

Building Simulation

Performance evaluation of damper control settings for operation of multiple-zone variable air volume reheat system in different building applications and climate types --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	BUIL-D-16-00228R1
Full Title:	Performance evaluation of damper control settings for operation of multiple-zone variable air volume reheat system in different building applications and climate types
Article Type:	Research Article
Corresponding Author:	Esmail M. Saber, Ph.D. University of Sheffield Sheffield, South Yorkshire UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Sheffield
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Esmail M. Saber, Ph.D.
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Esmail M. Saber, Ph.D.
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Choosing the right control strategies is an important task for effective operation of variable air volume reheat (VAVR) system in commercial buildings. In this design, dampers' position inside air terminal units (ATUs) are modulated to adjust the amount of air supply volume based on thermal zones' cooling or heating demand. A minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) is set for damper settings of ATUs to avoid under-ventilation problem in thermal zones. This study investigated the impact of MAFF value on various performance aspects of multiple-zone VAVR design in different building applications and climate types. A five-storey commercial building for three applications of school, office and retail in four climate types of tropical monsoon, hot desert, Mediterranean and humid continental have been simulated in EnergyPlus building simulation software. The results of simulations have shown that lowering MAFF value in ATUs would reduce the required reheat coil energy to maintain precise air supply temperature at part load cooling scenarios. Nonetheless, this reduction could have some implications on thermal comfort and indoor air quality level of thermal zones in a multiple-zone arrangement. It was concluded that in general it is an energy efficient control strategy to keep MAFF value to as low as 0.1 for high ventilation rate spaces like classrooms in school buildings (except for hot desert climate). On the other hand, it is advisable to not reduce MAFF value below 0.3 for low ventilation rate spaces like office areas to avoid any air quality issues in thermal zones.</p>
Response to Reviewers:	A separate file containing the responses to the reviewers' comments is attached to the Manuscript.

I would like to appreciate the efforts of reviewers for examining the paper and providing these constructive and helpful comments. Please find the responses to the raised comments and suggestions listed in the below table.

No.	Editor's Comments	
	<p>Reviewer#2: This paper presents a study on the impact of minimum air flow fraction value on various performance aspects of multiple-zone variable-air-volume reheat design in different building applications and climate types. Several types of building use and climate were investigated. This is relatively simple question (only minimum air flow fraction is considered), but the conclusion might be important for the design of VAV system. Comments are listed below:</p>	
1	<p>As the minimum air flow fraction should be used for specific weather conditions, it is not clear how many hours this setting should be used (for every climate type)? This is important to evaluate the significance of this work.</p>	<p>This study attempted to explore the impact of minimum air flow fraction value on different performance aspects of multiple-zone VAVR design. In the common control settings of VAVR, a fixed MAFF is set in air terminal units to bring in enough outdoor air in part load scenarios. The number of hours when thermal comfort and air quality were not acceptable are explicitly shown on the graphs for different scenarios. These values could be used to interpret the effectiveness of each control strategy for different building applications and climate types. These explanations have been added to the paper.</p>
2	<p>In other weather conditions (when the minimum air flow fraction should not be applied), what type of control strategy is used? Does this control strategy have similar performance in different building type and climate type?</p>	<p>The main idea behind this research was to find the best trade-off point considering all factors regarding energy, thermal comfort and air quality on annual basis. As you indicated, there are other alternative control strategies beside the fixed minimum air flow fraction which could suit better certain building applications and climate types. However, the focus of this study is on the common practice of VAVR control in the existing commercial buildings which is the fixed MAFF in ATUs. Several other strategies have been reported in the literature for the control of ATUs like CO₂-based control of air flow fraction with deployed carbon dioxide sensors in air streams or indoor space. The performance of each strategy varies depending on building application and climate type. These explanations have been added to the paper.</p>

3	All the figures have a poor quality.	The quality of figures has been improved.
4	If multiple control settings are considered, the value of this paper will be improved.	There is a significant body of research in the literature on performance of different control strategies for operation of ventilation controller and air terminal units in VAVR system. The aim of this research was to introduce some practical guidelines for efficient operation of existing commercial buildings with current embedded control platform. Upgrading the control platform of HVAC system in building and employing CO2 or other building occupancy sensors could bring further opportunities in efficient operation of building. This has been extended in the future works recommendations of the paper.
	Reviewer#3: Overall the paper is well written, easy to follow, and concise. There are however, some typos and grammatical errors. I've listed a few below.	
1	Page 4: control system while VAV has --> control system, while VAV has Page 4: complimentary --> complementary Page 6: inside ATUs and its impacts --> inside ATUs, and its impacts Page 7: gradually opens till supply air --> gradually opens until supply air Page 8: department of energy --> Department of Energy Page 9: including fan, coil and etc. and the outdoor --> including fan, coil, etc., and the outdoor Page 9: department of energy --> Department of Energy Page 10: of Miami while for the dry --> of Miami, while for the dry Page 10: 1000 hours while in other --> 1000 hours, while in other Page 10: for school buildings while there could --> for school buildings, while there could Page 11: for school buildings while it could --> for school buildings, while it could	All the typos and grammatical errors have been corrected in the manuscript

