

IMPACTS OF AIRTIGHTENING RETROFITS ON VENTILATION AND ENERGY IN A MANUFACTURED HOME

Andrew Persily, Steven Nabinger, and W. Stuart Dols

*National Institute of Standards and Technology
100 Bureau Drive MS8633
Gaithersburg, MD 20899, USA*

ABSTRACT

A retrofit study was conducted in an unoccupied manufactured house to investigate the impacts of airtightening on ventilation rates and energy consumption. This report describes the retrofits and the results of the pre- and post-retrofit assessment of building airtightness, ventilation, and energy use. Building envelope and air distribution systems airtightness were measured using fan pressurization. Air change rates were measured continuously using the tracer gas decay technique. Energy consumption associated with heating and cooling was monitored through measurement of gas consumption by the forced-air furnace for heating and electricity use by the air-conditioning system for cooling. The results of the study show that the retrofits reduced building envelope leakage by about 18 % and duct leakage by about 80 %. The reduction in the house infiltration rates depended on weather conditions and the manner in which the heating and cooling system was controlled, but in general these rates were reduced by about one third. The energy consumption of the house for heating and cooling was reduced by only about 10 %, which is relatively small but not unexpected given that infiltration only accounts for a portion of the heating and cooling load. An existing multizone airflow model of the building was modified to reflect the airtightening retrofits, and the predicted infiltration rates agreed well with the measured values over a range of weather and system operation conditions.

KEYWORDS

Airtightness; energy; manufactured homes; residential; retrofit; ventilation

INTRODUCTION

Single-family residential buildings have traditionally been ventilated via weather-driven infiltration through unintentional leakage sites in the building envelope. More recently, there has been a trend towards the use of mechanical ventilation to provide more predictable ventilation rates and air distribution that are less dependent on weather conditions. ASHRAE Standard 62.2, Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality in Low-Rise Residential Buildings, requires mechanical ventilation in many U.S. climates [1]. However, only a small fraction of site-built, low-rise residential buildings employ mechanical ventilation. The situation is different in manufactured homes, for which the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards [2] contain requirements for mechanical ventilation for these dwellings. In the implementation of the HUD standards, and the implementation of mechanical ventilation in low-rise residential buildings in general, questions have arisen regarding the actual ventilation rates in homes built to the HUD and other standards, the approaches being used to provide mechanical

ventilation, and the energy and indoor air quality impacts of mechanical ventilation [3]. Specific questions also exist regarding how duct leakage, local exhaust fans and ventilation inlets affect ventilation rates, air movement patterns, and building pressures.

Based on 2005 statistics, manufactured homes constitute about 6 % of U.S. households and about 5 % of U.S. residential energy consumption [4]. These same data show that on average manufactured homes consume more energy per unit floor area on an annual basis, 850 MJ/m^2 , than detached homes, which consume 450 MJ/m^2 . Given the smaller size of manufactured homes, the average energy consumption per household is about 74 GJ/y compared with 114 GJ/y for detached homes). Low energy manufactured homes have been constructed, with annual energy consumption as low as 52 MJ/y [5]. Therefore, while manufactured homes constitute a small fraction of the national housing stock, they also provide an opportunity for significant energy savings through improved design and construction.

The manner in which residential buildings, including manufactured homes, are ventilated and the roles of weather-driven infiltration and mechanical ventilation are becoming increasingly important in the context of national efforts to reduce residential energy consumption in new and existing buildings. Working with HUD and various state energy offices, the U.S. Department of Energy is undertaking a major effort to retrofit large numbers of residences [6]. A number of other efforts are underway to increase the energy efficiency of new residential buildings. One key component of energy efficiency in both new and existing residences is the control of infiltration through tight envelope construction and the provision of adequate amounts of outdoor air to meet the health and comfort needs of the occupants. Efforts to improve building design and to implement effective retrofits are raising the same questions as noted previously about how to provide ventilation in residential buildings and how ventilation and energy performance are impacted by duct leakage, fan operation and other effects.

