

This document is downloaded from DR-NTU, Nanyang Technological University Library, Singapore.

Title	New directions : potential climate and productivity benefits from CO2 capture in commercial buildings(Main article)
Author(s)	Gall, Elliott Tyler; Nazaroff, William W.
Citation	Gall, E. T., & Nazaroff, W. W. (2015). New directions : potential climate and productivity benefits from CO2 capture in commercial buildings. Atmospheric environment, 103, 378-380.
Date	2015
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10220/26372
Rights	© 2015 Elsevier. This is the author created version of a work that has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication by Atmospheric Environment, Elsevier. It incorporates referee's comments but changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, structural formatting, may not be reflected in this document. The published version is available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.01.004].

New Directions: Potential Climate and Productivity Benefits from CO₂ Capture in Commercial Buildings

Elliott T. Gall^{1,2,*} and William W Nazaroff³

¹Berkeley Education Alliance for Research in Singapore

²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nanyang Technological University

³Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, University of California, Berkeley

*Corresponding author: Elliott T. Gall

email: egall@ntu.edu.sg phone: +65-8283-5756

Primarily because of humanity's heavy reliance on fossil fuels, ambient CO₂ levels have risen from 280 ppm in preindustrial times to 400 ppm today, and levels continue to rise by a few ppm per year (Tans and Keeling, 2014). Progress toward stabilizing atmospheric CO₂ levels can be achieved not only through reducing emissions but also through the engineering of new or enhanced sinks of atmospheric CO₂. Research and private sector initiatives on removing CO₂ from ambient air (Boot-Handford et al., 2014) lead us to consider this challenge in the context of a well-known indoor air quality concern: elevated CO₂ concentrations in occupied buildings.

Considerable energy is consumed in operating commercial buildings. In the United States, commercial buildings consume 19% of the total energy use (US DOE, 2012) causing approximately 1000 Tg CO₂ y⁻¹ of fossil carbon dioxide release to the atmosphere, which is 18% of the US and 3% of the global anthropogenic emission rate (Boden et al., 2011; U.S. EIA, 2011). Reducing the carbon footprint of buildings is a strategic priority for offsetting future anthropogenic carbon emissions (Ochsendorf, 2012).

In addition to CO₂ release associated with fossil energy use, carbon footprints of buildings include CO₂ generated from the metabolism of human occupants that is transported outdoors via indoor-outdoor air exchange. Elevated concentrations that occur indoors from human metabolism might be an attractive target for air capture technologies. Although the carbon in

metabolic CO₂ is of contemporary rather than fossil origin, removing metabolic CO₂ would contribute in the same way as removing fossil CO₂ from air in pursuing climate-stabilization goals.

Metabolic CO₂ has long been used as an indicator of indoor air quality. As a proxy for the adequacy of ventilation, guidelines call for indoor CO₂ not to exceed 700 ppm above outdoor levels (ANSI/ASHRAE, 2013). High occupant densities in inadequately ventilated spaces can generate indoor CO₂ levels that exceed this limit. For example, Seppänen et al. (1999) document indoor CO₂ levels as high as 3700 ppm in offices and 2800 ppm in schools. On the other hand, a survey of US commercial buildings found lower values, with the median increment of indoor CO₂ being 140 ppm above the outdoor value (interquartile range: 100-220 ppm) (Apte et al., 2000). Human exposure to indoor CO₂ is expected to increase as a result of climate change, due to (a) higher ambient CO₂ concentrations and (b) energy-efficient building practices that reduce ventilation (Committee on the Effect of Climate Change on Indoor Air Quality and Public Health, 2011).

In addition to offsetting anthropogenic carbon emissions to the atmosphere, removing CO₂ either from recirculating airstreams or utilizing portable air cleaners indoors would decrease indoor CO₂ concentrations. Evidence suggests that exposure to CO₂ may degrade decision-making performance (Satish et al., 2012). In schools and offices, such effects might contribute to decrements in learning or in workplace productivity. Controlling CO₂ in offices and schools by means of active CO₂ removal therefore might confer multiple benefits: strengthening capture processes by treating indoor air with elevated CO₂ levels because of metabolic emissions, contributing to the attainment of carbon neutrality goals for buildings, and improving indoor air quality by reducing the CO₂ exposure of building occupants.

