



Are Naturally Ventilated LEED Buildings Healthier?

Stefan Storey^a, Karen Bartlett^b

evidence review

Summary

- Green building rating systems such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) employ a variety of design solutions to reduce energy and minimize environmental damage. These solutions, such as the use of passive ventilation, do not necessarily lead to improvements in occupant health
 - Passive ventilation strategies employed to reduce energy can lead to uneven airflow distribution and low air exchange rates. This can potentially lead to localized increases in building related emissions such as the off-gassing of volatile organic compounds.
 - Methods to reduce volatile organic compounds (VOC) and airborne particulate entrainment, such as the elimination of carpets and furnishings, can result in increased acoustical noise and reverberation time. Passive ventilation apertures that allow the free movement of air between rooms and corridors can lead to uncontrolled noise transmission.
- Prescriptive measures embedded in the LEED rating system and the structure of the rating method (selective point scoring) do not always ensure high Indoor Air Quality (IAQ).
 - LEED recognizes the need to encourage low emission materials and provides support for alternative material selection. However, periodic measures of performance provide meaningful information for building managers and occupants.
 - LEED buildings may qualify for a high level of certification with multiple points for energy efficiency but the minimum number of points for IAQ. This means that a high certification level such as Platinum or Gold is not necessarily synonymous with high quality indoor environments.
- There exists a research gap between how buildings are designed and how buildings perform in terms of human health. The knowledge gap can be remediated by:
 - Incorporating lessons learned from Sick Building Syndrome (SBS) studies which can be used to inform both future exposure studies and mitigation strategies for green buildings with ventilation problems.
 - Acknowledging the need to move away from prescriptive design processes employed by LEED and towards performance-based measurements enforced by regionally determined benchmark standards.

^a Institute of Resources, Environment & Sustainability, University of British Columbia

^b School of Environmental Health, University of British Columbia

Introduction

This report, highlighting pertinent indoor health issues for naturally ventilated LEED buildings, is relevant for building health inspectors, building code regulators, building science researchers, and regional policy-makers. The report summarizes the potential health impacts to building occupants, the effectiveness of LEED New Construction (NC) indoor air quality strategies and the research gap between building design and measured performance.

What is a LEED building?

LEED NC 3.0 is a voluntary, market-based building assessment method. LEED uses a point scoring system to rate the “greenness” of a building on an escalating scale from LEED Certified (40-49 points) to the highest level LEED Platinum (>80 points). Points are distributed in categories spanning many building metrics, including water efficiency, low-impact building site location, energy and atmosphere impact minimization, material and resources consumption, and indoor environmental quality (IEQ).

LEED 2009 strategies on IEQ

For LEED NC, there are 15 points available for IEQ, of which 2 points are mandatory and 13 are optional. The two mandatory points require indoor ventilation rates to minimally perform to ASHRAE 62.1-2007 guidelines and to minimize the entrainment of tobacco smoke in occupied zones. The non-mandatory points include monitoring of CO₂ levels, increased ventilation, an indoor air quality management plan for the construction and pre-occupancy phases, the use of low emission materials, and the management of indoor chemical/pollutant source control. The remainder of the points are available for supporting indoor comfort and verification. LEED does not significantly differentiate between the common indoor pollutants which include volatile organic compounds, aldehydes including formaldehyde, biologic agents including allergens, mould and endotoxins, ultrafine particulate matter including combustion products, and gases including carbon monoxide or H₂S from sanitary vents. LEED does not specify occupancy limits for each of these IAQ metrics. Instead LEED outlines mitigating strategies such as the use of materials that emit low levels of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)¹, increased ventilation (30% over ASHRAE 60.1-2007 for mechanically ventilated buildings and (CIBSE)

Applications Manual 10: 2005 guidelines for naturally ventilated buildings), air flush-out protocols for construction and pre-occupancy phases, basic guidelines to control indoor chemical dispersion, thermal comfort guidelines (ASHRAE 55-2004) and a Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE) survey.