To obtain insight into the issues of residential infiltration and ventilation, a modeling study was performed on a manufactured home to investigate different ventilation scenarios [7]. The results of that study showed that assuming a single value of 0.25 h^{-1} for the weather-driven infiltration rate, as is done in the HUD standard, is inherently problematic given the strong dependence of infiltration on weather. The simulated infiltration rates varied by as much as 5 to 1 based on variations in weather conditions alone. Including the impacts of exhaust fan and forced-air fan operation more than doubled the range of variation in the air change rates. In addition, the predicted infiltration rates were lower than this assumed value under milder weather conditions. Therefore, assuming an infiltration rate of 0.25 h^{-1} in modern manufactured homes may be too high, but more importantly ignores variations due to weather and fan operation. The study also showed that employing an outdoor air intake duct on the forced-air return duct can be effective in raising air change rates and distributing ventilation air throughout the house. However, the overall impact on the building air change rate is a strong function of the operating schedule of the forced-air system, which in turn depends on the extent of system over-sizing and the specific strategies used to control the system operation such as manual switches and timers. While increased forced-air fan operation provides higher ventilation rates, there is an energy cost associated with the increased fan operation, particularly when the forced-air fan has a high wattage rating. Also, given the existence of significant duct leakage, this ventilation approach was associated with excessive air change rates (relative to the requirements in standards) particularly when weather-driven infiltration is high.

In order to investigate these residential ventilation issues, as well as a range of other indoor air quality issues, a manufactured house was installed on the NIST campus in 2002. The house and its airtightness, ventilation and energy performance, as installed, have been described previously [8]. Since that time, the building was subject to a series of retrofits to

improve the airtightness of the building envelope and the air distribution system ductwork. This paper summarizes the results of these retrofit on the building airtightness, ventilation rates and energy consumption.

DESCRIPTION OF HOUSE AND VENTILATION SYSTEMS

The study was performed in a double-wide manufactured home installed on the NIST campus, shown in the photograph in Figure 1. This house was built to the HUD standard that applies nationwide to manufactured homes [2]. Additional details on the house can be found in Nabinger and Persily [8]. Figure 2 is a schematic floor plan of the test house, showing the three bedrooms, two baths, kitchen, and the family, dining and living area. The house has a floor area of 140 m^2 , a volume of 340 m^3 and a cathedral ceiling over its full length that is 2.7 m high at the center and slopes down to 2.1 m at the front and back walls.



Figure 1. Photograph of the manufactured house.

The house's heating, ventilating and air-conditioning (HVAC) system consists of a 22 kW gas furnace, a 15 kW air conditioner, and a forced air re-circulation fan with a design airflow rate of 470 L/s. In addition there is a whole house, kitchen, and two bathroom exhaust fans in the house. The whole house and bathroom ventilation fans have an airflow capacity of 24 L/s, while the kitchen fan capacity is 47 L/s. Both of these airflow capacities are per manufacturer claims.




Figure 2. Schematic floor plan of manufactured house.

MEASUREMENT METHODS

This section summarizes the measurement techniques and instrumentation used in the test house, with additional details available in Nabinger and Persily [8].

Whole house air change rates

Whole house air change rates were measured using the tracer gas decay technique as described in ASTM test method E-741 [9]. These rates reflect the combination of the rate at which outdoor air enters the house from mechanical ventilation and due to infiltration through leaks in the house's envelope. The air change rate measurements in the house were made with an automated tracer gas monitor system employing sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) as the tracer gas that injects tracer gas into the building and monitors the concentration at multiple locations.

Exterior envelope and duct leakage

Exterior envelope leakage of the house was measured using whole building pressurization testing per ASTM E779 using a blower door [10]. These whole building tests were performed with the air distribution system off but with all the vents in their normal operating positions (unsealed) and then again with all the supply and return air vents sealed with plastic (sealed). The latter test provides an indication of the envelope leakage independent of any leakage via the air distribution system, while the unsealed test provides an overall leakage for the envelope and air distribution system in combination. The measurements of airtightness using the blower door have an accuracy of roughly +/- 10 % of the measured value based on the calibrations performed. Pressurization tests were also used to determine the leakage from the air distribution system using ASTM E1554 [11], which also has a measurement uncertainty of about +/- 10%.

