buildings)

Prior to ECM installation visually inspect the ventilation system to determine that outside air is reaching building occupants, that harmful or irritating contaminant sources are isolated from the main ventilation system, and that there are no known building ventilation problems which could be compounded or exacerbated by a ventilation reduction. If problems exist they must be corrected prior to ECM installation. A short report documenting the inspection shall be prepared and be available in the Energy Analysis Report or other site visit documentation

C. Ventilation Rate Measurement

Determine outside air rate (cfm) using one of the two following methods. For the measurement, the outside air supply shall be set to the minimum amount for systems which supply varying amounts (e.g. variable air volume, economizer control).

Documentation of ventilation rate measurement results shall be contained in the Energy Analysis Report or other site visit documentation.

1. Percent outside air method

- a. Measure outside, return, and mixed air temperatures. Calculate percent outside air using equation IAQ-2.
- b. Measure total supply air (cfm), either by a pitot tube traverse of main supply duct or by measure of supply air at diffusers.

¹ The critical space is that space with the greatest required fraction of outdoor air in the supply.

Equation IAQ-2

$$\% \text{ OA} = (T_s - T_r) / (T_o - T_r)$$

Where,

T_s = mixed air temperature

T_r = return air temperature

T_o = outdoor air temperature

- c. Calculate outside air = (% outside air) x (cfm)
- d. Determine total outside air for all mechanical ventilation systems serving building.
- e. Determine peak number of occupants
 - i. This should be the highest number of people usually encountered during the average workday. If the peak number of occupants is difficult to determine, use Standard 90.1 occupancy values.
 - ii. Where requirements are in cfm/sq ft or cfm/room, determine the square feet or number of rooms served by the mechanical ventilation system.
- f. Calculate mechanical ventilation rate = outside air (cfm) / peak number of occupants, or cfm/sq ft, or cfm/room as appropriate.
- g. Adjust the ventilation rate in accordance with the procedure given for New Buildings.

2. Carbon Dioxide method

Alternatively, where a mechanical ventilation system serves a space(s) where the activities are well known and constant from day-to-day a simplified procedure can be used. This method will show whether indoor carbon dioxide concentrations are below ASHRAE Standard 62-89 recommended levels of 1000 ppm. If the indoor carbon dioxide concentrations are above 1000 ppm, then the building or space does not comply with these requirements.

- a. For each mechanical ventilation system measure carbon dioxide concentration in return air and in outside air.
- b. Determine if required cfm/person ventilation rate (OA) is being met by solving equation IAQ-3 for indoor carbon dioxide concentration:

Equation IAQ-3

$$OA = \text{Gen. Rate} / (C_i - C_o)$$

Where,

Gen. Rate = occupant generation rate (cfm/person) of carbon dioxide (refer to Standard 62-89).

C_i = return air (indoor air) carbon dioxide concentration

C_o = outdoor air carbon dioxide concentration

6.0 REFERENCES

1. Cutter Information Corp., "Indoor Air Quality Update", October 1989.
2. Eto, J. and Meyer, C. 1988. "The HVAC Costs of Fresh Air Ventilation." ASHRAE Journal, September 1988.
3. United Industries Corporation, Inc. "DOE-2 Commercial Building Prototype Review and Revision", 1988.
4. ASHRAE 1987. "Proposed revisions to ASHRAE standard 62-81: Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality, public review draft." Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.
5. ASHRAE 1987. "Standard 90.1P, Energy Efficient Design of New Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings." Atlanta: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.
6. International Conference of Building Officials 1988. Uniform Building Code.
7. Associated Air Balance Council 1987. National Standards for Field Measurements and Instrumentation.
8. Persily, A. K., "Ventilation Rates In Office Buildings." ASHRAE Journal, July 1989.
9. Cutter Information Corp., "Indoor Air Quality Update", September 1989.
10. R. S. Means Co., 1988, Means Mechanical Cost Data: 1988
11. ASHRAE 1989, 1989 ASHRAE Handbook: Fundamentals

VS5-RMCB-3309c

APPENDIX A

PROTOTYPE BUILDING MINIMUM VENTILATION AIR REQUIREMENTS

1/ ASHRAE Standard 62-89 required minimum outside air for ventilation.

2/ Number of people (maximum) within the is the Uniform Building Code value.

3/ Prototype building square footage.
4/ Number of people = # of people/50 ft x \$0 ft

b/ Number of people = # OF PEOPLE/SQ FT \times SQ FT
b/ Minimum outside air = SID 62 (CFM/PERSON) \times # OF PEOPLE

APPENDIX B

PROTOTYPE BUILDING ENERGY CONSUMPTION AS A FUNCTION OF OUTSIDE AIR RATES
ASSUMING OCCUPANT DENSITY AT THE PROTOTYPE BUILDING AVERAGE

CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	ENERGY USE ENERGY COST PEAK			ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	% INCREASE	AVAILABLE SAVINGS
			CFM	OUTSIDE AIR	CFM/PERSON								
EXISTING/RICHLAND													
560	5	2.7	3.4%	1,636,359	44,526	463	0.0%	0.0%	27,302	975			
1,110	10	5.3	6.8%	1,648,720	45,000	477	0.8%	1.1%	3.0%	14,941	501		
1,670	15	8.0	10.2%	1,663,661	45,501	491	1.7%	2.2%	6.0%	0	0		
2,220	20	10.7	13.6%	1,679,544	46,042	506	2.6%	3.4%	9.3%				
2,780	25	13.3	17.0%	1,696,337	46,620	520	3.7%	4.7%	12.3%				
EXISTING/SEATTLE													
560	5	2.7	4.3%	1,580,931	49,755	377	0.0%	0.0%	24,720	903			
1,110	10	5.3	8.5%	1,591,574	50,152	384	0.7%	0.8%	1.9%	14,077	506		
1,670	15	8.0	12.9%	1,605,651	50,658	390	1.6%	1.8%	3.4%	0	0		
2,220	20	10.7	17.1%	1,620,055	51,182	397	2.5%	2.9%	5.3%				
2,780	25	13.3	21.4%	1,635,004	51,729	403	3.4%	4.0%	6.9%				
NEW/RICHLAND													
560	5	2.7	4.2%	1,743,767	46,026	436	0.0%	0.0%	25,970	994			
1,110	10	5.3	8.3%	1,755,467	46,500	450	0.7%	1.0%	3.2%	14,270	520		
1,670	15	8.0	12.5%	1,769,737	47,020	464	1.5%	2.2%	6.4%	0	0		
2,220	20	10.7	16.7%	1,785,207	47,566	479	2.4%	3.3%	9.9%				
2,780	25	13.3	20.9%	1,801,503	48,135	494	3.3%	4.6%	13.3%				
NEW/SEATTLE													
560	5	2.7	5.1%	1,696,155	52,702	357	0.0%	0.0%	23,155	858			
1,110	10	5.3	10.2%	1,705,996	53,074	364	0.6%	0.7%	2.0%	13,314	486		
1,670	15	8.0	15.3%	1,719,310	53,560	371	1.4%	1.6%	3.9%	0	0		
2,220	20	10.7	20.4%	1,733,225	54,070	377	2.2%	2.6%	5.6%				
2,780	25	13.3	25.5%	1,747,906	54,616	384	3.1%	3.6%	7.6%				