Performance evaluation of damper control settings for operation of multiple-zone variable air volume reheat system in different building applications and climate types

Esmail M. Saber

Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield, Mappin Street,

Sheffield S1 3JD, UK

Tel.: +447709769067

E-mail address: e.saber@sheffield.ac.uk

7. Acknowledgment

This work was inspired through numerous conversations with professors and researchers at department of building in National University of Singapore (Prof. Kwok Wai Tham, Prof. Chandra Sekhar, Prof. David Cheong and Mr. Prashant Anand) and college of environmental design in University of California, Berkeley (Prof. Stefano Schiavon and Mr. Carlos Duarte).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Performance evaluation of damper control settings for operation of multiple-zone variable air volume reheat system in different building applications and climate types

Abstract

Choosing the right control strategies is an important task for effective operation of variable air volume reheat (VAVR) system in commercial buildings. In this design, dampers' position inside air terminal units (ATUs) are modulated to adjust the amount of air supply volume based on thermal zones' cooling or heating demand. A minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) is set for damper settings of ATUs to avoid under-ventilation problem in thermal zones. This study investigated the impact of MAFF value on various performance aspects of multiple-zone VAVR design in different building applications and climate types. A five-storey commercial building for three applications of school, office and retail in four climate types of tropical monsoon, hot desert, Mediterranean and humid continental have been simulated in EnergyPlus building simulation software. The results of simulations have shown that lowering MAFF value in ATUs would reduce the required reheat coil energy to maintain precise air supply temperature at part load cooling scenarios. Nonetheless, this reduction could have some implications on thermal comfort and indoor air quality level of thermal zones in a multiple-zone arrangement. It was concluded that in general it is an energy efficient control strategy to keep MAFF value to as low as 0.1 for high ventilation rate spaces like classrooms in school buildings (except for hot desert climate). On the other hand, it is advisable to not reduce MAFF value below 0.3 for low ventilation rate spaces like office areas to avoid any air quality issues in thermal zones.

1
2
3 **Keywords – Damper Control Settings, Variable Air Volume Reheat, Air Terminal Unit,**
4
5
6 **Minimum Air Flow Fraction, Building Simulation, EnergyPlus**
7
8
9

10
11
12 **1. Nomenclature**
13
14
15
16
17

18	AHU	Air Handling Unit
19		
20	ATU	Air Terminal Unit
21		
22	CAV	Constant Air Volume
23		
24	CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
25		
26	DCV	Demand Control Ventilation
27		
28	HVAC	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning
29		
30	IAQ	Indoor Air Quality
31		
32	MAFF	Minimum Air Flow Fraction
33		
34	OAFF	Outdoor Air Flow Fraction
35		
36	SHGC	Solar Heat Gain Coefficient
37		
38	VAV	Variable Air Volume
39		
40	VAVR	Variable Air Volume Reheat
41		
42	ϵ	Emissivity
43		
44	σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant
45		
46	ρ	Density of Air
47		
48	c	Heat Capacity
49		
50	A_{ext}	Exterior Surface Area
51		
52	M	Mass Concentration
53		
54	M_{out}	Outdoor Mass Concentration
55		
56	M_{sup}	Supply Mass Concentration
57		
58	Q_{exf}	Exfiltration Flow Rate
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		

1	Q_{exh}	Exhaust Flow Rate
2	Q_{inf}	Infiltration Flow Rate
3		
4	Q_{sup}	Supply Flow Rate
5		
6	R	Thermal resistance
7		
8	S_T	Source of Heat
9		
10	S_M	Source of pollutants
11		
12	T	Temperature
13		
14	T_{ext}	Exterior Surface Temperature
15		
16	T_{sky}	Average Temperature of Sky
17		
18	T_{sup}	Supply Air Temperature
19		
20	T_{out}	Outdoor Air Temperature
21		
22	U	Thermal Transmittance
23		
24	V	Volume
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		