Energy consumption

Energy consumption for heating and cooling was monitored to determine any reductions due to the airtightness retrofits. The electrical energy consumption of the air conditioning system was measured using a 240 V power transducer, and the energy used by the forced-air fan was monitored with 120 V energy meters. The energy use by other items in the house, and therefore contributing to the interior heat gain, were monitored separately. The 240 V power transducers have an accuracy of +/- 0.5 % of full scale and a resolution of 0.1 W. The 120 V energy meters have an accuracy of +/- 0.2 % of full scale and a resolution of 3.6 W•h. The heating energy was measured using a calibrated gas flow meter that recorded the average value of natural gas flow rate into the furnace. The gas meter has a measurement range of 0 L/s to 0.94 L/s and an accuracy of 1 % of full scale and a resolution of 0.0002 L/s.

Environmental and System Parameters

Additional sensors were used to monitor air temperature, relative humidity, wind conditions and operating status of the forced-air system fan. Details on these measurements and the associated uncertainty are contained in Nabinger and Persily [8]. Temperatures of the indoor and outdoor air were measured using epoxy coated polymer thermistors, and the relative humidity was monitored with capacitive thin film polymer sensors. Wind speed and direction were measured at the top of a 10 m tower located approximately 5 m south of the southernmost wall of the house. Fan status switches were wired into the electrical circuits of the forced air fan and the four exhaust fans to detect and record whether each fan is on or off.

RETROFITS

The retrofits focused on increasing the airtightness of the building envelope and the air distribution system supply ductwork. The envelope retrofits included installation of a house wrap over the exterior walls and sealing of leaks in the belly and living space floor. The house wrap installation involved removing the siding from the house and installing the wrap from

the top of the crawl space to the top of the walls, and then replacing the vinyl siding. The wrap was a flash spunbonded olefin, non-woven sheet material and was installed per the manufacturer's instructions. The second portion of the envelope airtightening effort involved sealing the leakage sites in the flooring of the house and in the insulated belly that encloses the ductwork. Sealing the flooring involved spraying a two-part foam, which expanded and hardened to seal the leaks. The leakage sites included the accessible portions of the marriage line between the front and back section of the house; holes in the floor made for the water drainage pipes, "P-traps" in the bathrooms; and gas and other utility lines.

Figure 3 shows several of these leakage sites, before and after sealing. The top two photographs show drain and water lines in the floor of the living area, viewed from below, showing these lines passing through large holes that constitute significant leakage sites. The existence of such leakage sites is not unusual in residential construction, though recent efforts to build tighter homes result in such airflow paths being sealed during construction. The photograph on the lower right shows both of these leakage sites sealed with spray foam. The photograph on the lower left shows a supply air register in the floor, viewed from above, after it was sealed with mastic. In this house, and many others with supply ductwork under the floor, significant leakage occurs where the vertical supply duct connects with the floor register.



Drain line in floor (from below), leakage associated with large hole in floor relative to pipe diameter



Water line in floor (from below)



Drain and water lines after sealing



Floor register (from above) after sealing with mastic

Figure 3. Schematic floor plan of manufactured house.

Additional air sealing was performed in the air distribution system in the belly space, including large leaks in the four ends of the two main supply ducts in the front and rear halves of the house and the large connection to the underside of the HVAC system. Foam was also used to seal leaks at the ends of the two crossover ducts joining the two main HVAC ducts at

each end of the house. Such duct leakage is not uncommon in manufactured homes and can have a major, negative effect on the overall system efficiency and thereby the energy consumption for heating and cooling [12].