Ventilation strategies and Indoor Environmental Quality

The overall intent of the LEED approach is to combine energy efficiency, environmental impact reduction, and high indoor air quality. One of the most pervasive building design strategies used to achieve these design goals is the use of natural ventilation. Broadly classified, there are three modes of ventilation: fully mechanical, naturally ventilated, and hybrid systems. Natural ventilation (NV) relies on the stack effect (vertical buoyancy), or crosswinds (horizontal wind pressure), to introduce outside air to occupied spaces. NV buildings save energy by avoiding the use of motor driven air handling units.² Eliminating forced air also has the advantage of lowering fibre counts by reducing the entrainment of small particulate matter residing in air ducting systems. Studies have shown that mechanical systems can have up to four times the number of suspended airborne dust particles when compared to NV buildings.³ However, while NV buildings have lower dust counts, and a reduction in acoustical noise generated by mechanical blowers and air vents, they expose indoor occupants to other potential health risks. Natural ventilation relies on small differential pressure differences between the outside air and interior spaces. These small pressure differences are relatively sensitive to local wind and temperature fluctuations and can lead to non-uniform flow rates, both spatially and temporally.⁴

- Outdoor pollution sources: Air intakes for stack-effect ventilated buildings are often located at low levels of the building structure. Direct outdoor air supply at street level can allow traffic pollution (combustion gases and ultrafine particulate matter) to enter the building unchecked and cause degraded indoor air quality.^{5, 6}
- Indoor pollution sources: Without adequate venting of all interior spaces, local concentrations of indoor pollutants can build up in local regions within the building. Of particular concern is the potential of VOCs, such as formaldehyde, which can accumulate in rooms containing stagnant air. This is a critical issue for the off-gassing of new

furnishings and finishings after a renovation or rebuild.⁷

- Additionally, natural ventilation may allow the transmission of internally generated noise. Ventilation apertures are installed in NV buildings to allow airflow between rooms and offices. These apertures also allow the transfer of unattenuated noise (see Figure 1). In office environments, noise levels in LEED buildings have been shown by POE studies to be unsatisfactory. Recent studies suggest that chronic exposure to low and medium intensity (50-75 dBA) noise is also an important environmental stressor.
- Studies in school and office environments have shown elevated blood pressure and urinary stress hormone levels associated with increased exposure to low-level noise.^{8,9}
- Workers in noisy office environments often self-report increased levels of stress^{10,11} and noise has been linked to stress related symptoms (headaches, nausea, musculoskeletal problems) in people suffering from "Sick Building Syndrome" (SBS).¹²⁻¹⁴ Additionally, low frequency noise has been found to sensitize occupants to the symptoms of SBS.¹⁵




Figure 1. Ventilation aperture configuration in NV buildings: Typical natural ventilation pathways are located above doorways, with the arrows in the figure representing airflow. In practice, the width of the apertures varies, with the slots frequently designed to span an entire wall of an office.

The issues outlined indicate a unique set of challenges to ensuring high indoor environmental conditions in NV buildings. However, experimental studies have shown that natural ventilation strategies can work effectively if occupant behaviour is well-informed and occupants have easily accessible controls.¹⁶ High-quality comfort can be attained in NV buildings, but considerable attention must be directed to the design of intuitive

controls that enhance the ability of occupants to adapt to adverse conditions.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Well-managed and properly operated NV buildings have been found to reduce the reported frequency of SBS type symptoms.²⁰⁻²³

How is LEED performing?

Broadly, performance evaluation is divided into three groups: pre-build design (target) performance, post-occupancy evaluation by users, and measured analytical performance. The current understanding of LEED indoor environmental performance is underdeveloped; although numerous post-occupancy studies involving building occupants have been completed, studies focused on the efficacy of design approaches and measured performance research are sparse.