2. Introduction

There are many considerations to be taken into account in order to choose the right control strategies for operation of a HVAC system in buildings. Any efficient HVAC design requires an optimized and robust control system to operate effectively under different indoor/outdoor scenarios (Liu et al. 2014; Nassif, 2013; Saber et al. 2016). The central all air design is the most common type of HVAC system in commercial high-rise buildings. In this design, several chillers and boilers provide chilled and hot water for air handling units (AHUs) and air terminal units (ATUs) located at different floors of building. Each AHU typically serves several thermal zones and provides a conditioned mix of outdoor and return air to terminal units of zones. AHUs and ATUs operate based on constant air volume (CAV) or variable air volume (VAV) strategies. In CAV design, the supply air volume remains constant while supply air temperature is modulated in response to the changing load of space. On the other

1 hand, supply air temperature remains constant in VAV design while air volume is modulated
2 in air terminal units. CAV has lower investment cost and simpler **control system, while VAV**
3 **has** higher initial cost and requires more sophisticated control strategies to bring in enough
4 outdoor air at part load scenarios. In addition, VAV provides better dehumidification
5 performance at part load operation and it is more suitable for spaces where load characteristics
6 are not well defined or future expansion is predicted (Rengarajan and Colacino, 2004).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 ATUs are employed with a reheat coil in multiple-zone design scenarios to concurrently
15 satisfy different cooling/heating loads of zones. In cooling mode, reheat coil provides sensible
16 heating to supply air to maintain precise control of indoor condition without compromising air
17 quality. In actual building operation, each zone has different cooling load and reducing the
18 amount of outdoor air coming into the space could raise air quality concern in some thermal
19 zones connected to the same air loop system. In heating mode, reheat coil provides a
20 **complementary** heating to pre-heated air stream and its capacity could be modulated through
21 valve control to satisfy changing heating demand of zones. The schematic diagram of a
22 multiple-zone VAV design with reheat coils is shown in Fig. 1. Ventilation controller
23 modulates dampers' settings on return air, exhaust air and outdoor air streams to bring
24 necessary amount of outdoor air into thermal zones. In addition, VAV controller modulates
25 damper and valve settings inside air terminal units based on thermostat feedback and air flow
26 sensors in ducts.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Fig. 1 here*
55

56 The control settings of ventilation and VAV controllers could have considerable impacts
57 on the performance of VAVR design in terms of thermal comfort, air quality and energy
58 consumption. Various studies in the literature attempted to explore the most optimal control
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 strategies for operation of VAVR system in buildings (Murphy 2011; Warden 2004; Xu et al.
2 2009; Yang et al. 2011). Pan et al. (2003) investigated two high rise office buildings in
3 Shanghai and found that the amount of outdoor air flow rate varies significantly from zone to
4 zone especially in part load operations. They concluded that fixed outdoor air flow fraction
5 (OAFF) of 0.1 to 0.2 is unable to provide necessary ventilation to all zones. In a similar study,
6 Krarti et al. (2000) conducted an experimental evaluation of different air flow measurement
7 techniques and control strategies in order to maintain the minimum level of outdoor air in
8 VAV design. They found strategies using direct measurement of outdoor flow rate using Pitot
9 tube and anemometer as the best control scheme. CO₂ based demand control ventilation
10 (DCV) was found to be an effective strategy for spaces where there are high variations in
11 occupancy level and non-occupant pollutant sources are negligible (Emmerich and Persily,
12 1997). Xu and Wang (2007) proposed an adaptive DCV with dynamic ventilation equation
13 and critical zone set point temperature reset which can provide better thermal comfort and air
14 quality with energy saving of 7.8 to 9 % for summer condition of Hong Kong. In another
15 study, Nassif (2012) proposed a robust DCV based on CO₂ concentration of supply air for
16 multiple-zone VAV system which has estimated energy savings of up to 25% under different
17 USA climates.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Cho and Liu (2009) evaluated several control strategies of air terminal units and proposed
42 an improved control algorithm which could reduce the energy saving of HVAC system by
43 33%. Control settings of the damper inside ATUs could play an important role in operation of
44 VAVR system at part load. The minimum amount of supply air volume at part load could be
45 controlled with this damper setting as constant minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) or fixed
46 minimum air flow rate. Liu and Brambley (2011) suggested employing building occupancy
47 sensors to determine minimum air flow set point for each zone or terminal box. In another
48 study, Lee et al. (2012) investigated three MAFF values of 10%, 20% and 30% with
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 EnergyPlus and found that this value has significant impact on annual energy consumption of
2 boiler. The current study aimed to investigate the impact of damper control settings in
3 performance of multiple-zone VAVR system for different building applications and climate
4 types. **In the common control settings of VAVR, a fixed MAFF is set in air terminal units**
5 **to bring in enough outdoor air in part load scenarios.** Different values of MAFF have been
6 applied in control settings of the dampers **inside ATUs, and its impacts** on air quality,
7 thermal comfort and reheat coil energy have been explored through building performance
8 simulation.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **3. Research Methodology**