As noted elsewhere in this paper, it is much easier and cost-effective to achieve a tight envelope during construction than as part of a retrofit effort. The retrofits reported on here were thorough, even to the extent of removing the siding to install a house wrap, but some leakages sites were inaccessible. No leaks in the ceiling of the house could be accessed or sealed, and there were probably additional leaks in the floor and the belly that could not be repaired.

RESULTS

This section presents the results of the measurements of the impact of the retrofits on the building and air distribution system tightness, the ventilation system airflow rates, the whole building air change rates and the energy consumption for heating and cooling.

Airtightness

As noted above, pressurization test methods were used to measure the exterior envelope leakage, the leakage between the living space and the crawl space, and the leakage of the air distribution system ductwork. The results of these measurements are shown in Table 1. In terms of the air change rate at 50 Pa, the whole building pressurization leakage was reduced by 24 % relative to the pre-retrofit results with the system unsealed and by about 11 % relative to pre-retrofit leakage with the system sealed. As noted before, the unsealed tests were conducted with the air distribution system off but with all vents in their normally open positions, while the sealed tests were conducted with all supply and return vents sealed. The leakage reduction due to the retrofit in terms of the effective leakage area (ELA) at 4 Pa was similar on a percentage basis. Relative to the average of the unsealed and sealed pre-retrofit values, the house leakage was reduced by 18 % by the airtightening retrofits. The duct leakage reduction is quite significant, with a reduction of about 82 % relative to the pre-retrofit value.

Whole building pressurization	Pre-retrofit		Post-retrofit	
	Airflow at 50 Pa, h ⁻¹	ELA at 4 Pa, cm ²	Airflow at 50 Pa, h ⁻¹	ELA at 4 Pa, cm ²
Forced-air system unsealed	11.8	728	9.0*	555*
Forced-air system sealed	10.1	636		
	ELA at 25 Pa, cm ²			
Duct leakage		320		58

* Post-retrofit values with the system sealed and unsealed are not significantly different relative to measurement uncertainty.

Table 1. Pre- and post-retrofit airtightness results.

Air change rates

The air change rates in the house decreased after the airtightening retrofits as expected. Figure 4 shows the pre- and post-retrofit air change rates measured with the forced-air system off (Condition 0) as a function of the indoor-outdoor temperature difference under low wind speed conditions (less than 2 m/s). While the data exhibit a fair bit of scatter, the post-retrofit rates are roughly 20 % lower than the pre-retrofit values, which is close to the reduction in the whole building leakage measured by pressurization testing as seen in Table 1. Figure 5 shows the pre- and post-retrofit air change rates with the forced-air system off as a function of wind speed (u) under low indoor-outdoor temperature differences (ΔT), i.e., absolute values less than 10 °C. There are only a relatively small number of post-retrofit points, but the reduction in air change rates is again roughly 20 % relative to the pre-retrofit values.




Figure 4. Pre- and Post-Retrofit measured air change rates as a function of temperature difference (low wind speed): forced-air fan off (Condition 0)




Figure 5. Pre- and Post-Retrofit measured air change rates as a function of wind speed (low ΔT): forced-air fan off (Condition 0)

Figures 6 and 7 show the pre- and post-retrofit air change rates with the forced-air fan on and the outdoor air intake closed (Condition 1a), plotted against temperature difference and wind speed respectively. As seen in Figure 6, the air change rate reduction with the system on is much larger than the reduction with the system off due to the impacts of the reduced duct leakage, particularly at low temperature differences. The pre-retrofit data exhibit an unusual dependence on temperature difference as discussed previously [8] because of the duct leakage pressurizing the volume under the living space. With the improved airtightness

of the ductwork and the belly volume, the dependence of air change rate on temperature difference is more consistent with the pattern seen in other buildings. Figure 7 shows a significant reduction in the post-retrofit air change rates as a function of wind speed, larger than that seen for the fan-off data in Figure 5. The reduction is more pronounced with the fan on because these data correspond to low temperature-differences, where the reduced duct leakage has a large impact on the post-retrofit rates. The pre- and post-retrofit air change rates for Condition 1b (forced-air fan on and outdoor air intake open) are similar to the results seen for Condition 1a and plots of those data are not presented in this paper.