In the following paragraphs, we briefly explore the opportunity scale for reducing the carbon footprint of buildings through CO₂ capture in buildings. Schools and offices are used as specific examples for several reasons: the importance of productivity in these environments, the evidence of elevated indoor CO₂ concentrations from metabolic emissions, and their large number and high occupancy.

Considering the total building stock of the United States, the scale of indoor human metabolic CO₂ emissions can be estimated using a bottom-up approach:

$$E_{tot} = P \times E_m \times f_{in} \times 24 \frac{h}{d} \times 365 \frac{d}{y} \quad (1)$$

where E_{tot} is the emission rate of human metabolic CO₂ emitted to all indoor microenvironments in the United States (g CO₂ y⁻¹), P is the US population (persons), E_m is the human metabolic emission rate (g CO₂ person⁻¹ h⁻¹), and f_{in} is the average fraction of time a person spends indoors, For a US scaling estimate, P is 3.2×10⁸ persons, E_m is 34 g CO₂ person⁻¹ h⁻¹ (Smith, 1988), and f_{in} is 0.87 (Klepeis et al., 2001). Thus, the overall human metabolic CO₂ emissions into US built environments is $E_{tot} \sim 83$ Tg CO₂ y⁻¹. An activity survey of Californians (Jenkins et al., 1992) indicates that the average proportion of time spent in schools (0.67 h/d per person) and offices (1.2 h/d per person) sum to 9% of the total time spent indoors, so the corresponding total emissions into these two microenvironment categories would be about 7.4 Tg CO₂ y⁻¹.

In addition to removing metabolic CO₂ emitted, indoor air capture can remove CO₂ supplied with outdoor ventilation air. The total quantity of CO₂ of outdoor origin that flows through US classrooms and offices can be estimated by combining 10 L/s per person as a typical outdoor-air ventilation rate (Apte et al. 2000), 400 ppm CO₂ in outdoor air, 320 million people, and 1.9 h/d as the average per-person occupancy of these indoor environments. The result is 5.8 Tg CO₂ per

year. So, summing the metabolic emissions and the ventilation supply from outdoor air, we estimate that about 13 Tg CO₂ per year pass through offices and classrooms in the United States.

If CO₂ control were applied in these microenvironments and achieved a net capture efficiency of 75%, then the total carbon footprint of could be reduced by 10 Tg CO₂ y⁻¹. This reduction is similar in magnitude to that projected for energy efficiency efforts in buildings; it exceeds CO₂ reductions resulting from energy performance contracting in the US; and it is roughly half of the anticipated CO₂ reductions from appliance efficiency standards (IPCC, 2014).

Several key challenges must be overcome before office buildings or schools could become an effective point-of-control for active CO₂ removal. To realize the joint benefits of reducing CO₂ exposure and capturing CO₂ from air with higher than ambient levels, the CO₂ removal infrastructure must be located either in the building air recirculation system or in stand-alone indoor-air treatment units. Large commercial office spaces are often designed with recirculating airflow systems; however, classrooms commonly rely on simple package ventilators or on operable windows to provide outdoor air, which would present a different set of logistic challenges and opportunities.

The scaling analysis shows that a moderate efficacy is necessary to substantially reduce the carbon footprint of commercial buildings through active CO₂ capture. For dilute CO₂ levels, adsorption technologies appear to be the most promising approach (Lackner et al., 2012). Zhang et al. (2014) have demonstrated a polyethyleneimine-silica adsorbent that removes CO₂ with nearly 100% capture at relatively short (7.5 s) media-air contact times. He et al. (2012) have shown that removal of 80 mg CO₂ per gram of sorbent is possible at 400 ppm CO₂ and that the media can be regenerated at low temperatures with little effect on sorbent capacity. However, even assuming regeneration as frequent as weekly, substantial masses of sorbent media would be

required to capture CO₂ from offices and schools. Distributing control technology to buildings would confer the benefit of capturing from higher CO₂ concentrations; however, it would also create the need to manage the collection and transport of the sorbent media to processing and disposal facilities. Development of collection and regeneration infrastructure, investigation of long-term regeneration efficiencies, and creation of reliable carbon storage are all foreseeable research needs that require solutions for carbon capture from buildings to become a practical reality. In addition, sorbents for direct air capture in indoor spaces must not produce harmful byproducts, as placement of sorbent media in recirculation ducts or in stand-alone indoor air cleaners could commonly result in human exposure to air treated by sorbent media.