23
24
25
26

27 Each thermal zone in the building represents a control volume in which temperature,
28 humidity, carbon dioxide and other pollutants could be assumed to be uniform. The general
29 heat and mass flows through boundaries inward and outward thermal zone as a control volume
30 are illustrated in Fig. 2. Heat transfer and mass transfer could happen through walls, windows,
31 gaps, air supply diffusers and return grills. There could be radiative, convective/conductive
32 heat gain and heat loss as well as infiltration and exfiltration through doors or windows gaps.
33 Occupants, lighting and equipment inside thermal zone would act as the sources of heat and
34 pollutants which also need to be taken into account.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Fig. 2 here*

55 Heat and mass balance equations for each thermal zone representing a control volume can
56 be written as Eq. 1 and Eq. 2. M denotes mass concentration of any chemical components in
57 air including water vapour (H₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), and other indoor air pollutants.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

EnergyPlus building simulation software has been employed in this study to model zone heat and mass balance processes in buildings. This open-source software formulates energy and mass balances for thermal zones based on integration of zone and air systems and solves the resulting ordinary differential equations using a predictor-corrector approach (ENERGYPLUS, 2016a).

$$\rho c V \frac{dT}{dt} = \rho c (Q_{sup} T_{sup} - Q_{exh} T) + \rho c (Q_{inf} T_{out} - Q_{exf} T) + U A_f (T_{out} - T) + A_{ext} \varepsilon \sigma (T_{sky}^4 - T_{ext}^4) + S_T \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = \frac{1}{V} (Q_{sup} M_{sup} - Q_{exh} M) + \frac{1}{V} (Q_{inf} M_{out} - Q_{exf} M) + S_M \quad \text{Eq. 2}$$

The geometry of a five-storey commercial building has been modelled in 3D modelling program of SketchUp. The 3D geometry and floor plan of the simulated building are shown in Fig. 3. Each storey has the floor area of 625 m² (25 m × 25 m) which is divided into five thermal zones (East, West, North, South, Centre) of the same floor area (125 m²). All the perimeter zones have the same window and flat overhang dimensions. All the five zones in each floor are connected to one air loop system. Air is supplied to different zones through ATUs which include dampers and reheat coils. As explained in the introduction section, VAV controller modulates damper and reheat coil control settings based on the feedback from thermostat and air flow sensors. A minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) could be set for damper position in ATUs to assure a minimum level of zone ventilation at part load cooling scenarios. In heating mode, damper position remains at MAFF point while reheat valve **gradually opens until supply air** temperature gets to a maximum set point. A maximum air flow fraction in heating mode is also set in dual maximum control logic of ATU to provide higher level of heating capacity by increasing air flow rate in heating mode (Taylor et al. 2012).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 3 here

The impact of MAFF value on performance of multiple-zone VAVR system has been investigated through building simulation. Three MAFF values of 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 have been set in control settings of 25 zones' ATUs in the simulated building. The impact of this parameter was explored on several performance metrics related to energy consumption, thermal comfort and air quality. The variation of MAFF value would change the air supply volume at some part load scenarios which could affect the design load of reheat coil or heating energy of building. It also could affect comfort level of occupants and the amount of outdoor air flow rate in some scenarios. Fanger's PMV/PPD model has been used as the comfort metrics in this research. The number of hours in the year when PMV falls out of acceptable range ($-1 < PMV < 1$, $PPD < 25\%$) was calculated for each simulation scenario (ISO 7730, 2005). In addition, zone CO₂ level has been determined through zone air contaminant balance model in EnergyPlus as an indicator of air quality in thermal zones (ENERGYPLUS, 2016b). The threshold of 1000 ppm has been assumed in this study and the number of hours in the year when CO₂ concentration has exceeded this limit was calculated. Outdoor air flow fraction (OAFF) of the air loop system in each floor was also calculated for the range of simulated MAFF values.

The building simulations have been conducted for different applications and climate types. Three building applications of office building, retail establishment and educational facilities (classroom) have been considered in this study. The specific load characteristics and ventilation requirements of these buildings are listed in Table 1. These numbers were adopted from USA **Department of Energy** commercial prototype building models (DOE, 2016) which represent typical buildings designs in the United States based on ASHRAE standard