Figure 6. Pre- and Post-Retrofit measured air change rates as a function of temperature difference (low wind speed): forced-air fan on, outdoor air intake sealed (Condition 1a)




Figure 7. Pre- and Post-Retrofit measured air change rates as a function of wind speed (low ΔT): forced-air fan on, outdoor air intake sealed (Condition 1a)

Table 2 summarizes the air change rate reductions for the various conditions of fan operation and for specific ranges of outdoor weather. Each mean air change rate in the table is calculated for the test condition and the noted weather condition. The last column shows the percentage reduction in the post-retrofit air change rate relative to the pre-retrofit value for that particular case. Most of the mean air change rates decrease by about 25 % to 35 %, with some exceptions. There is very little reduction for high ΔT and low wind speed for conditions 1a and 1b as discussed earlier. The reductions for low ΔT with the fan on tend to be larger than 30 %, as large as 50 % in one case. As noted earlier, these reductions are impacted by the decrease in duct leakage more than the other cases.

	Mean air change rate (h^{-1})		% reduction
	Pre-retrofit	Post-retrofit	
Condition 0 (fan off)			
$\Delta T = 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.34	0.24	29
$u = 4\text{ m/s}$ to 6 m/s , $ \Delta T < 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.36	0.25*	31
Condition 1a (fan on, intake sealed)			
$\Delta T = 0\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.35	0.24	31
$\Delta T = 20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.27	0.26	4
$u = 4\text{ m/s}$ to 6 m/s , $ \Delta T < 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.50	0.31	38
Condition 1b (fan on, intake open)			
$\Delta T = 0\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.39	0.19	51
$\Delta T = 20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.34	0.34	0
$u = 4\text{ m/s}$ to 6 m/s , $ \Delta T < 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.52	0.31	41
Condition 2a (fan controlled by thermostat, intake sealed)			
$\Delta T = 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.30	0.23	23
$u = 4\text{ m/s}$ to 6 m/s , $ \Delta T < 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.39	0.29	26
Condition 2b (fan controlled by thermostat, intake open)			
$\Delta T = 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, $u < 2\text{ m/s}$	0.34	0.28	18
$u = 4\text{ m/s}$ to 6 m/s , $ \Delta T < 10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.39	0.33	15

* Only 3 post-retrofit air changes rates in this range of weather conditions.

Table 2. Summary of pre- and post-retrofit air change rates.

Energy Consumption

After the retrofits were completed, the energy used to heat and cool the building was measured for several months in order to compare it with the levels of energy use before the retrofits. Figures 8 and 9 show the pre and post gas (heating) and electrical (cooling) energy use respectively. Each point in these plots corresponds to 24 h of heating or cooling energy consumption, versus the average indoor-outdoor temperature difference during that same 24-h period. The gas energy consumption values are based on the rate of gas consumption times the heating system's claimed value of efficiency of 85 % and therefore correspond to the energy to heat the house. The electrical energy consumption values are based on the system's rated COP of 2.93 to yield the cooling energy required. The plots show, but do not distinguish between, data collected when the forced air fan is always on (condition 1), and when the fan operation is controlled by the thermostat (condition 2).

The data in both Figures 8 and 9 exhibit a lot of scatter, making it difficult to see the difference in the pre and post energy consumption. In order to estimate the difference, the average heating energy use before and after the retrofit was determined for a temperature difference range of $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. As seen in Figure 8, this temperature range appears to be better behaved than other ranges and has sufficient points to determine reliable averages. In this temperature range, the daily average heating energy consumption pre-retrofit is 137.5 MJ and the average post-retrofit is 125.6 MJ, corresponding to a reduction of 8.6 %. In the case of cooling, Figure 9, the average energy use was calculated for temperature differences between

-6 °C and -1 °C. Again, the data in this range exhibit less scatter than at the higher temperature differences. In this temperature range, the daily average cooling energy consumption pre-retrofit is 371.9 MJ and the average post-retrofit is 328.7 MJ, corresponding to a reduction of 11.6 %. Based on the standard deviations of the mean energy consumption values for heating and cooling, the uncertainty in the energy reduction for heating and cooling are quite large because of the large uncertainty in the difference between the pre- and post-retrofit energy consumption. In both cases the uncertainties are estimated to be larger than the reductions themselves.