- The design, or anticipated, performance of LEED has been reviewed by the National Center of Healthy Housing (NCHH).^{24,25} Guidelines for LEED homes were compared against a comprehensive basket of NCHH best practices for IEQ strategies. LEED homes were found to be trailing behind the American Lung Association (ALA) Health House, EPA Indoor Air Package, and Enterprise Community Partners Green Communities guidelines, but superior to the National Association of Home Builders Green Building Program. Of the problems cited, protection from contaminants such as lead, radon, and pesticides are not uniformly covered by LEED.
- Post-occupancy evaluations of LEED buildings show that the acoustic performance of LEED consistently lags behind conventional buildings.^{26,27} For LEED buildings, considerations such as office layout are critically important for IEQ.²⁸ Open plan offices, often adopted in NV design, exacerbate problems such as noise transmission, speech privacy, thermal comfort, and lighting distribution.
- Measured performance studies of NV LEED buildings are relatively rare; however, preliminary studies show that measured CO₂ levels in non-LEED NV classrooms can exceed ASHRAE 62 limits.²⁹ Similarly, acoustics studies have shown excessive noise transmission in NV "Green Buildings."^{30,31}
- Although LEED encourages the installation of CO₂ sensors (non-mandatory point IEQ Credit 1), CO₂ readings do not necessarily act as a proxy variable to indicate IAQ.³² Because occupants are usually

the source of CO₂, clearly organic compounds can build up even when occupancy is low. Furthermore, LEED does not set any numerical limits on the presence of any of the main analytes of IEQ during occupancy. Paradoxically, LEED lists hard limits for IAQ pollutants during construction and pre-occupancy phases, but no limits for the occupancy phase.

Understanding the IEQ performance of buildings is best determined through either continuous or at least periodic interval monitoring. Leadership in this regard has been taken by the Living Building Challenge which requires air quality testing pre-occupancy and after nine months of occupancy to measure levels of Respirable Suspended Particulates (RSP) and Total Volatile Organic Compounds (TVOC).³³ Developing a protocol on periodical performance measurement, in addition to rigorous benchmarks, will be key to ensuring high performance from LEED buildings.

Conclusion

Naturally ventilated LEED NC buildings are a major step forward in terms of supporting high IEQ. However, a weakness of the LEED IEQ points system is a reliance on a prescriptive approach. Without mandatory measured performance strategies, along with benchmark limits for VOC and other pollutants, high IEQ cannot be ensured. Additionally, high levels of LEED Certification do not necessarily result in high IEQ. Since most LEED points are voluntary, many points can be scored in other areas, such as energy efficiency, meaning that points acquired for advanced IEQ can be relatively few.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Trevor Hancock and Pam Moore for their valuable input and review of the draft document. Stefan Storey and Karen Bartlett acknowledge support from the University of British Columbia Bridge Program.

References

1. USGB Council. LEED 2009 for new construction and major renovations. Washington (DC): US Green Building Council; 2009. Available from: <http://www.usgbc.org/ShowFile.aspx?DocumentID=5546>.
2. Emmerich S, Dols W, Axley J. Natural ventilation review and plan for design and analysis tools: National Institute of Standards and Technology; 2001 Contract No.: NISTIR 6781. Available from: http://www.estig.ipbeja.pt/~pdnl/Sub-paginas/Fisica%20dos%20edificios_files/Documentos/b01073.pdf.
3. Paul T, Sree D, Aglan H. Effect of mechanically induced ventilation on the indoor air quality of building envelopes. *Energy Build.* 2010;42(3):326-32.
4. Linden PF. The fluid mechanics of natural ventilation. *Annual Review Fluid Mech.* 1999;31(1):201-38.

Evidence Gaps

Currently, little is known about the performance of NV LEED. This is partly due to the relatively recent arrival of large numbers of LEED Buildings and also due to the difficulty in obtaining permission to test buildings. With the impending exponential increase in LEED buildings, further research is required to identify appropriate IEQ performance indices, types of exposure for occupants, collective impacts of exposure, types of interventions, and the relative costs and benefits of resulting health outcomes. Exposure information needs to be applicable to a broad spectrum of building types, to various populations, and tailored to individual cultural and geographical needs.³⁴⁻³⁶ Additionally, building designers need to involve multiple stakeholders to ensure that policies and methods employed to support high IEQ involve building owners, managers and occupants during the design phase.³⁷ For example, 'Green leasing' provides an opportunity to develop binding agreements between owners and leaseholders so that both parties can benefit from performance-based IAQ strategies.