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

90.1 (2013). Occupant density in these buildings has the order of educational > retail > office and the required ventilation rate needs to be modified for each building, accordingly. There are two sets of ventilation rate specified for each building. One is used for sizing of equipment **including fan, coil, etc., and the outdoor** control ventilation is used to specify necessary outdoor air in each application. The impact of MAFF has also been investigated for buildings in different climate types. The simulations have been conducted for four climate types of tropical monsoon (Miami), hot desert (Phoenix), Mediterranean (San Francisco) and humid continental (Chicago). The specific construction characteristics of buildings for each of these climate types are listed in Table 2. These values were also adopted from USA **Department of Energy** commercial prototype building models (DOE, 2016). Colder climate requires higher thermal resistance (R) or lower thermal transmittance (U) in roof insulation, exterior wall insulation and window glazing materials. Solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) of the selected window for humid continental climate of Chicago is higher than other climates to bring more solar heat into the space for this relatively cold climate. It is noteworthy that in all of the conducted simulations, cooling/heating set point temperatures were set to 24/21 °C from 6 AM to 9 PM and 29.4/15.6 °C for the rest of the hours in weekdays. Infiltration rate per exterior surface of 0.57 L/s.m² was assumed in these building energy simulations and the infiltration level was reduced to a quarter when HVAC system was operating.

Table 1 here

Table 2 here

4. Results

The impact of MAFF value in ATUs was investigated on several performance metrics of the building in different applications and climates. These metrics cover various aspects of

1 building performance including reheat coil energy, thermal comfort and indoor air quality. The
2 simulations have been conducted for three MAFF values of 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 in three building
3 applications (school, office, retail) and four climate types (tropical monsoon, hot desert,
4 Mediterranean, humid continental). The results of the simulations for school, office and retail
5 buildings are compared to each other in Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively. The error bars
6 indicate the standard deviation of the calculated values for 25 simulated thermal zones. In
7 general, there is a reduction in reheat coil load of zones when the minimum air flow fraction
8 (MAFF) decreases from 0.5 to 0.3 and 0.1. The level of reduction for the climates where there
9 is no dominant heating demand (Miami, Phoenix and San Francisco) could be up to 40%.
10 However, the reduction level is less than 6% for the continental climate of Chicago. The
11 reheat coil design load for the Chicago climate is three times more than other climates because
12 of higher heating degree days in this climate.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The comfort analysis of the simulations showed that the number of hours when PMV
30 value was not in the acceptable range increases for lower values of MAFF. This increase
31 ranges between 10 to 21% for the tropical climate **of Miami, while for the dry** climate of
32 Phoenix, the level of increase could be up to 106%. On the other hand, the number of
33 uncomfortable hours with reduced MAFF on annual basis seems to be decreasing or remaining
34 unchanged for the temperate climate of San Francisco and continental climate of Chicago. The
35 number of hours when PMV was not acceptable for the tropical monsoon climate of Miami
36 was found to be in the range of **1000 hours, while in other** climate this value was in the range
37 of 500 hours. The specific cooling load profile in the tropics which constitutes a significant
38 portion of latent load could be the reason behind this higher level of uncomfortable hours.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The indoor air quality level of thermal zones was found to be more dependent on
54 application type of buildings. The number of hours when CO₂ exceeds the limit is
55 considerably higher for school buildings compared to office and retail application because of
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 denser occupancy level. However, the level of increase in number of hours for reduced MAFF
2 values remain almost unchanged **for school buildings, while there could** be up to 573% and
3
4 58% increase, respectively for office and retail buildings. On the basis of climate types, air
5
6 quality level in the simulated building has been more affected with reduction of MAFF value
7
8 in the continental climate of Chicago.
9
10

11
12
13
14 *Fig. 4 here*
15

16
17
18
19 *Fig. 5 here*
20

21
22
23
24 *Fig. 6 here*
25

26
27
28
29 Reducing MAFF value would have some impacts on operational condition of ventilation
30 controller to bring in necessary amount of outdoor air at part load scenarios. Outdoor air flow
31 fraction (OAFF) of air loop systems in the simulated building has been determined throughout
32 the year. The results of the simulations for different building applications and climate types are
33 compared to each other in Fig. 7. The error bars indicate the standard deviation of the
34 calculated values for 5 air loop systems in the simulated building. Outdoor air flow fraction
35 (OAFF) in air handling units of the building was close to 0.4, 0.2 and 0.3 respectively for
36 school, office and retail applications. School and retail buildings have higher OAFF values
37 compared to office building because of denser occupancy. In general, OAFF increases for
38 lower values of MAFF to maintain the same level of ventilation rate or indoor air quality in
39 the space. The level of increase in OAFF is insignificant **for school buildings, while it could**
40
41 be up to 142% and 47% respectively for office and retail applications.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 7 here

1
2
3
4
5 The OAFF value of the air loop system in building varies depending on the time of the day
6
7 and the month of the year. The flood plots of OAFF over simulation time for school, office
8
9 and retail applications in the tropical monsoon climate of Miami are shown in Fig. 8. It can be
10
11 seen that there is a slight increase in OAFF of AHU systems in buildings during heating
12
13 season (November to March). The higher OAFF value in heating mode of system could be
14
15 justified considering the fact that heating demand of thermal zones could be satisfied at
16
17 minimum supply air flow rate while modulating hot water flow rate in reheat coil. This could
18
19 require higher OAFF value to bring necessary amount of outdoor air into the thermal zones.
20
21 As illustrated in these flood plots, OAFF has only nonzero values during occupancy period
22
23 when HVAC system is operating which mainly includes weekdays from 6 AM to 9 PM.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Fig. 8 here