Estimates of the total cost for air capture of CO₂ are disputed, in part because technologies for CO₂ air capture are still being developed (Lackner et al., 2012). Holmes and Keith (2012) have estimated the cost of air contacting (regeneration costs not included) at \$60 per tonne of CO₂ for a functional prototype (Holmes et al., 2013). Cost estimates that include regeneration range broadly, from ~\$20 to \$1000 per tonne of CO₂ (Goeppert et al., 2012). To remove 10 Tg CO₂ y⁻¹ at this range of costs, the corresponding expense would amount to \$0.2-10 billion per year.

Workplace productivity and performance is found to decrease when indoor air quality is poor, in part a result of sick building syndrome (SBS) symptoms (Wyon, 2004). Low ventilation rates are significantly associated with degraded indoor air quality, increases in SBS symptoms, and decreased performance in simulated office tasks (Seppanen et al., 1999; Wargocki et al., 2000). Indoor CO₂ concentrations are elevated in occupied buildings with low per-person ventilation rates. While the specific role of CO₂ as an indoor pollutant requires further investigation, studies have documented statistically significant associations between CO₂ and

SBS symptoms (Apte et al., 2000; Tsai et al., 2012). The costs of sick building syndrome, likely dominated by accompanying decreases in worker productivity, are estimated to be \$17-26 billion per year for US offices alone (Fisk, 2000; Fisk et al., 2011), higher than the estimated cost associated with capturing CO₂ in US offices and schools. Therefore, it is feasible that the cost of CO₂ capture in commercial buildings could be justified economically if it is demonstrated that doing so improves workplace productivity because of lower CO₂ levels in offices.

Indoor environments will evolve with the changing climate, and such an evolution may be consequential for a wide range of indoor pollutants (Nazaroff, 2013). The substantial energy demand of commercial buildings and the climate impacts of elevated outdoor CO₂ concentrations suggest a need to consider indoor CO₂ not only as a pollutant to be managed through dilution, but also to be captured and sequestered. While the technology and infrastructure to effectively do so remains to be developed, CO₂ removal in commercial buildings warrants attention in discussions of carbon sequestration as a potential win-win opportunity: increasing productivity in offices and schools and developing carbon-neutral buildings.

Acknowledgment

This research was funded by the Republic of Singapore's National Research Foundation through a grant to the Berkeley Education Alliance for Research in Singapore (BEARS) for the Singapore-Berkeley Building Efficiency and Sustainability in the Tropics (SinBerBEST) Program. BEARS has been established by the University of California, Berkeley as a center for intellectual excellence in research and education in Singapore.

References

ANSI/ASHRAE, 2013. Standard 62.1-2013 Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air- Conditioning Engineers, Inc., Atlanta.