Finally, measures must be taken to fill the research gap between building design and building performance. Novel research is required to investigate indoor chemistry, the mode of dispersion of indoor aerosols over short-time frames, and the interactions between various volatile indoor air pollutants.^{38, 39}

Further Information Sources:

Future studies in IEQ can refer to surveys of jurisdictional guidelines on IAQ.^{34, 40, 41}

5. Perry R, Gee IL. Vehicle emissions and effects on air quality: Indoors and outdoors. *Indoor Built Environ.* 1994;3(4):224-36.
6. Chang TJ. Numerical evaluation of the effect of traffic pollution on indoor air quality of a naturally ventilated building. *J Air Waste Mgmt. Assoc.* 2002;52(9):1043-53.
7. Shaw C, Won D, Reardon J. Managing volatile organic compounds and indoor air quality in office buildings—An engineering approach. Ottawa: National Research Council Canada; 2005. Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.125.7996&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
8. Evans G, Hygge S, Bullinger M. Chronic noise and psychological stress. *Psych. Sci.* 1995;6(6):333-8.
9. Evans GW, Johnson D. Stress and open-office noise. *J Appl. Psych.* 2000;85(5):779-83.
10. Brennan A, Chugh JS, Kline T. Traditional versus open office design: A longitudinal field study. *Environ Behav.* 2002;34(3):279-99.
11. Loewen LJ, Suedfeld P. Cognitive and arousal effects of masking office noise. *Environ. Behav.* 1992;24(3):381-95.
12. Salter C, Powell K, Begault D, Alvarado R. Designing acoustically successful workplaces: Case studies of a method for predicting speech privacy in the contemporary workplace. Berkeley (CA): Center for the Built Environment; 2003. Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.61.4953&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
13. Witterseh T, Wyon DP, Clausen G. The effects of moderate heat stress and open-plan office noise distraction on SBS symptoms and on the performance of office work. *Indoor Air.* 2004;14(s8):30-40.
14. Newsham G. Making the open plan office a better place to work. *Construction Technology Update.* 2003;60.
15. Niven RM, Fletcher AM, Pickering CAC, Faragher EB, Potter IN, Booth WB, et al. Building sickness syndrome in healthy and unhealthy buildings: An epidemiological and environmental assessment with cluster analysis. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 2000;57(9):627-34.
16. Silvestre C, Andre P, Michel T, editors. Air temperature and CO2 variations in a naturally ventilated classroom under a Nordic climate. PLEA2009 - 26th Conference on Passive and Low Energy Architecture, 22-24 June 2009. Quebec City, Canada. 2009.
17. Brown Z. Occupant comfort and engagement in green buildings: Examining the effects of knowledge, feedback and workplace culture [PhD thesis]. Vancouver: University of British Columbia; 2009. Available from: <https://circle.ubc.ca/handle/2429/17490>.
18. Brager G, de Dear R. A standard for natural ventilation. *ASHRAE Journal.* 2000.
19. Brager G, de Dear R. Thermal comfort in naturally ventilated buildings: Revisions to ASHRAE Standard 55. *Energy Build.* 2002;34:549-61.
20. Burge PS. Sick building syndrome. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 2004;61(2):185-90.
21. Jaakkola JJ, Miettinen P. Type of ventilation system in office buildings and sick building syndrome. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1995;141(8):755-65.
22. Zweers T, Preller L, Brunekreef B, Boleij JSM. Health and indoor climate complaints of 7043 office workers in 61 buildings in the Netherlands. *Indoor Air.* 1992;2(3):127-36.
23. Mendell MJ, Fisk WJ, Deddens JA, Seavey WG, Smith AH, Smith DF, et al. Elevated symptom prevalence associated with ventilation type in office buildings. *Epidemiology.* 1996;7(6):583-9.
24. Morley R, Tohn E. How healthy are national green building programs? Columbia (MD): National Center for Healthy Housing; 2008. Available from: <http://www.community-wealth.com/pdfs/articles-publications/green/report-morley-tohn.pdf>.
25. Mermin N, Morley R, Powell K, Tohn E. Comparing green building guidelines and healthy homes principles: A preliminary investigation. Columbia (MD): National Center for Healthy Housing; 2006. Available from: http://www.nchh.org/Portals/0/Contents/Green_Analysis.pdf.
26. Lee YS, Guerin DA. Indoor environmental quality related to occupant satisfaction and performance in LEED-certified buildings. *Indoor Built Environ.* 2009;18(4):293-300.
27. Turner C. LEED building performance in the Cascadia Region: A post occupancy evaluation report. Portland (OR): Cascadia Region Green Building Council; 2006.
28. Lee YS, Guerin DA. Indoor environmental quality differences between office types in LEED-certified buildings in the US. *Build Environ.* 2010;45(5):1104-12.
29. Bartlett KH, Martinez M, Bert J. Modeling of occupant-generated CO2 dynamics in naturally ventilated classrooms. *J Occup. Environ. Hyg.* 2004;1(3):139-48.
30. Khaleghi A, Bartlett K, Hodgson M. Relationship between ventilation, air quality, and acoustics in "green" and "brown" buildings. *J Acoust. Soc. Am.* 2006;120(5).
31. Hodgson M, Hyde R, Fulton B, Richter M. Acoustical evaluation of a "green" office building. *J Acoust. Soc. Am.* 2006;120:3185.
32. Persily A. Evaluating building IAQ and ventilation with indoor carbon dioxide. *Ashrae Transactions - Proceedings of the Ashrae Summer Meeting, Boston, 29 June - 2 July, 1997.* 1997;103(2):1-12.
33. McLennan J. The living building challenge: In pursuit of true sustainability in the built environment. Portland (OR): Cascadia Region Green Building Council; 2006. Available from: <http://ilbi.org/the-standard/lbc-v1.3.pdf>.
34. Veitch J, editor. Proceedings of the 1st Canadian Building and Health Sciences Workshop 2008; Montreal (QC): National Research Council of Canada.
35. Bluysen PM. Towards new methods and ways to create healthy and comfortable buildings. *Build Environ.* 2010;45(4):808-18.

