



# Reducing Exposures to Airborne Particles Through Improved Filtration: A High-Level Modeling Analysis

Michael B Dillon  
Richard G Sextro

April 2020

LLNL-TR-809043

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is operated by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.



## **Auspices and Disclaimer**

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

# 1 Reducing Exposures to Airborne Particles 2 Through Improved Filtration: 3 A High-Level Modeling Analysis 4

## 5 **Authors**

6 Michael B Dillon [dillon7@llnl.gov](mailto:dillon7@llnl.gov) (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory)

7 Richard G Sextro [rgsextro@lbl.gov](mailto:rgsextro@lbl.gov) (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory)  
8

## 9 **1. Abstract**

10 Indoor airborne particulates are well-known health hazards and filtration is one common  
11 method of reducing exposures. Based on our previously developed Regional Shelter Analysis  
12 methodology and parameters that characterize the existing US building stock, we perform a  
13 high-level assessment of the potential benefits of upgrading existing filters in furnace and in  
14 heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems using off-the-shelf filters. We use three  
15 metrics to assess the improvement: Building Transmission Factor (a measure of protection  
16 against outdoor airborne particles), Indoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air  
17 Concentration (a measure of indoor exposure to indoor-origin airborne particles), and Building  
18 Exit Fraction (fraction of indoor airborne particles that are released to the outdoor  
19 atmosphere). We also discuss the potential reduction in regional exposures due to particles  
20 exiting the building and exposing downwind building occupants.

21 Our modeling indicates that while buildings provide their occupants passive protection against  
22 airborne particulate hazards, including but not limited to  $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $PM_{10}$ , and wildfire smoke;  
23 improving particle filtration efficiency may further improve this protection. The degree of  
24 improvement varies with particle size and building type. Of the building types studied,  
25 apartments are predicted to benefit most, with greater than a factor of 2 improvement ( $\geq 50\%$   
26 reduction in exposures) for  $1\ \mu m$  particle exposures when using MERV 7 to 12 rated filters.  
27 Non-residential buildings were notably less responsive to improved filtration but had the  
28 highest Building Exit Fractions with 30% to 40% of indoor airborne particles released to the  
29 outdoor atmosphere (apartment buildings only released 6% to 9%). Improvements predicted  
30 for single family homes were intermediate between apartments and non-residential buildings.  
31 Improvements in the Regional Exposure metric are larger, ranging from a factor of 2.5x to 10x  
32 for residences (when using MERV 7 to 12 rated filters) and up to 25x for large apartments with  
33 MERV 14 or 15 rated filters. The results of our modeling analysis are broadly consistent with the  
34 limited experimental data and modeling results available in the literature.  
35

36	<b>Table of Contents</b>	
37	<b>1. Abstract.....</b>	<b>1</b>
38	<b>2. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
39	<b>3. Building Models and Key Metrics .....</b>	<b>4</b>
40	3.1. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Outdoor Airborne Particles (Building Transmission Factor) ....	7
41	3.2. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Indoor Airborne Particles (Indoor Normalized TSIAC) .....	9
42	3.3. Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors (Exit Fraction) .....	11
43	3.4. Regional Exposures.....	13
44	<b>4. Building Parameter Values .....</b>	<b>15</b>
45	4.1. Building Model Assignment.....	15
46	4.2. Air Flow Parameters ( $\lambda_{inf}$ , $F_{r, fan}$ , $r_{fan}$ , $v_{fan}$ , $\lambda_T$ , $F_{oa}$ ) .....	18
47	4.3. Particle Size Specific Parameters ( $\lambda_{dep}$ , $L_{inf}$ , $F_{filter}$ ) .....	21
48	<b>5. Results.....</b>	<b>26</b>
49	5.1. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Outdoor Airborne Particles (Building Transmission Factor) ..	28
50	5.2. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Indoor Airborne Particles (Indoor Normalized TSIAC) .....	31
51	5.3. Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors (Building Exit Fraction) .....	34
52	5.4. Regional Exposures.....	37
53	<b>6. Discussion and Conclusion .....</b>	<b>39</b>
54	6.1. Comparison to Prior Work.....	40
55	6.2. Other Considerations .....	44
56	<b>7. Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>46</b>
57	<b>8. Attestations.....</b>	<b>47</b>
58	<b>9. References.....</b>	<b>48</b>
59	<b>Supplemental Material A: Detailed Results .....</b>	<b>52</b>
60	<b>Supplemental Material B: Results Summary.....</b>	<b>53</b>
61	<b>Supplemental Material C: Additional Building Metric Figures .....</b>	<b>57</b>
62	<b>Supplemental Material D: Improvement Sensitivity to Particle Size and Airborne Loss Rate .</b>	<b>61</b>
63		
64		