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 **5. Discussions**

38
39
40
41
42 Control settings of dampers inside ATUs in multiple-zone VAVR design could have
43
44 considerable impacts on energy consumption and well-being of occupants inside buildings.
45
46 The damper position is modulated at part load cooling scenarios to reduce air supply volume
47
48 according to the cooling demand of space. However, due to the zone ventilation concern, a
49
50 minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) of design flow rate is set for damper control setting. The
51
52 MAFF value would affect required reheat energy in both cooling and heating mode. In
53
54 addition, the ventilation controller needs to adjust outdoor air flow fraction (OAFF) of air
55
56 loops based on this MAFF value. The functions of VAV controller and ventilation controller
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 in multiple-zone VAVR system are interconnected and reducing the MAFF value could have
2 implications on thermal comfort and air quality of thermal zones.
3

4 The results of this investigation revealed that there is a reduction in reheat coil design load
5 for reduced MAFF values. Lower MAFF values would result in decreased air supply volume
6 at part load scenarios which requires less reheat energy to warm up the supply air. The level of
7 reduction in reheat coil load for Miami, Phoenix and San Francisco climates ranges between
8 14 to 23% and 5 to 20%, respectively when MAFF value decreases from 0.5 to 0.3 and from
9 0.3 to 0.1. The impact of this parameter on reheat coil load is less pronounced for continental
10 climate of Chicago because the reheat load in this climate is mainly determined by heating
11 demand of zones. The reduction level in this climate is within 3 to 6% and 0.5 to 1%,
12 respectively when MAFF value drops from 0.5 to 0.3 and from 0.3 to 0.1. In a relevant study,
13 Lee et al. (2012) investigated the effect of minimum air flow setting on building energy
14 consumption under Korean climate condition. They studied three MAFF values of 0.1, 0.2 and
15 0.3 and found that this value has significant impact on reheat energy and consequently on
16 annual energy consumption of boiler. Hoyt et al. (2009) also investigated the impact of
17 lowering the minimum supply air volume for San Francisco climate. They concluded that
18 lowering MAFF value from 0.3 to 0.2 and 0.1 would reduce the annual energy usage by 17%
19 and 27%, respectively.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Thermal comfort analysis of the simulated building showed that in relatively warm
44 climates of Miami and Phoenix, the number of hours when PMV was not in acceptable range
45 increases by lowering MAFF value. However, no similar trend was observed for
46 Mediterranean climate of San Francisco and continental climate of Chicago. Higher cooling
47 load in tropical monsoon climate of Miami and hot desert climate of Phoenix could be the
48 reason behind these differences. In terms of indoor air quality, office spaces were found to be
49 the most vulnerable types of commercial applications for lowering MAFF value. The number
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 of CO₂ exceeded hours on annual basis increases by 203% and 435% respectively for office
2 buildings in San Francisco and Chicago climates when MAFF value decreases from 0.3 to 0.1.
3
4 It could be said that lowering MAFF value is more likely to cause IAQ issues for spaces with
5 low ventilation rate like in office buildings. The analysis of outdoor air flow fraction (OAFF)
6
7 in different air loops of the simulated building revealed that OAFF varies significantly
8
9 depending on application types. Ventilation controller would increase OAFF value in different
10
11 scenarios to bring enough outdoor air into thermal zones for reduced MAFF values of ATUs.
12
13 The level of increase in OAFF value is more pronounced in office spaces which ranges
14
15 between 28 to 55% and 28 to 66% when MAFF value decreases from 0.5 to 0.3 and 0.3 to 0.1,
16
17 respectively.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 It was shown in this investigation that in general it is a good design practice to keep the
25
26 MAFF value to as low as 0.1 to reduce reheat coil load in part load scenarios. Nevertheless,
27
28 the results of simulations have shown that reducing MAFF value below 0.3 in some building
29
30 applications and climate types could cause comfort and IAQ issues for some thermal zones in
31
32 multiple-zone VAVR design. The number of uncomfortable hours in thermal zones would
33
34 significantly increase for school buildings in hot desert climate and retail buildings in both
35
36 Mediterranean and hot desert climates if MAFF value reduces to less than 0.3. In addition, the
37
38 number of CO₂ exceeded hours is likely to increase considerably for office buildings in the all
39
40 four simulated climates and retail buildings in continental climate if MAFF setting drops to
41
42 less than 0.3. It is noteworthy that ventilation controller of VAVR design needs to modulate
43
44 dampers' position near outdoor intake and adjust OAFF value of air loop system to assure
45
46 necessary amount of outdoor air in all thermal zones for the range of MAFF values. **The CO₂-
47
48 based control of air flow fraction with deployed carbon dioxide sensors in air streams or
49
50 indoor space is an alternative strategy for operation of ATUs which could suit better
51
52 specific building applications and climate types.**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