36. Taske N, Taylor L, Mulvihill C, Doyle N. Housing and public health: A review of reviews of interventions for improving health. London: National Institute for Health and Excellence; 2005. Available from: http://www.nice.org.uk/aboutnice/whoweare/abouttheheadpublications/hdapublications/housing_and_public_health_a_review_of_reviews_of_interventions_for_improving_health_evidence_briefing_summary_ms_word.jsp.
37. Wu F, Jacobs D, Mitchell C, Miller D, Karol MH. Improving indoor environmental quality for public health: Impediments and policy recommendations. Environ. Health Perspect. 2007;115(6):953-7.
38. Weschler CJ. Chemical reactions among indoor pollutants: What we've learned in the new millennium. Indoor Air. 2004;14(s7):184-94.
39. Richmond-Bryant J, Eisner AD, Brixey LA, Wiener RW. Short-term dispersion of indoor aerosols: Can it be assumed the room is well mixed? Build. Environ. 2006;41(2):156-63.
40. Lighthouse Sustainable Building Centre. BC green building code background research: Materials emissions & indoor air quality. Vancouver: LSBC; 2007. Available from: http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca/Portals/Rainbow/Documents/LighthouseSBC_IAQ-Oct07.pdf.
41. Environmental Protection Agency. Ventilation and air quality in offices: Office of Air and Radiation, Indoor Environments Division (6609J)1990 Contract No.: EPA 402-F-94-003. Available from: <http://www.epa.gov/iaq/pubs/ventilat.html>.

This document was produced by the National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health at the British Columbia Centre for Disease Control in June 2010.

Permission is granted to reproduce this document in whole, but not in part.

Production of this document has been made possible through a financial contribution from the Public Health Agency of Canada.

ISBN: 978-0-9812646-9-1

© National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health 2010

400 East Tower
555 W 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5Z 3X7

Tel.: 604-707-2445
Fax: 604-707-2444
contact@ncceh.ca



National Collaborating Centre
for Environmental Health

Centre de collaboration nationale
en santé environnementale

To provide feedback on this document, please visit www.ncceh.ca/en/document_feedback

www.ncceh.ca