- Apte, M.G., Fisk, W.J., Daisey, J.M., 2000. Associations between indoor CO₂ concentrations and sick building syndrome symptoms in U.S. office buildings: an analysis of the 1994-1996 BASE study data. *Indoor Air* 10, 246–257.
- Boden, T.A., Marland, G., Andres, R.J., 2011. Global, regional, and national fossil-fuel CO₂ emissions. Carbon dioxide information analysis center. U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A., Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- Boot-Handford, M.E., Abanades, J.C., Anthony, E.J., Blunt, M.J., Brandani, S., Dowell, N.M., Fernández, J.R., Ferrari, M.-C., Gross, R., Hallett, J.P., Haszeldine, R.S., Heptonstall, P., Lyngfelt, A., Makuch, Z., Mangano, E., Porter, R.T.J., Pourkashanian, M., Rochelle, G.T., Shah, N., Yao, J.G., Fennell, P.S., 2014. Carbon capture and storage update. *Energy & Environmental Science* 7, 130–189.
- Committee on the Effect of Climate Change on Indoor Air Quality and Public Health, 2011. Climate change, the indoor environment, and health. The National Academies Press.
- Fisk, W.J., 2000. Health and productivity gains from better indoor environments and their relationship with building energy efficiency. *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 25, 537–566.
- Fisk, W.J., Black, D., Brunner, G., 2011. Benefits and costs of improved IEQ in U.S. offices. *Indoor Air* 21, 357–367.
- Goeppert, A., Czaun, M., Prakash, G.K.S., Olah, G.A., 2012. Air as the renewable carbon source of the future: an overview of CO₂ capture from the atmosphere. *Energy & Environmental Science* 5, 7833–7853.
- He, L., Fan, M., Dutcher, B., Cui, S., Shen, X., Kong, Y., Russell, A.G., McCurdy, P., 2012. Dynamic separation of ultradilute CO₂ with a nanoporous amine-based sorbent. *Chemical Engineering Journal* 189–190, 13–23.
- Holmes, G., Keith, D.W., 2012. An air-liquid contactor for large-scale capture of CO₂ from air. *Philosophical Transactions. Series A, Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences* 370, 4380–4403.
- Holmes, G., Nold, K., Walsh, T., Heidel, K., Henderson, M.A., Ritchie, J., Klavins, P., Singh, A., Keith, D.W., 2013. Outdoor prototype results for direct atmospheric capture of carbon dioxide. *Energy Procedia, GHGT-11* 37, 6079–6095.
- IPCC, 2014. Chapter 9: Buildings (Accepted report), Working Group III contribution to the IPCC 5th Assessment Report “Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change.”
- Lackner, K.S., Brennan, S., Matter, J.M., Park, A.-H.A., Wright, A., Zwaan, B. van der, 2012. The urgency of the development of CO₂ capture from ambient air. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, 13156–13162.
- Nazaroff, W.W., 2013. Exploring the consequences of climate change for indoor air quality. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 015022.
- Ochsendorf, J., 2012. Challenges and opportunities for low-carbon buildings. *The Bridge* 42, 26–32.
- Satish, U., Mendell, M.J., Shekhar, K., Hotchi, T., Sullivan, D., Streufert, S., Fisk, W.J., 2012. Is CO₂ an indoor pollutant? Direct effects of low-to-moderate CO₂ concentrations on human decision-making performance. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 120, 1671–1677.
- Seppanen, O.A., Fisk, W.J., Mendell, M.J., 1999. Association of ventilation rates and CO₂ concentrations with health and other responses in commercial and institutional buildings. *Indoor Air* 9, 226–252.

- Smith, P.N., 1988. Determination of ventilation rates in occupied buildings from metabolic CO₂ concentrations and production rates. *Building and Environment* 23, 95–102.
- Tans, P., Keeling, R., 2014. ESRL Global Monitoring Division - Global Greenhouse Gas Reference Network [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/> (accessed 10.17.14).
- Tsai, D.-H., Lin, J.-S., Chan, C.-C., 2012. Office workers' sick building syndrome and indoor carbon dioxide concentrations. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 9, 345–351.
- U.S. DOE, 2012. 2011 Buildings Energy Databook. U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.
- U.S. EIA, 2011. Emissions of greenhouse gases in the U.S. (No. DOE/EIA-0573:2009).
- Wargocki, P., Wyon, D.P., Sundell, J., Clausen, G., Fanger, P.O., 2000. The effects of outdoor air supply rate in an office on perceived air quality, sick building syndrome (SBS) symptoms and productivity. *Indoor Air* 10, 222–236.
- Wyon, D.P., 2004. The effects of indoor air quality on performance and productivity. *Indoor Air* 14 Suppl 7, 92–101.
- Zhang, W., Liu, H., Sun, C., Drage, T.C., Snape, C.E., 2014. Capturing CO₂ from ambient air using a polyethyleneimine–silica adsorbent in fluidized beds. *Chemical Engineering Science* 116, 306–316.