## 65 **2. Introduction**

66 Indoor exposure to airborne particles can arise from many outdoor and indoor sources and  
67 sufficient exposures are known to result in acute and chronic lung disease as well as heart  
68 disease [1]–[5]. Buildings can passively provide – in some cases significant – protection to their  
69 occupants from a broad range of particle inhalation hazards – including but not limited to PM<sub>2.5</sub>,  
70 PM<sub>10</sub>, and wildfire smoke – as discussed in detail in [6], [7]. Using the Regional Shelter Analysis  
71 (RSA) method described in [6], we previously estimated the passive protection provided by the  
72 existing US building stock for airborne particulate hazards [7]. The present work – utilizing the  
73 same RSA approach – focuses on the degree to which straightforward changes in building  
74 operation could yield an additional measure of protection. Specifically, this report considers the  
75 building protection benefits of improving current particle filtration efficiency by (a) using off-  
76 the-shelf furnace and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system filters and (b)  
77 increased furnace fan operation for residential buildings.

78 Our modeling uses the Building Transmission Factor metric (BTF) which is the ratio of indoor to  
79 outdoor exposures, where exposures are time-integrated airborne particle concentrations. The  
80 BTF, sometimes called the Building Exposure Ratio, is the inverse of the Building Protection  
81 Factor metric used in our previous RSA work [6], [7]. In addition to the BTF, two related, but  
82 distinct, building metrics are also of interest and are analyzed here: (a) the Indoor Normalized  
83 Time and Space Integrated Air Concentration (TSIAC) which is the degree to which indoor  
84 individuals are exposed to indoor airborne particles (the indoor time and space integrated air  
85 concentration normalized to the release of a unit amount of airborne material, such as a single  
86 particle or a  $\mu\text{g}$  of material) and (b) the Building Exit Fraction (BEF) which is the fraction of indoor  
87 airborne particulates that exit the building and enter the outdoor atmosphere. The potential  
88 improvement in (i.e., reduction in) regional exposures that arises due to the reduction in both  
89 the number of particles exiting the building and entering downwind buildings is also discussed.

90

### 91 **3. Building Models and Key Metrics**

92 Outdoor airborne particles can enter a building through mechanical ventilation (e.g., HVAC  
93 systems), natural ventilation (e.g., open windows), and/or infiltration (e.g., through exterior  
94 wall cracks). Once indoors, airborne particles can be removed from the indoor air through (a)  
95 air leaving the building by mechanical or natural ventilation and exfiltration; (b) active filtration  
96 by recirculation through furnace or HVAC systems (if present); (c) deposition on indoor surfaces  
97 (particle resuspension is not accounted for in this study); and (d) other processes, including but  
98 not limited to, chemical reactions and portable (stand-alone) indoor air filtration systems  
99 (neither of which are considered here). For this study, we have assumed building doors and  
100 windows are closed.

101 Modeling indoor contaminant concentrations requires choosing among a variety of  
102 mathematical models with increasing complexity, ranging from simple single compartment  
103 models to multizone models to highly detailed computational fluid dynamics models. While  
104 increasingly detailed and complex models may reduce modeling conservatism and uncertainty,  
105 the number and required fidelity of the input parameters also increases (see [8] for a general  
106 discussion). Since our goal is to provide a broad, high level assessment across a range of  
107 building categories and, as a practical matter, detailed parameters are not generally available  
108 for many buildings of interest; we make two key modeling assumptions (these assumptions are  
109 consistent with prior studies [9]–[12]). First, indoor air volumes, such as the breathing space of  
110 a building, can be represented as a single compartment, which can be used to describe the time  
111 evolution of indoor contaminant concentrations. Second, airborne particle concentrations  
112 within that single compartment are spatially uniform.