B. SMALL RETAIL PROTOTYPE		OUTSIDE AIR			ENERGY USE			ENERGY COST			PEAK			ANNUAL DEMAND			% INCREASE			AVAILABLE SAVINGS			
CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	CFM/PERSON	PROTO. ASHRAE	CFM	%	kWh/yr	CFM	%	kWh/yr	CFM	%	kWh/yr	CFM	%	kWh/yr	CFM	%	kWh/yr	CFM	%	kWh/yr	
EXISTING/RICHLAND																							
220	5	0.7	2.1%		275	381	10,561	161	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	351	
440	10	1.4	4.1%		279	479	10,734	166	1.5%	1.6%	3.1%	4,188	178	1.5%	1.8%	2.9%	3,375	13	1.5%	1.8%	2.9%	3,375	13
660	15	2.1	6.2%		283	667	10,912	170	3.0%	3.3%	5.6%	0	0	3.0%	3.4%	5.8%	0	0	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0
880	20	2.7	8.3%		287	854	11,095	174	4.5%	5.1%	8.1%			4.5%	5.2%	8.3%			4.6%	5.5%	8.6%		
1,100	25	3.4	10.3%		292	088	11,281	178	6.1%	6.8%	10.6%			6.1%	6.4%	7.0%	10.7%		6.2%	7.4%	12.4%		
EXISTING/SEATTLE																							
220	5	0.7	2.8%		237	310	8,364	121	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1,071	
440	10	1.4	5.6%		241	009	8,511	125	1.6%	1.8%	3.3%	14,949	547	1.6%	1.7%	2.8%	3,755	16	1.6%	1.7%	2.8%	3,755	16
660	15	2.1	8.4%		244	734	8,648	128	3.1%	3.4%	5.8%	0	0	3.1%	3.4%	5.8%	0	0	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0
880	20	2.7	11.2%		248	556	8,799	131	4.7%	5.2%	8.3%			4.7%	5.2%	8.3%			4.6%	5.5%	8.6%		
1,100	25	3.4	14.0%		252	383	8,951	134	6.4%	7.0%	10.7%			6.4%	6.4%	7.0%	10.7%		6.5%	7.1%	11.9%		
NEW/RICHLAND																							
220	5	0.7	2.2%		254	937	9,618	143	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	335	
440	10	1.4	4.5%		258	629	9,785	147	1.4%	1.7%	2.8%	3,755	16	1.4%	1.7%	2.8%	3,755	16	1.4%	1.7%	2.8%	3,755	16
660	15	2.1	6.7%		262	384	9,953	151	2.9%	3.5%	5.6%	0	0	2.9%	3.5%	5.6%	0	0	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0
880	20	2.7	9.0%		266	162	10,121	155	4.4%	5.2%	8.4%			4.4%	5.2%	8.4%			4.5%	5.5%	8.6%		
1,100	25	3.4	11.2%		269	961	10,291	160	5.9%	7.0%	11.9%			5.9%	6.4%	7.0%	11.9%		6.0%	7.1%	12.4%		
NEW/SEATTLE																							
220	5	0.7	2.8%		221	314	7,653	105	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27	
440	10	1.4	5.7%		224	678	7,792	108	1.5%	1.8%	2.9%	3,375	13	1.5%	1.7%	2.8%	3,375	13	1.5%	1.7%	2.8%	3,375	13
660	15	2.1	8.5%		228	053	7,931	111	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0	3.0%	3.6%	5.7%	0	0
880	20	2.7	11.4%		231	541	8,073	114	4.6%	5.5%	8.6%			4.6%	5.5%	8.6%			4.7%	5.6%	8.7%		
1,100	25	3.4	13.2%		235	034	8,217	118	6.2%	7.4%	12.4%			6.2%	7.4%	12.4%			6.3%	7.5%	12.5%		

C. LARGE OFFICE PROTOTYPE

OUTSIDE AIR		ENERGY USE			PEAK			% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	
PROTO. ASHRAE											
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
9,120	5	3.2	2.0%	15,560,753	504,725	5910	0.0%	0.0%	18,390	419	
18,240	10	6.4	3.9%	15,559,497	504,727	5912	-0.0%	0.0%	19,646	417	
27,360	15	9.6	5.9%	15,567,781	504,905	5915	0.0%	0.0%	11,362	239	
36,480	20	12.7	7.9%	15,579,143	505,144	5917	0.1%	0.1%	0	0	
45,600	25	15.9	9.8%	15,598,062	505,236	5855	0.2%	0.1%	-0.9%		
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
9,120	5	3.2	2.2%	14,659,114	492,581	5040	0.0%	0.0%	(1,986)	143	
18,240	10	6.4	4.3%	14,657,534	492,599	5040	-0.0%	0.0%	(406)	125	
27,360	15	9.6	6.5%	14,657,013	492,554	5041	-0.0%	-0.0%	115	170	
36,480	20	12.7	8.7%	14,657,128	492,724	5042	-0.0%	0.0%	0	0	
45,600	25	15.9	10.8%	14,658,618	492,800	5042	-0.0%	0.0%			
NEW/RICHLAND											
9,120	5	3.2	2.7%	8,858,835	286,355	4031	0.0%	0.0%	(2)	294	
18,240	10	6.4	5.3%	8,853,914	285,819	4063	-0.1%	-0.2%	4,919	83	
27,360	15	9.6	8.0%	8,856,156	286,342	4049	-0.0%	-0.0%	2,677	301	
36,480	20	12.7	10.7%	8,858,833	286,650	4156	-0.0%	0.1%	0	0	
45,600	25	15.9	13.3%	8,864,750	287,127	4155	0.1%	0.3%	3.1%		
NEW/SEATTLE											
9,120	5	3.2	2.9%	8,115,521	272,482	3051	0.0%	0.0%	(4,275)	(19)	
18,240	10	6.4	5.8%	8,114,592	272,444	3051	-0.0%	-0.0%	(3,346)	(15)	
27,360	15	9.6	8.7%	8,113,011	272,389	3051	-0.0%	-0.0%	(1,765)	(9)	
36,480	20	12.7	11.7%	8,111,246	272,290	3051	-0.1%	-0.1%	0	0	
45,600	25	15.9	14.6%	8,109,941	272,297	3051	-0.1%	-0.1%	0		