6. Conclusion

The impact of damper control settings in multiple-zone variable air volume reheat (VAVR) design has been investigated through building performance simulations. Three values of 0.5, 0.3 and 0.1 have been considered for minimum air flow fraction (MAFF) in air terminal units (ATUs) of a five-storey building with 25 thermal zones. The simulations have been conducted for three building applications (school, office and retail) and four climate types (tropical monsoon, hot desert, Mediterranean and humid continental). The outcomes of simulations have shown that reheat coil design load would drop by lowering MAFF value in ATUs of thermal zones. However, this reduction in supply air flow rate at part load scenarios could have some implications regarding thermal comfort and IAQ level in some thermal zones. In general, it is advisable to keep MAFF value to as low as 0.1 for relatively high ventilation rate spaces like school buildings except for school spaces in hot desert climate of phoenix. For relatively low ventilation rate spaces like office buildings, it is the best to not reduce MAFF value below 0.3 since that could considerably deteriorate IAQ level in some thermal zones. In all of the simulated scenarios, ventilation controller of VAVR system adjusted outdoor air flow fraction (OAFF) of air loops based on ventilation demand of zones. The proper and effective function of the ventilation controller is a necessity for providing adequate amount of outdoor air into space for the range of MAFF values. It is recommended for future works to further investigate the impact of damper control settings in multiple-zone VAVR design through experimental setup or field studies. Exploring the impact of this control setting in the installed cases of VAVR system in actual buildings can bring further insight into optimal control strategies of this design for different applications and climate types. **The aim of this research was to introduce some practical guidelines for efficient operation of**

1 existing commercial buildings with current embedded control platform. Upgrading the
2 control platform of HVAC system in building and employing CO₂ or other building
3 occupancy sensors could bring further opportunities in efficient operation of building.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 7. References

13
14
15
16
17

- 18 ASHRAE 90.1. (2013). *Energy Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings*. Atlanta, GA,
19 USA: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers.
20
21 Cho, Y.-H., & Liu, M. (2009). Minimum airflow reset of single duct VAV terminal boxes. *Building and*
22 *Environment*, 44(9), 1876–1885. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.01.001>
23
24 DOE. (2016). Commercial Prototype Building Models | Building Energy Codes Program. Retrieved September
25 4, 2016, from https://www.energycodes.gov/development/commercial/prototype_models
26
27 Emmerich, S. J., & Persily, A. K. (1997). Literature review on CO₂-based demand-controlled ventilation.,
28 *ASHRAE Transactions*, 103, 229–243.
29
30 ENERGYPLUS. (2016a). *EnergyPlus™ Version 8.5 Documentation: Engineering Reference*. Washington, DC,
31 USA: U.S. Department of Energy.
32
33 ENERGYPLUS. (2016b). *EnergyPlus™ Version 8.5 Documentation: Input Output Reference*. Washington, DC,
34 USA: U.S. Department of Energy.
35
36 Hoyt, T., Lee, K. H., Zhang, H., Arens, E., & Webster, T. (2009). Energy savings from extended air temperature
37 setpoints and reductions in room air mixing. In *13th International Conference on Environmental*
38 *Ergonomics*. Boston, MA, USA. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/28x9d7xj>
39
40 ISO 7730. (2005). *Ergonomics of the thermal environment -- Analytical determination and interpretation of*
41 *thermal comfort using calculation of the PMV and PPD indices and local thermal comfort criteria*.
42 Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization.
43
44 Krarti, M., Schroeder, C. C., Jeanette, E., & Brandemuehl, M. J. (2000). Experimental Analysis of Measurement
45 and Control Techniques of Outside Air Intake Rates in VAV Systems. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 106(2),
46 234–255.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Lee, K. H., Chin, K. I., & Yoon, J. H. (2012). Effect of Minimum Airflow Setting of VAV Unit on Building Energy Consumption under Korean Climatic Condition. *Advanced Materials Research*, 450–451, 1435–1439. <http://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.450-451.1435>
- Liu, G., & Brambley, M. R. (2011). Occupancy based control strategy for variable-air-volume (VAV) terminal box systems. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 117(2), 244–252.
- Liu, Z., Song, F., Jiang, Z., Chen, X., & Guan, X. (2014). Optimization based integrated control of building HVAC system. *Building Simulation*, 7(4), 375–387. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-014-0161-z>
- Murphy, J. (2011). High-performance VAV Systems. *ASHRAE Journal*, 53(10), 18–28.
- Nassif, N. (2012). A robust CO₂-based demand-controlled ventilation control strategy for multi-zone HVAC systems. *Energy and Buildings*, 45, 72–81. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.10.018>
- Nassif, N. (2013). Modeling and optimization of HVAC systems using artificial neural network and genetic algorithm. *Building Simulation*, 7(3), 237–245. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-013-0138-3>
- Pan, Y., Zhou, H., Huang, Z., Zeng, Y., & Long, W. (2003). Measurement and simulation of indoor air quality and energy consumption in two Shanghai office buildings with variable air volume systems. *Energy and Buildings*, 35(9), 877–891. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788\(02\)00245-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(02)00245-1)
- Rengarajan, K., & Colacino, F. (2004). VAV Systems in Hot and Humid Climates. *Heating/Piping/Air Conditioning Engineering: HPAC*, 76(1), 56–67.
- Saber, E. M., Tham, K. W., & Leibundgut, H. (2016). A review of high temperature cooling systems in tropical buildings. *Building and Environment*, 96, 237–249. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.11.029>
- Taylor, S. T., Stein, J., Paliaga, G., & Cheng, H. (2012). Dual maximum VAV box control logic. *ASHRAE Journal*, 54(12), 16–24.
- Warden, D. (2004). Supply Air CO₂ Control of Minimum Outdoor Air for Multiple Space Systems. *ASHRAE Journal*, 46(10), 25–35.
- Xu, X., & Wang, S. (2007). An Adaptive Demand-Controlled Ventilation Strategy with Zone Temperature Reset for Multi-Zone Air-Conditioning Systems. *Indoor and Built Environment*, 16(5), 426–437. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1420326X07082744>
- Xu, X., Wang, S., Sun, Z., & Xiao, F. (2009). A model-based optimal ventilation control strategy of multi-zone VAV air-conditioning systems. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 29(1), 91–104. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2008.02.017>