113 These assumptions are codified in the single box model (**Equation 1**) which can be used to  
114 describe the time evolution of indoor airborne particle concentrations. This study includes the  
115 additional, commonly used assumption that the transport and loss terms, i.e., the  $\lambda$   
116 parameters, are independent of both time and air concentration on the timescales of interest.

117 **(Equation 1)**

118 
$$\frac{dC_{Indoor}}{dt} = \lambda_{in} \times C_{Outdoor}(t) - (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal}) \times C_{Indoor}(t)$$

119

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

120 where

121

122  $\lambda_{in}$  = the rate at which outdoor airborne particles enters the building – typically via infiltration or  
123 ventilation. Includes losses that occur during transport from outdoor to indoor ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

124  $\lambda_{internal}$  = the rate at which indoor airborne particles are lost within the building – typically by  
125 deposition to surfaces or by filtration ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

126  $\lambda_{out}$  = the rate at which indoor airborne particles exit the building – typically via exfiltration or  
127 ventilation ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

128  $C_{Indoor}(t)$  = the indoor particle air concentration at time t ( $\text{g m}^{-3}$ )

129  $C_{Outdoor}(t)$  = the outdoor particle air concentration at time t ( $\text{g m}^{-3}$ )

130  $t$  = time (h)

131

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

132 We adapt **Equation 1** to develop two sets of generalized equations for each of the three  
133 building metrics (Building Transmission Factor, Indoor Normalized TSIAC, and Building Exit  
134 Fraction). Each equation set is defined on the basis of one of two common combinations of (a)  
135 the two building airflow mechanisms described above (filtered recirculation; HVAC systems)  
136 and (b) the relevant indoor loss mechanisms. In addition to any filtration that might be present,  
137 and already incorporated into the airflow terms, we consider two additional indoor loss  
138 mechanisms: (a) deposition of airborne particles to indoor surfaces,  $\lambda_{dep}$ , and (b) a generic first-  
139 order airborne loss mechanism that can be used to account for other loss mechanisms not  
140 explicitly considered in this analysis,  $\lambda_{decay}$ . Several parameters are particle-size-dependent. For  
141 readability, these dependencies are not shown in the equations themselves, but are denoted by  
142 (particle size) in the list of variable definitions.

143 The first set of airflow equations (denoted by **R**) corresponds to buildings with filtered  
144 recirculation, which in the US are typically residences. Outdoor airborne material enters the  
145 building only through the infiltration pathway. The forced air furnace recirculation air filter, if  
146 present and active (fan on), removes a fraction of indoor airborne particles.

147 The second set of airflow equations (denoted by **H**) corresponds to buildings with an active  
148 HVAC system, which in the US are typically non-residential buildings. Outdoor airborne material  
149 enters the building through either infiltration or the HVAC system outdoor air intake. The HVAC  
150 system air filter removes airborne particles from both the entering and recirculating air. This  
151 equation implicitly assumes that the HVAC system fan duty cycle is 100% (the system is always  
152 moving building air, although not necessarily heating or cooling it).

153



M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

154 **3.1. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Outdoor Airborne Particles (Building Transmission**  
155 **Factor)**

156 The building transmission factor equations were previously derived in [6], [7], where the  
157 Building Protection Factor metric was used. **Equation 2** provides the general form. This term is  
158 the ratio of the total indoor exposure to total outdoor exposure. For this application, exposure  
159 is defined as the time-integrated airborne particle concentration, hence the Building  
160 Transmission Factor is not simply the ratio of indoor to outdoor concentrations. [6], [7] provide  
161 more details, discussion, and alternative equations for other exposure metrics.

162 **(Equation 2)**

163 
$$[\textit{Building Transmission Factor}] = \frac{1}{[\textit{Building Protection Factor}]}$$

164 
$$= \frac{\int C_{\textit{Indoor}}(t)dt}{\int C_{\textit{Outdoor}}(t)dt} = \frac{\lambda_{in}}{(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}$$

165

166 For buildings with filtered recirculation, **Equation 3R** specifies the Building Transmission Factor.

167 **(Equation 3R)**

168 
$$[\textit{Building Transmission Factor}] = \frac{(\lambda_{inf} \times L_{inf})}{\lambda_{inf} + (F_{filter} \times F_{r, fan} \times r_{fan} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}$$