D. HOSPITAL PROTOTYPE OUTSIDE AIR				ENERGY USE	ENERGY COST	PEAK	% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS		
CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
6,880	5	1.7	3.3%	16,915,932	525,769	3197	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11,172	287
13,750	10	3.3	6.5%	16,919,530	525,865	3197	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7,574	191
20,630	15	5.0	9.8%	16,927,104	526,056	3197	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0	0
27,500	20	6.6	13.0%	16,937,442	526,340	3203	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	-----	-----
34,380	25	8.3	16.3%	16,957,878	526,995	3243	0.2%	0.2%	1.4%	-----	-----
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
6,880	5	1.7	3.5%	15,614,430	482,056	2685	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,580	64
13,750	10	3.3	6.9%	15,615,468	482,082	2685	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1,542	38
20,630	15	5.0	10.4%	15,617,010	482,120	2685	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
27,500	20	6.6	13.9%	15,618,720	482,162	2685	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-----	-----
34,380	25	8.3	17.4%	15,620,412	482,203	2685	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-----	-----
NEW/RICHLAND											
6,880	5	1.7	3.5%	15,357,402	383,307	2757	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9,991	279
13,750	10	3.3	7.0%	15,360,596	383,416	2757	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6,797	170
20,630	15	5.0	10.6%	15,367,393	383,586	2757	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0	0
27,500	20	6.6	14.1%	15,377,669	383,880	2766	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	-----	-----
34,380	25	8.3	17.6%	15,394,503	384,494	2805	0.2%	0.3%	1.7%	-----	-----
NEW/SEATTLE											
6,880	5	1.7	3.7%	14,351,413	441,862	2375	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,375	60
13,750	10	3.3	7.3%	14,352,374	441,887	2375	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1,414	35
20,630	15	5.0	11.0%	14,353,788	441,922	2375	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
27,500	20	6.6	14.7%	14,355,278	441,959	2375	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-----	-----
34,380	25	8.3	18.4%	14,356,791	441,996	2375	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-----	-----

E. HOTEL PROTOTYPE		OUTSIDE AIR		ENERGY USE			COST		PEAK		% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	CFM/PERSON	CFM/yr	\$	kWh/yr	\$	kW	ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
PROTO. ASHRAE														
EXISTING/RICHLAND														
3,210	5	1.7	2.0%	6,766,156	180,041	2053	0.0%	0.0%	309,986	10,467				
6,400	10	3.5	3.9%	6,917,835	185,199	2184	2.2%	2.9%	6.4%	158,307	5,309			
9,610	15	5.2	5.8%	7,076,142	190,508	2317	4.6%	5.8%	12.9%	0	0			
12,800	20	7.0	7.8%	7,242,680	196,125	2457	7.0%	8.9%	19.7%	-----	-----			
16,010	25	8.7	9.7%	7,412,602	201,644	2561	9.6%	12.0%	24.7%	-----	-----			
EXISTING/SEATTLE														
3,210	5	1.7	1.6%	6,303,939	197,680	1482	0.0%	0.0%	246,186	9,110				
6,400	10	3.5	3.2%	6,422,804	202,100	1531	1.9%	2.2%	3.3%	127,321	4,690			
9,610	15	5.2	4.9%	6,550,125	206,790	1588	3.9%	4.6%	7.2%	0	0			
12,800	20	7.0	6.5%	6,690,395	211,917	1666	6.1%	7.2%	12.4%	-----	-----			
16,010	25	8.7	8.1%	6,844,051	217,535	1737	8.6%	10.0%	17.2%	-----	-----			
NEW/RICHLAND														
3,210	5	1.7	1.9%	6,459,316	166,135	1629	0.0%	0.0%	305,915	10,523				
6,400	10	3.5	3.7%	6,603,609	170,901	1750	2.2%	2.9%	7.4%	161,622	5,758			
9,610	15	5.2	5.6%	6,765,231	176,658	1887	4.7%	6.3%	15.8%	0	0			
12,800	20	7.0	7.5%	6,936,813	182,734	2025	7.4%	10.0%	24.3%	-----	-----			
16,010	25	8.7	9.4%	7,111,522	188,643	2132	10.1%	13.5%	30.9%	-----	-----			
NEW/SEATTLE														
3,210	5	1.7	2.0%	6,173,773	190,238	1206	0.0%	0.0%	236,882	9,062				
6,400	10	3.5	4.1%	6,282,333	194,374	1272	1.8%	2.2%	5.5%	128,322	4,926			
9,610	15	5.2	6.1%	6,410,655	199,300	1351	3.8%	4.8%	12.0%	0	0			
12,800	20	7.0	8.1%	6,553,499	204,678	1429	6.2%	7.6%	18.5%	-----	-----			
16,010	25	8.7	10.2%	6,691,745	209,777	1502	8.4%	10.3%	24.5%	-----	-----			

E. LARGE RETAIL OUTSIDE AIR			ENERGY USE ENERGY COST PEAK			% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS			
CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROTO. ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
1,500	5	0.5	2.2%	2,546,571	71,206	826	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57,679	1,901
2,900	10	1.1	4.3%	2,574,510	72,122	861	1.1%	1.3%	4.2%	29,740	985
4,500	15	1.6	6.6%	2,604,250	73,107	894	2.3%	2.7%	8.2%	0	0
6,000	20	2.2	8.8%	2,635,848	74,216	941	3.5%	4.2%	13.9%	-----	-----
7,500	25	2.7	11.0%	2,669,401	75,467	988	4.8%	6.0%	19.6%	-----	-----
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
1,500	5	0.5	2.6%	2,325,699	73,053	529	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44,375	1,768
2,900	10	1.1	5.0%	2,346,828	73,879	545	0.9%	1.1%	3.0%	23,246	941
4,500	15	1.6	7.8%	2,370,074	74,821	563	1.9%	2.4%	6.4%	0	0
6,000	20	2.2	10.4%	2,395,483	75,762	593	3.0%	3.7%	12.1%	-----	-----
7,500	25	2.7	13.1%	2,423,064	76,857	619	4.2%	5.2%	17.0%	-----	-----
NEW/RICHLAND											
1,500	5	0.5	0.9%	2,228,721	62,143	571	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35,908	1,425
2,900	10	1.1	1.7%	2,245,244	62,780	607	0.7%	1.0%	6.3%	19,385	788
4,500	15	1.6	2.6%	2,264,629	63,568	657	1.6%	2.3%	15.1%	0	0
6,000	20	2.2	3.5%	2,286,677	64,493	712	2.6%	3.8%	24.7%	-----	-----
7,500	25	2.7	4.4%	2,311,518	65,476	759	3.7%	5.4%	32.9%	-----	-----
NEW/SEATTLE											
1,500	5	0.5	1.0%	2,069,755	64,025	462	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18,717	947
2,900	10	1.1	1.8%	2,077,823	64,461	463	0.4%	0.7%	0.2%	10,649	511
4,500	15	1.6	2.9%	2,088,472	64,971	464	0.9%	1.5%	0.4%	0	0
6,000	20	2.2	3.8%	2,102,044	65,574	465	1.6%	2.4%	0.6%	-----	-----
7,500	25	2.7	4.8%	2,118,800	66,286	466	2.4%	3.5%	0.9%	-----	-----