1 Yang, X.-B., Jin, X.-Q., Du, Z.-M., Fan, B., & Chai, X.-F. (2011). Evaluation of four control strategies for
 2 building VAV air-conditioning systems. *Energy and Buildings*, 43(2–3), 414–422.
 3
 4 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.10.004>
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9

10 **Tables**

11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16 Table 1 Specific load characteristics and ventilation requirements of different building
 17 applications
 18
 19

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45

Application	Outdoor control ventilation, L/s.m ²	Sizing ventilation, L/s.m ²	Floor area per person, m ² /person	Lighting (W/m ²)	Electric equipment (W/m ²)
Office buildings	Sum of 0.00001 L/s/person and 0.43 L/s/m ²	0.43	18.579	8.83	8
Retail establishments	Sum of 0.00001 L/s/person and 1.18 L/s/m ²	1.18	6.193	15.5	3.23
Educational facilities	Sum of 4.7 L/s/person and 0.6 L/s/m ²	2.39	2.654	13.35	10

46
 47
 48 Table 2 Specific construction characteristics of buildings in different climate types
 49

50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

City	Climate type	Roof insulation, thermal resistance R, m ² .K/W	Exterior wall insulation thermal resistance R, m ² .K/W	Window specification, U factor and solar heat gain coefficient
Miami	Tropical monsoon	3.47	1.04	U factor = 0.60, SHGC = 0.25

Phoenix	Hot desert	4.32	1.71	U factor = 0.60, SHGC = 0.25
San Francisco	Mediterranean	4.32	1.9	U factor = 0.55, SHGC = 0.25
Chicago	Humid Continental	5.31	2.82	U factor = 0.48, SHGC = 0.40

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 Schematic diagram of a multiple-zone VAVR

Fig. 2 Inward and outward heat and mass flows for each thermal zone

Fig. 3 The 3D geometry and floor plan of the simulated five-storey building

Fig. 4 Comparison of performance metrics in school buildings for the range of MAFF values in (a) tropical monsoon, (b) hot desert, (c) Mediterranean, (d) humid continental climates

Fig. 5 Comparison of performance metrics in office buildings for the range of MAFF values in (a) tropical monsoon, (b) hot desert, (c) Mediterranean, (d) humid continental climates

Fig. 6 Comparison of performance metrics in retail buildings for the range of MAFF values in (a) tropical monsoon, (b) hot desert, (c) Mediterranean, (d) humid continental climates

Fig. 7 Comparison of outdoor air flow fraction (OAFF) for the range of MAFF values in different building applications and climate types

Fig. 8 Flood plot of OAFF over the simulation time for school, office and retail buildings in the tropical monsoon climate of Miami