Analysis of the pre-retrofit heating and cooling yielded slopes of about 22 MJ/°C and 10 MJ/°C respectively [8]. These two values should have been the same based on conduction heat losses (gains) alone, but the factor of two difference is not unreasonable given the use of assumed values for the system efficiencies, the impact of solar and other internal gains, the lack of consideration of latent loads, and the variation of infiltration with weather. A simple heat loss calculation for the building, assuming an air change rate of 0.5 h⁻¹, yields a heat loss rate through the envelope of 15 MJ/°C, which is roughly halfway between the two measured, pre-retrofit values. The same heat loss calculation was used to examine the energy impacts of the infiltration rate reductions. Considering the air change rates plotted in Figures 4 through 7, the heat loss was calculated for a pre-retrofit air change rate of 0.4 h⁻¹ and a post-retrofit rate of 0.2 h⁻¹. The corresponding reduction in heat loss for the building is 13.5 %, which is reasonably close to the estimated energy reductions above of 8.6 % and 11.6 %.




Figure 8. Pre-post gas heating energy versus indoor-outdoor temperature difference




Figure 9. Pre-post electric cooling energy versus indoor-outdoor temperature difference

AIR CHANGE RATE PREDICTIONS

In the previous report on the pre-retrofit assessment of the house [8], the multizone airflow model CONTAM [13] was used to predict the air change rates under various conditions of fan operation and weather. Those predictions were in fairly good agreement with the air change rates measured with the tracer gas system in the house. The model was used again after the retrofits to predict the air change rates.

Table 3 shows the input values used in the CONTAM model of the house for both pre- and post-retrofit conditions. Only those airflow paths that were impacted by the retrofit efforts are seen to be different post-retrofit. The leakage values for the exterior envelope of the living space that are above floor level only decrease by about 10 %, but the leakage to the belly, the belly to the crawl space, and the duct leakage decrease by a much larger fraction.

Figure 10 shows the measured and predicted post-retrofit air change rates under condition 0 (forced-air fan off) plotted against indoor-outdoor temperature difference. The values in this plot correspond to wind speeds less than 2 m/s. The predictions match the measurements very well, though the measured values exhibit some scatter due in part to variations in wind speed and direction. Figure 11 shows the measured and predicted rates plotted against wind speed, again for condition 0, corresponding to indoor-outdoor temperature differences between -10 °C and +10 °C. Again, the predictions match the measurements fairly well.

Figures 12 and 13 show the measured and predicted air change rates as a function of temperature difference and wind speed respectively for condition 1a (forced-air fan on, outdoor air intake closed). The predictions match the general trend seen in the measurements but tend to under-predict, particularly for near-zero and negative temperature differences. The predicted air change rates in Figure 13 are somewhat higher than the measured values at low wind speeds. The plots of measured and predicted air change rates for condition 1b (the same as 1a except the outdoor air intake is open) show very similar trends to those seen in Figures 12 and 13 and are not shown in this paper.