G. SMALL OFFICE PROTOTYPE				ENERGY USE				PEAK				% INCREASE				AVAILABLE SAVINGS			
OUTSIDE AIR	CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROTO.		kWh/yr	\$	kW		ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW		kWh/yr	\$				
			ASHRAE	%															
EXISTING/RICHLAND																			
120	5	2.9	1.8%	1.8%	125,667	4,634	82	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6,957	346						
200	10	5.8	3.0%	3.0%	127,638	4,733	83	1.6%	2.1%	1.2%	4,986	247							
320	15	8.8	4.8%	4.8%	130,622	4,884	86	3.9%	5.4%	4.9%	2,002	97							
400	20	11.7	6.0%	6.0%	132,624	4,980	87	5.5%	7.5%	6.1%	0	0							
520	25	14.6	7.9%	7.9%	135,650	5,128	90	7.9%	10.7%	9.8%									
EXISTING/SEATTLE																			
120	5	2.9	2.2%	2.2%	112,854	4,204	69	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6,212	242						
200	10	5.8	3.7%	3.7%	114,617	4,277	70	1.6%	1.7%	1.4%	4,449	170							
320	15	8.8	6.0%	6.0%	117,268	4,379	72	3.9%	4.2%	4.3%	1,798	68							
400	20	11.7	7.5%	7.5%	119,066	4,447	74	5.5%	5.8%	7.2%	0	0							
520	25	14.6	9.7%	9.7%	121,788	4,552	76	7.9%	8.3%	10.1%									
NEW/RICHLAND																			
120	5	2.9	2.1%	2.1%	108,527	3,908	78	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6,162	331						
200	10	5.8	3.5%	3.5%	110,261	4,003	81	1.6%	2.4%	3.8%	4,428	237							
320	15	8.8	5.6%	5.6%	112,901	4,145	84	4.0%	6.1%	7.7%	1,788	94							
400	20	11.7	6.9%	6.9%	114,689	4,240	87	5.7%	8.5%	11.5%	0	0							
520	25	14.6	9.0%	9.0%	117,401	4,381	90	8.2%	12.1%	15.4%									
NEW/SEATTLE																			
120	5	2.9	2.5%	2.5%	97,012	3,613	61	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5,242	207						
200	10	5.8	4.2%	4.2%	98,471	3,670	62	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	3,783	150							
320	15	8.8	6.7%	6.7%	100,721	3,760	64	3.8%	4.1%	4.9%	1,533	60							
400	20	11.7	8.4%	8.4%	102,254	3,820	65	5.4%	5.7%	6.6%	0	0							
520	25	14.6	10.9%	10.9%	104,591	3,912	66	7.8%	8.3%	8.2%									

H. CFM PROT0.	SCHOOL PROTOTYPE OUTSIDE AIR			ENERGY USE ENERGY COST			% INCREASE			AVAILABLE SAVINGS		
	CFM/PERSON	CFM/PERSON	ASHRAE	ANNUAL DEMAND	PEAK kW	ANNUAL DEMAND kW	kWh/yr	\$	kWh/yr	\$	kWh/yr	\$
EXISTING/RICHLAND												
5180	5	1.4	7.9%	1,429,442	60,012	1230	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	142,367	6,876	
10320	10	2.8	15.8%	1,500,007	63,542	1324	4.9%	5.5%	7.6%	71,802	3,347	
15500	15	4.1	23.7%	1,571,809	66,888	1414	10.0%	11.5%	15.0%	0	0	
20640	20	5.5	31.6%	1,641,106	70,222	1518	14.8%	17.0%	23.4%	-----	-----	
25820	25	6.9	39.5%	1,712,204	73,676	1640	19.8%	22.8%	33.3%	-----	-----	
EXISTING/SEATTLE												
5180	5	1.4	9.7%	1,345,656	52,632	1017	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	133,828	5,678	
10320	10	2.8	19.4%	1,411,232	55,503	1081	4.9%	5.5%	6.3%	68,252	2,806	
15500	15	4.1	29.1%	1,479,484	58,309	1157	9.9%	10.8%	13.8%	0	0	
20640	20	5.5	38.8%	1,548,070	61,094	1237	15.0%	16.1%	21.6%	-----	-----	
25820	25	6.9	47.7%	1,618,716	63,978	1319	20.3%	21.6%	29.7%	-----	-----	
NEW/RICHLAND												
5180	5	1.4	15.5%	800,544	36,941	819	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	127,847	6,553	
10320	10	2.8	30.9%	862,440	40,212	930	7.7%	8.9%	13.6%	65,951	3,282	
15500	15	4.1	45.7%	928,391	43,494	1041	16.0%	17.7%	27.1%	0	0	
20640	20	5.5	59.0%	997,231	46,569	1079	24.6%	26.1%	31.7%	-----	-----	
25820	25	6.9	71.6%	1,068,640	49,826	1083	33.5%	34.9%	32.2%	-----	-----	
NEW/SEATTLE												
5180	5	1.4	17.8%	768,725	31,288	651	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	120,510	5,223	
10320	10	2.8	35.5%	825,810	33,797	721	7.4%	8.0%	10.8%	63,425	2,715	
15500	15	4.1	51.8%	889,235	36,511	802	15.7%	16.7%	23.2%	0	0	
20640	20	5.5	66.5%	954,809	39,298	885	24.2%	25.6%	35.9%	-----	-----	
25820	25	6.9	75.2%	1,023,524	42,186	969	33.1%	34.8%	48.8%	-----	-----	

I.	RESTAURANT		OUTSIDE AIR		ENERGY USE			ENERGY COST		PEAK		% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS			
	CFM	CFM/PERSON	CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROT.	ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	
EXISTING/RICHLAND																	
200	5	1.6	7.2%	256,285	11,534	146	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10,880	418	0.0%	0.0%	9,433	360	
400	10	3.2	14.4%	361,566	11,741	150	1.5%	1.8%	2.7%	5,599	210	3.1%	3.6%	0	0	0	0
600	15	4.8	21.6%	367,165	11,952	155	4.7%	5.5%	9.6%	0	0	4.7%	5.4%	13.0%	13.0%	0	0
800	20	6.4	28.8%	372,964	12,168	160	6.4%	7.4%	10.5%	0	0	6.4%	7.4%	0	0	0	0
1000	25	8.0	36.0%	378,945	12,387	165	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10,880	418	0.0%	0.0%	9,433	360	
EXISTING/SEATTLE																	
200	5	1.6	9.0%	336,286	10,965	105	1.4%	1.6%	2.9%	4,873	184	9.0%	11.1%	0	0	0	0
400	10	3.2	17.9%	340,846	11,141	108	2.8%	3.3%	5.7%	0	0	2.8%	3.3%	0	0	0	0
600	15	4.8	26.9%	345,719	11,325	111	4.3%	5.0%	7.6%	0	0	4.3%	5.0%	0	0	0	0
800	20	6.4	35.9%	350,812	11,517	113	5.9%	6.8%	10.5%	0	0	5.9%	6.8%	0	0	0	0
1000	25	8.0	44.8%	356,075	11,713	116	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10,880	418	0.0%	0.0%	9,433	360	
NEW/RICHLAND																	
200	5	1.6	9.7%	355,488	11,249	132	1.1%	1.5%	3.0%	4,853	201	9.7%	11.1%	0	0	0	0
400	10	3.2	19.4%	359,540	11,418	136	2.5%	3.3%	6.8%	0	0	2.5%	3.3%	0	0	0	0
600	15	4.8	29.1%	364,393	11,619	141	4.0%	5.1%	10.6%	0	0	4.0%	5.1%	0	0	0	0
800	20	6.4	38.8%	369,655	11,826	146	5.5%	7.0%	15.2%	0	0	5.5%	7.0%	0	0	0	0
1000	25	8.0	48.5%	375,151	12,040	152	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10,880	418	0.0%	0.0%	9,433	360	
NEW/SEATTLE																	
200	5	1.6	11.4%	337,692	10,801	96	1.0%	1.3%	2.1%	4,175	167	11.4%	12.8%	0	0	0	0
400	10	3.2	22.9%	341,030	10,946	98	2.2%	2.9%	5.2%	0	0	2.2%	2.9%	0	0	0	0
600	15	4.8	34.3%	345,205	11,112	101	3.6%	4.5%	8.3%	0	0	3.6%	4.5%	0	0	0	0
800	20	6.4	45.7%	349,869	11,292	104	5.1%	6.3%	11.5%	0	0	5.1%	6.3%	0	0	0	0
1000	25	8.0	57.1%	354,902	11,481	107	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10,880	418	0.0%	0.0%	9,433	360	

APPENDIX C

**PROTOTYPE BUILDING ENERGY CONSUMPTION AS A FUNCTION OF OUTSIDE AIR RATES
ASSUMING ASHRAE DESIGN OCCUPANCIES**

A. GROCERY		OUTSIDE AIR		ENERGY USE			ENERGY COST		PEAK DEMAND		% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
CFM	CFM/PERSON PROTO.	CFM/PERSON ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	kWh/yr	\$	kWh/yr	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
EXISTING/RICHLAND														
1,040	9.4	5	5.7%	1,640,973	44,052	428	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59,746	2,037		
2,080	18.7	10	11.4%	1,669,639	45,018	455	1.7%	2.2%	6.3%	31,080	1,072			
3,120	28.1	15	17.1%	1,700,719	46,089	483	3.6%	4.6%	12.9%	0	0			
4,160	37.5	20	22.8%	1,732,666	47,197	510	5.6%	7.1%	19.2%					
5,200	46.8	25	28.5%	1,764,872	48,319	539	7.6%	9.7%	25.9%					
EXISTING/SEATTLE														
1,040	9.4	5	7.0%	1,583,706	49,651	351	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	54,222	1,974			
2,080	18.7	10	14.0%	1,610,122	50,607	363	1.7%	1.9%	3.4%	27,806	1,018			
3,120	28.1	15	21.0%	1,637,928	51,625	376	3.4%	4.0%	7.1%	0	0			
4,160	37.5	20	28.0%	1,666,140	52,662	391	5.2%	6.1%	11.4%					
5,200	46.8	25	35.0%	1,694,712	53,711	406	7.0%	8.2%	15.7%					
NEW/RICHLAND														
1,040	9.4	5	6.8%	1,747,312	45,476	400	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57,796	2,047			
2,080	18.7	10	13.7%	1,774,694	46,462	427	1.6%	2.2%	6.8%	30,414	1,061			
3,120	28.1	15	20.5%	1,805,108	47,523	455	3.3%	4.5%	13.8%	0	0			
4,160	37.5	20	27.3%	1,836,414	48,630	483	5.1%	6.9%	20.8%					
5,200	46.8	25	34.2%	1,868,177	49,759	512	6.9%	9.4%	28.0%					
NEW/SEATTLE														
1,040	9.4	5	8.1%	1,697,227	52,513	328	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	52,294	1,933			
2,080	18.7	10	16.3%	1,722,305	53,434	341	1.5%	1.8%	4.0%	27,216	1,012			
3,120	28.1	15	24.4%	1,749,521	54,446	354	3.1%	3.7%	7.9%	0	0			
4,160	37.5	20	32.6%	1,777,569	55,488	370	4.7%	5.7%	12.8%					
5,200	46.8	25	40.7%	1,806,125	56,544	385	6.4%	7.7%	17.4%					