		ELA at 4 Pa	
Airflow path		Pre-retrofit	Post-retrofit
Living space envelope	Exterior wall	0.14 cm ² /m ²	0.13 cm ² /m ²
	Ceiling wall interface	0.81 cm ² /m	0.73 cm ² /m
	Floor wall interface	1.24cm ² /m	1.12 cm ² /m
	Window #1	5.00 cm ²	*
	Window #2	1.94 cm ²	*
	Corner interface	0.81 cm ² /m	0.73 cm ² /m
	Exterior doors	18.7 cm ²	*
	Living space to belly	3.65 cm ² /m ²	1.43 cm ² /m ²
Interior airflow paths	Interior walls	2 cm ² /m ²	*
	Bedroom doorframe	410 cm ²	*
	Open interior doors	2 m x 0.9 m	*
	Bathroom doorframe	330 cm ²	*
	Interior doorframe	250 cm ²	*
	Closet doorframe	4.6 cm ²	*
Attic	Attic floor	2 cm ² /m ²	*
	Roof vents	0.135 m ² /each	*
	Eave vents	106 cm ² /m	296 cm ² /m **
Crawl space and belly	Exterior walls of crawl space	25 cm ² /m ²	*
	Rear crawl space vents	323 cm ²	*
	Front crawl space vents	465 cm ²	*
	Crawl space access door	206 cm ²	*
	Crawl space to "belly"	258 cm ²	181 cm ²
	Duct leak into belly	320 cm ²	58 cm ²

* Same as pre-retrofit

** The eave vent values were remeasured and the values were corrected in the post-retrofit model.

Table 3. Model inputs for pre- and post-retrofit conditions.




Figure 10. Measured and predicted post-retrofit air change rates as a function of temperature difference (low wind speed): Forced-air fan off (Condition 0).




Figure 11. Measured and predicted post-retrofit air change rates as a function of wind speed (low temperature difference): Forced-air fan off (Condition 0).




Figure 12. Measured and predicted post-retrofit air change rates as a function of temperature difference (low wind speed): Forced-air fan on, outdoor air intake sealed (Condition 1a).




Figure 13. Measured and predicted post-retrofit air change rates as a function of wind speed (low temperature difference): Forced-air fan on, outdoor air intake sealed (Condition 1a).

Overall, as was the case with the pre-retrofit data, the air change rates predicted with CONTAM are in fairly good agreement with the measurements. Even with different conditions of fan operation and weather, the good agreement is sustained. Table 5 summarizes the agreement of the predicted and measured air change rates for the different cases of system operation. For each case, a linear regression of the predicted air change rate against the measured rate was performed for temperature and wind dominated conditions. The values of R-squared and the standard error of the regression are presented for each of the five cases. The values of R-squared range from 0.54 to 0.78 with one exception and the standard error of regression values are all about 0.04. The agreement tends to be better for the temperature dominated conditions, which is not surprising given that it is generally more challenging to predict wind-driven air change rates.

Case	Temperature difference		Wind speed	
	R-squared	Std error of regression	R-squared	Std error of regression
0 – Fan off	0.685	0.04	0.572	0.05
1a – Fan on, intake sealed	0.615	0.03	0.542	0.04
1b – Fan on, intake open	0.696	0.03	0.308	0.05
2a – T-stat control, intake sealed	0.784	0.04	0.597	0.05
2b – T-stat control, intake open	0.755	0.05	0.752	0.04

Table 4. Summary Statistics of Predicted versus Measured Air Change Rates.

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to evaluate the impacts of airtightening retrofits on building airtightness, ventilation rates and energy consumption in an existing manufactured home. In this study, a manufactured home constructed in 2002 was subjected to a series of airtightening retrofits including installing house wrap over the exterior walls, sealing a number of leakage sites in the living space floor, tightening the insulated belly layer, and sealing leaks in the air distribution system. These retrofits reduced the whole house leakage, as determined by a fan pressurization test, by about 18 % and the duct leakage by about 80 %. Whole house

infiltration rates were reduced by about one-third, with the specific reduction dependent on weather conditions and how the forced-air system was operating. The energy consumption rate for heating and cooling was reduced by about 10 %.

While the retrofits did improve the airtightness of the house and reduce the energy consumption, the effectiveness of the effort was limited by the challenges of airtightening an existing building. In general, it is easier to construct a tight building envelope than to achieve one through retrofits [14]. Manufactured homes in particular have the potential for high levels of airtightness performance given the quality control that can be achieved in the factory. Similarly, quality design and construction of these homes has been shown to yield high levels of energy performance [15].