B. SMALL RETAIL PROTOTYPE OUTSIDE AIR				ENERGY USE ENERGY COST				% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
CFM PROT.	CFM/PERSON ASHRAE	ANNUAL DEMAND		PEAK kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
		%	kWh/yr								
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
1,680	36.5	5	17.0%	298,700	11,605	187	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66,954	2,771
3,350	73.0	10	33.9%	331,586	12,992	219	11.0%	12.0%	17.1%	34,068	1,384
5,030	109.5	15	51.0%	365,654	14,376	249	22.4%	23.9%	33.2%	0	0
6,700	146.0	20	67.9%	400,404	15,792	286	34.0%	36.1%	52.9%	—	—
8,380	182.5	25	84.9%	436,450	17,332	326	46.1%	49.3%	74.3%	—	—
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
1,680	36.5	5	21.4%	258,145	9,192	139	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56,784	2,087
3,350	73.0	10	42.6%	288,602	10,400	163	11.8%	13.1%	17.3%	28,572	1,050
5,030	109.5	15	64.0%	320,652	11,658	190	24.2%	26.8%	36.7%	0	0
6,700	146.0	20	85.2%	353,925	12,962	218	37.1%	41.0%	56.8%	—	—
8,380	182.5	25	99.8%	388,390	14,309	246	50.5%	55.7%	77.0%	—	—
NEW/RICHLAND											
1,680	36.5	5	18.5%	276,629	10,630	168	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61,107	2,671
3,350	73.0	10	36.8%	306,586	11,944	200	10.8%	12.4%	19.0%	31,150	1,357
5,030	109.5	15	55.3%	337,736	13,301	232	22.1%	25.1%	38.1%	0	0
6,700	146.0	20	73.6%	369,728	14,755	271	33.7%	38.8%	61.3%	—	—
8,380	182.5	25	92.1%	402,955	16,274	313	45.7%	53.1%	86.3%	—	—
NEW/SEATTLE											
1,680	36.5	5	22.6%	240,994	8,463	124	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58,439	2,324
3,350	73.0	10	45.0%	269,158	9,585	149	11.7%	13.3%	20.2%	30,275	1,202
5,030	109.5	15	67.6%	299,433	10,787	176	24.2%	27.5%	41.9%	0	0
6,700	146.0	20	90.1%	331,157	12,031	204	37.4%	42.2%	64.5%	—	—
8,380	182.5	25	100.0%	364,201	13,325	232	51.1%	57.5%	87.1%	—	—

C. LARGE OFFICE PROTOTYPE			ENERGY USE						% INCREASE			AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
OUTSIDE AIR	CFM/PERSON	%	CFM/yr	\$	kWh/yr	kW	ANNUAL DEMAND	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	
PROTO. ASHRAE													
EXISTING/RICHLAND													
15,080	7.9	5	3.3%	14,978,353	487,770	5,755	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44,333	1,439		
29,260	15.7	10	6.4%	14,993,387	488,764	5,758	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	29,299	446		
43,640	23.6	15	9.6%	15,011,003	489,200	5,768	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	11,683	9		
57,820	31.4	20	12.7%	15,022,686	489,209	5,713	0.3%	0.3%	-0.7%	0	0		
72,210	39.3	25	15.8%	15,046,170	490,056	5,805	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%				
EXISTING/SEATTLE													
15,080	7.9	5	3.6%	14,159,981	476,109	4,909	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4,740	304		
29,260	15.7	10	6.9%	14,161,474	476,037	4,910	0.0%	-0.0%	0.0%	3,247	375		
43,640	23.6	15	10.3%	14,159,903	476,077	4,911	-0.0%	-0.0%	0.0%	4,818	335		
57,820	31.4	20	13.7%	14,164,721	476,412	4,912	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0	0		
72,210	39.3	25	17.1%	14,171,750	476,486	4,913	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				
NEW/RICHLAND													
15,080	7.9	5	4.5%	9,254,585	307,816	3,967	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32,960	2,872		
29,260	15.7	10	8.8%	9,260,033	308,103	4,037	0.1%	0.1%	1.8%	27,512	2,586		
43,640	23.6	15	13.1%	9,270,609	308,885	4,115	0.2%	0.3%	3.7%	16,936	1,804		
57,820	31.4	20	17.3%	9,287,545	310,689	4,311	0.4%	0.9%	8.7%	0	0		
72,210	39.3	25	21.6%	9,315,200	314,761	4,734	0.7%	2.3%	19.3%				
NEW/SEATTLE													
15,080	7.9	5	5.0%	8,452,790	287,011	3,210	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	(866)	(19)		
29,260	15.7	10	9.6%	8,452,091	287,048	3,210	-0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	(167)	(56)		
43,640	23.6	15	14.4%	8,451,433	287,089	3,210	-0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	491	(97)		
57,820	31.4	20	19.1%	8,451,924	286,992	3,210	-0.0%	-0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
72,210	39.3	25	23.8%	8,453,233	287,101	3,215	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%				

D. HOSPITAL PROTOTYPE OUTSIDE AIR				ENERGY USE ENERGY COST PEAK				% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS			
CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROTO.	ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	ANNUAL DEMAND	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$
EXISTING/RICHLAND													
22,450	15.1	5	9.7%	16,031,498	401,974	2,856	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37,443	1,829		
36,080	30.2	10	15.5%	16,032,061	402,138	2,895	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	36,880	1,666		
49,730	45.3	15	21.4%	16,068,941	403,804	3,076	0.2%	0.5%	7.7%	0	0		
63,360	60.4	20	27.3%	16,174,148	407,281	3,334	0.9%	1.3%	16.7%				
77,010	75.5	25	33.1%	16,407,518	413,847	3,633	2.3%	3.0%	27.2%				
EXISTING/SEATTLE													
22,450	15.1	5	10.2%	14,931,611	459,720	2,477	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8,874	257		
36,080	30.2	10	16.4%	14,933,246	459,760	2,477	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7,239	217		
49,730	45.3	15	22.7%	14,940,485	459,977	2,478	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0	0		
63,360	60.4	20	28.9%	14,977,155	461,357	2,564	0.3%	0.4%	3.5%				
77,010	75.5	25	35.1%	15,074,432	465,188	2,673	1.0%	1.2%	7.9%				
NEW/RICHLAND													
22,450	15.1	5	10.6%	14,274,858	358,613	2,517	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	376,360	8,857		
36,080	30.2	10	17.0%	14,341,940	360,457	2,569	0.5%	0.5%	2.1%	309,278	7,013		
49,730	45.3	15	23.4%	14,651,218	367,470	2,799	2.6%	2.5%	11.2%	0	0		
63,360	60.4	20	29.9%	15,126,518	378,896	3,065	6.0%	5.7%	21.8%				
77,010	75.5	25	36.3%	15,656,732	392,398	3,446	9.7%	9.4%	36.9%				
NEW/SEATTLE													
22,450	15.1	5	11.0%	13,463,012	413,714	2,225	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	216,715	7,729		
36,080	30.2	10	17.7%	13,485,617	414,610	2,227	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	194,110	6,833		
49,730	45.3	15	24.4%	13,679,727	421,443	2,291	1.6%	1.9%	3.0%	0	0		
63,360	60.4	20	31.0%	14,087,452	434,259	2,391	4.6%	5.0%	7.5%				
77,010	75.5	25	37.7%	14,525,386	447,902	2,490	7.9%	8.3%	11.9%				

E. HOTEL PROTOTYPE OUTSIDE AIR			ENERGY USE ENERGY COST PEAK			ANNUAL DEMAND		% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS	
CFM	CFM/PERSON PROTO.	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
19,650	14.3	5	11.0%	7,646,311	205,784	2,630	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,411,195	77,484
39,240	28.6	10	21.9%	8,685,282	240,086	3,437	13.6%	16.7%	30.7%	1,372,224	43,182
58,890	42.9	15	32.9%	10,057,506	283,268	4,376	31.5%	37.7%	66.4%	0	0
78,480	57.2	20	43.9%	11,484,551	327,519	5,228	50.2%	59.2%	98.8%	-----	-----
98,330	71.5	25	55.0%	13,024,372	374,256	6,117	70.3%	81.9%	132.6%	-----	-----
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
19,650	14.3	5	12.2%	7,123,773	224,651	1,746	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,196,497	77,557
39,240	28.6	10	24.4%	8,129,566	257,752	2,205	14.1%	14.7%	26.3%	1,190,704	44,456
58,890	42.9	15	36.6%	9,320,270	302,208	2,688	30.8%	34.5%	54.0%	0	0
78,480	57.2	20	48.7%	10,684,998	348,327	3,161	50.0%	55.1%	81.0%	-----	-----
98,330	71.5	25	61.0%	12,159,338	397,522	3,651	70.7%	77.0%	109.1%	-----	-----
NEW/RICHLAND											
19,650	14.3	5	11.5%	6,792,216	180,027	2,153	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,422,073	74,592
39,240	28.6	10	23.0%	7,852,664	214,034	2,972	15.6%	18.9%	38.0%	1,361,625	40,585
58,890	42.9	15	34.5%	9,214,289	254,619	3,723	35.7%	41.4%	72.9%	0	0
78,480	57.2	20	46.0%	10,390,060	290,546	4,402	53.0%	61.4%	104.5%	-----	-----
98,330	71.5	25	57.6%	11,760,040	332,192	5,195	73.1%	84.5%	141.3%	-----	-----
NEW/SEATTLE											
19,650	14.3	5	12.4%	6,382,278	199,344	1,448	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,100,885	73,943
39,240	28.6	10	24.8%	7,280,126	232,006	1,850	14.1%	16.4%	27.8%	1,203,037	41,281
58,890	42.9	15	37.3%	8,483,163	273,287	2,286	32.9%	37.1%	57.9%	0	0
78,480	57.2	20	49.7%	9,636,291	312,188	2,685	51.0%	56.6%	85.4%	-----	-----
98,330	71.5	25	62.3%	10,992,375	357,460	3,132	72.2%	79.3%	116.3%	-----	-----

F. LARGE RETAIL PROTOTYPE			ENERGY USE ENERGY COST PEAK			% INCREASE			AVAILABLE SAVINGS		
OUTSIDE AIR		ANNUAL DEMAND									
CFM	CFM/PERSON	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	
PROTO.	ASHRAE										
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
13,650	45.5	5	20.1%	2,804,670	80.538	1,180	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	809,314	25,226
27,300	91.0	10	40.2%	3,209,409	93,739	1,369	14.4%	16.4%	16.0%	404,575	12,025
40,950	136.5	15	60.2%	3,613,984	105,764	1,450	28.9%	31.3%	22.9%	0	0
54,600	182.0	20	80.3%	3,928,587	114,410	1,457	40.1%	42.1%	23.5%	-----	-----
68,250	227.5	25	100.4%	4,249,425	123,650	1,515	51.5%	53.5%	28.4%	-----	-----
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
13,650	45.5	5	23.7%	2,530,000	81,359	735	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	848,094	30,795
27,300	91.0	10	47.5%	2,926,609	96,414	974	15.7%	18.5%	32.5%	451,485	15,740
40,950	136.5	15	71.2%	3,378,094	112,154	1,079	33.5%	37.9%	46.8%	0	0
54,600	182.0	20	95.0%	3,782,951	125,099	1,124	49.5%	53.8%	52.9%	-----	-----
68,250	227.5	25	100.0%	4,203,225	139,150	1,224	66.1%	71.0%	66.5%	-----	-----
NEW/RICHLAND											
13,650	45.5	5	24.9%	2,417,195	69,599	943	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	868,140	30,782
27,300	91.0	10	49.7%	2,811,251	83,742	1,368	16.3%	20.3%	45.1%	474,084	16,639
40,950	136.5	15	74.6%	3,285,335	100,382	1,746	35.9%	44.2%	85.2%	0	0
54,600	182.0	20	99.4%	3,771,889	117,762	1,947	56.0%	69.2%	106.5%	-----	-----
68,250	227.5	25	100.0%	4,230,719	135,209	2,297	75.0%	94.3%	143.6%	-----	-----
NEW/SEATTLE											
13,650	45.5	5	28.7%	2,188,533	69,468	574	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	870,566	32,592
27,300	91.0	10	57.4%	2,565,315	84,071	833	17.2%	21.0%	45.1%	493,784	17,990
40,950	136.5	15	86.2%	3,059,099	102,061	1,097	39.8%	46.9%	91.1%	0	0
54,600	182.0	20	100.0%	3,512,046	118,242	1,322	60.5%	70.2%	130.3%	-----	-----
68,250	227.5	25	100.0%	3,964,755	134,298	1,541	81.2%	93.3%	168.5%	-----	-----