It is important to note that the post-retrofit infiltration rates were often below the target ventilation rate of 0.35 h^{-1} in the HUD manufactured housing standard [2]. As seen in Table 3 under conditions 1b and 2b, the mean air change rates are all below 0.35 h^{-1} with the outdoor air intake open. These conditions of under-ventilation occur in part because the airflow through the intake is less than half of the HUD requirement. Also, in the case of condition 2b when the forced-air fan is controlled by the thermostat, the intake only operates when there is a demand for heating or cooling and is otherwise not bringing any outdoor air into the building.

While the mechanical ventilation system is not providing the rates required by the HUD standard, the reduced duct leakage combined with the tighter envelope does provide much better control of the envelope infiltration rates. Figures 8 through 11 show the reduced infiltration rates with the intake sealed, which highlights the potential to provide much better ventilation control through a mechanical approach than was possible before the retrofits. However, a mechanical ventilation system must still be provided to meet the overall ventilation requirements of house, either using an adequately sized intake, a whole house exhaust fan or some other approach. Ideally, the mechanical ventilation will be controlled independent of the need for heating or cooling.

This study also demonstrated the ability of multizone airflow modeling, in this case using the CONTAM model, to predict whole building air change rates with good accuracy. Before the retrofits, the air change rate exhibited an unusual dependence on temperature due to the duct leakage pressurizing the belly space, but this behavior was predicted by the model. After the retrofits, the new leakage values were entered into the model and the predicted air change rates matched the measurements quite well. These results show the potential value of building airflow modeling for analyzing the ventilation and infiltration performance of residences, which can be extended to simulating indoor contaminant levels as a means of understanding the impacts of building design, construction, and operation on indoor air quality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Michael Lubliner of Washington State University and the DOE Building America Program for his assistance in this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] ASHRAE, 2010. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2010 Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.
- [2] HUD, 1994. Part 3280, Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards, in, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- [3] M. Lubliner, D.T. Stevens, B. Davis, 1997. Mechanical Ventilation in HUD-Code Manufactured Housing in Pacific Northwest, *ASHRAE Transactions*, 103(1):693-705.
- [4] DOE, 2005. Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.
- [5] M. Lubliner, A. Hadley, A. Gordon, 2004. Manufactured Home Performance Case Study: A Preliminary Comparison of Zero Energy and Energy Star, ASHRAE Building Thermal Envelope Conference, Clearwater Beach, Florida.
- [6] DOE, 2010. Weatherization & Intergovernmental Program.
- [7] A.K. Persily, S.R. Martin, 2000. A Modeling Study of Ventilation in Manufactured Homes. National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 6455.
- [8] S. Nabinger, A. Persily, 2008. Airtightness, Ventilation and Energy Consumption in a Manufactured House: Pre-Retrofit Results, National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 7478.
- [9] ASTM, 2006. E741 Standard Test Method for Determining Air Change in a Single Zone by Means of a Tracer Gas Dilution, American Society for Testing and Materials.
- [10] ASTM, 2008. E779 Standard Test Method for Determining Air Leakage Rate by Fan Pressurization, American Society for Testing and Materials.
- [11] ASTM, 2003. E1554 Standard Test Methods for Determining External Air Leakage of Air Distribution Systems by Fan Pressurization, American Society for Testing and Materials.
- [12] P.W. Francisco, L. Palmiter, 2007. Thermal Characterization and Duct Losses of Belly Spaces in Manufactured Homes, *ASHRAE Transactions*, 113(2): 81-89.
- [13] Walton, G. N. and W. S. Dols, 2005. CONTAMW 2.4 User Guide and Program Documentation. National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 7251.
- [14] S.D. Hale, B. Davis, R.B. Peeks, 2007. Effect of Mastic on Duct Tightness in Energy-Efficient Manufactured Homes, *ASHRAE Transactions*, 113(2): 77-80.
- [15] R. Lucas, P. Fairey, R. Garcia, M. Lubliner, 2007. National Energy Savings Potential in HUD-Code Housing from Thermal Envelope and HVAC Equipment Improvements, *ASHRAE Transactions*, 113(2): 62-69.