		H. SCHOOL PROTOTYPE		ENERGY USE		ENERGY COST		PEAK		% INCREASE		AVAILABLE SAVINGS		
		OUTSIDE AIR												
CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROTO.	ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$		
EXISTING/RICHLAND														
18,850	18.2	5	28.9%		1,594,796	67,245	1,484		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	492,836	23,370	
37,640	36.3	10	53.8%		1,839,200	79,345	1,741		16.0%	17.2%	24.1%	249,096	11,270	
56,430	54.4	15	70.9%		2,087,632	90,616	1,747		32.5%	34.8%	30.9%	0	0	
75,250	72.6	20	84.4%		2,339,844	100,164	1,749		49.1%	44.9%	46.7%	49.0%	17.9%	
94,040	90.8	25	88.9%		2,588,721	108,037	1,751		65.5%	66.2%	62.3%	60.7%	18.0%	
EXISTING/SEATTLE														
18,850	18.2	5	35.4%		1,507,662	59,345	1,206		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	490,268	20,649	
37,640	36.3	10	63.4%		1,748,834	69,541	1,497		17.2%	24.1%	24.1%	249,096	10,453	
56,430	54.4	15	81.7%		1,997,930	79,994	1,734		32.5%	34.8%	43.8%	0	0	
75,250	72.6	20	88.6%		2,247,585	89,896	1,747		49.1%	51.5%	49.1%	44.9%	-----	
94,040	90.8	25	91.5%		2,494,452	98,619	1,749		65.5%	66.2%	65.5%	60.7%	45.0%	
NEW/RICHLAND														
18,850	18.2	5	53.5%		960,379	44,549	1,072		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	485,893	18,520	
37,640	36.3	10	83.8%		1,202,060	54,591	1,084		25.2%	22.5%	1.1%	244,212	8,478	
56,430	54.4	15	91.0%		1,446,272	63,069	1,087		50.6%	41.6%	1.4%	0	0	
75,250	72.6	20	93.8%		1,687,823	69,282	1,089		75.7%	55.5%	1.6%	-----	-----	
94,040	90.8	25	95.5%		1,914,135	74,506	1,092		99.3%	67.2%	1.9%	-----	-----	
NEW/SEATTLE														
18,850	18.2	5	53.5%		919,095	37,794	851		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	477,556	18,724	
37,640	36.3	10	87.2%		1,154,073	47,663	1,079		25.6%	26.1%	26.8%	242,578	8,855	
56,430	54.4	15	92.4%		1,396,651	56,517	1,085		52.0%	49.5%	27.5%	0	0	
75,250	72.6	20	94.9%		1,640,730	64,450	1,087		78.5%	70.5%	27.7%	-----	-----	
94,040	90.8	25	96.4%		1,883,480	72,110	1,090		104.9%	90.8%	28.1%	-----	-----	

I. RESTAURANT PROTOTYPE				ENERGY USE			COST			PEAK			% INCREASE			AVAILABLE SAVINGS		
CFM	CFM/PERSON	PROTO.	ASHRAE	%	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	%	kW	kWh/yr	\$		
EXISTING/RICHLAND																		
660	15.5	5	23.7%		368,880	12,016	157		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40,390	1,483					
1,310	31.1	10	47.1%		388,377	12,734	173		5.3%	6.0%	10.2%	20,893	765					
1,970	46.7	15	70.9%		409,270	13,498	192		10.9%	12.3%	22.3%	0	0					
2,620	62.2	20	94.2%		430,586	14,274	208		16.7%	18.8%	32.5%							
3,280	77.8	25	100.0%		452,859	15,062	220		22.8%	25.4%	40.1%							
EXISTING/SEATTLE																		
660	15.5	5	29.6%		347,212	11,381	111		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36,175	1,338					
1,310	31.1	10	58.7%		364,538	12,027	121		5.0%	5.7%	9.0%	18,849	693					
1,970	46.7	15	88.3%		383,387	12,720	131		10.4%	11.8%	18.0%	0	0					
2,620	62.2	20	100.0%		402,780	13,425	141		16.0%	18.0%	27.0%							
3,280	77.8	25	100.0%		422,515	14,140	151		21.7%	24.2%	36.0%							
NEW/RICHLAND																		
660	15.5	5	32.0%		365,944	11,679	143		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37,954	1,448					
1,310	31.1	10	63.6%		384,016	12,381	160		4.9%	6.0%	11.9%	19,882	746					
1,970	46.7	15	95.6%		403,898	13,127	177		10.4%	12.4%	23.8%	0	0					
2,620	62.2	20	100.0%		424,618	13,887	190		16.0%	18.9%	32.9%							
3,280	77.8	25	100.0%		445,786	14,668	206		21.8%	25.6%	44.1%							
NEW/SEATTLE																		
660	15.5	5	37.7%		346,544	11,164	102		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35,592	1,317					
1,310	31.1	10	74.9%		363,131	11,787	111		4.8%	5.6%	8.8%	19,005	695					
1,970	46.7	15	100.0%		382,136	12,481	121		10.3%	11.8%	18.6%	0	0					
2,620	62.2	20	100.0%		401,598	13,181	131		15.9%	18.1%	28.4%							
3,280	77.8	25	100.0%		421,452	13,896	142		21.6%	24.5%	39.2%							

J.	WAREHOUSE OUTSIDE AIR		ENERGY USE kWh/yr	ENERGY COST \$	PEAK ANNUAL DEMAND kW	% INCREASE kWh/yr	\$	kW	kWh/yr	\$	AVAILABLE SAVINGS
	CFM	CFM/PERSON PROTO.									
EXISTING/RICHLAND											
100	27.4	5	0.7%	350,744	13,156	230	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3,505	148
190	54.8	10	1.3%	352,405	13,225	231	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	1,844	79
290	82.2	15	2.0%	354,249	13,304	233	1.0%	1.1%	1.3%	0	0
380	109.6	20	2.6%	355,916	13,376	235	1.5%	1.7%	2.2%	-----	-----
480	137.0	25	3.3%	357,774	13,457	237	2.0%	2.3%	3.0%	-----	-----
EXISTING/SEATTLE											
100	27.4	5	1.1%	298,145	10,764	152	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3,011	132
190	54.8	10	2.1%	299,559	10,822	153	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	1,597	74
290	82.2	15	3.2%	301,156	10,896	155	1.0%	1.2%	2.0%	0	0
380	109.6	20	4.2%	302,591	10,955	156	1.5%	1.8%	2.6%	-----	-----
480	137.0	25	5.4%	304,205	11,021	158	2.0%	2.4%	3.9%	-----	-----
NEW/RICHLAND											
100	27.4	5	1.0%	276,240	10,128	163	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3,119	142
190	54.8	10	2.0%	277,711	10,194	165	0.5%	0.7%	1.2%	1,648	76
290	82.2	15	3.0%	279,359	10,270	167	1.1%	1.4%	2.5%	0	0
380	109.6	20	4.0%	280,848	10,339	169	1.7%	2.1%	3.7%	-----	-----
480	137.0	25	5.0%	282,509	10,416	170	2.3%	2.8%	4.3%	-----	-----
NEW/SEATTLE											
100	27.4	5	1.7%	239,579	8,437	111	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2,640	108
190	54.8	10	3.2%	240,819	8,490	112	0.5%	0.6%	0.9%	1,400	56
290	82.2	15	4.8%	242,219	8,546	114	1.1%	1.3%	2.7%	0	0
380	109.6	20	6.4%	243,499	8,600	115	1.6%	1.9%	3.6%	-----	-----
480	137.0	25	8.0%	244,938	8,660	117	2.2%	2.6%	5.4%	-----	-----

END

**DATE
FILMED**

// 1/18/91