169

170 For buildings with an active HVAC system, **Equation 3H** specifies the Building Transmission  
171 Factor.

172 **(Equation 3H)**

173 
$$[\textit{Building Transmission Factor}] = \frac{(\lambda_{inf} \times L_{inf} + v_{fan} \times F_{oa} \times (1 - F_{filter}))}{\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \times v_{fan} \times (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}$$

174

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

175 where

176

177  $\lambda_{dep}(\textit{particle size})$  = the particle-size-dependent indoor deposition loss rate ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

178  $\lambda_{decay}$  = the “generic” first-order airborne decay (loss) rate. This term is used to estimate the impact of  
179 loss mechanisms that are NOT otherwise specified. ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

180  $\lambda_{inf}$  = the air infiltration rate at which air enters a building ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

181  $\lambda_T$  = the total building ventilation rate [= sum of the infiltration and mechanical ventilation rates] ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ ).

182

183  $L_{inf}(\textit{particle size})$  = the particle-size-dependent efficiency by which particles can penetrate the  
184 building shell (dimensionless)

185  $F_{filter}(\textit{particle size})$  = the particle-size-dependent filtration efficiency (dimensionless)

186  $F_{oa}$  = the fraction of outdoor air passing through the HVAC supply fan (dimensionless)

187  $F_{r,fan}$  = the fraction of time the forced air furnace recirculation fan is on, i.e., the fan’s duty cycle  
188 (dimensionless)

189  $r_{fan}$  = the rate at which a building volume of air recirculates through the furnace systems when the fan  
190 is on ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

191  $v_{fan}$  = the rate at which a ventilation or HVAC supply fan delivers a building volume of air when the fan  
192 is on and combines the outside and recirculation air rates ( $\text{h}^{-1}$ )

193

194 [*Building Protection Factor*] = ratio of the outdoor to indoor exposure. Similar to sunscreen and  
195 personal protective respirator rating systems, higher protection factor values indicate lower  
196 exposures and thus increased protection. (protection factor)

197 [*Building Transmission Factor*] = ratio of the indoor to outdoor exposure. ( (protection factor) $^{-1}$  )

198

199 **3.2. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Indoor Airborne Particles (Indoor Normalized**  
200 **TSIAC)**

201 The following equations define the indoor normalized time and space integrated airborne  
202 particle concentration (Indoor Normalized TSIAC). While this metric can be applied more  
203 generally, it is used here to evaluate the exposure to particles released indoors. The equations  
204 are developed with the additional assumptions that outdoor airborne particle concentrations  
205 are zero and the indoor emission of a single particle occurs at single time ( $t = 0$ ). With these  
206 assumptions, **Equation 1** simplifies to **Equation 4**. When a unit amount of material is released  
207 indoors at  $t = 0$ , **Equation 4** reduces to **Equation 5**.

208 **(Equation 4)**

209 
$$C_{Indoor}(t) = C_{Indoor}(t = 0) \times e^{-(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})t}$$

210  
211 **(Equation 5)**

212 
$$[Indoor\ Normalized\ TSIAC] = [Building\ Floor\ Area] \times \int_0^{\infty} C_{Indoor}(t) dt$$

213 
$$= [Building\ Floor\ Area] \times \left( \frac{1}{[Building\ Volume]} \right) \times (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})^{-1}$$

214 
$$= \frac{1}{[Room\ Height] \times (\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}$$

215  
216 For buildings with filtered recirculation, **Equation 6R** specifies the Indoor Normalized TSIAC.

217 **(Equation 6R)**

218 
$$[Indoor\ Normalized\ TSIAC]$$
  
219 
$$= \frac{1}{[Room\ Height] \times (\lambda_{inf} + (F_{filter} \times F_{r,fan} \times r_{fan} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay}))}$$

220

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

221 For buildings with an active HVAC system, **Equation 6H** specifies the Indoor Normalized TSIAC.

222 **(Equation 6H)**

223 [*Indoor Normalized TSIAC*]

224 
$$= \frac{1}{[Room Height] \times (\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \times v_{fan} \times (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay}))}$$

225

226 where

227

228 [*Building Floor Area*] = floor area of the building (m<sup>2</sup>)

229 [*Indoor Normalized TSIAC*] = indoor time and space integrated air concentration assuming a unit  
230 amount of material is released (s m<sup>-1</sup>)

231 [*Room Height*] = height of building occupied space (m)

232

### 233 3.3. Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors (Exit Fraction)

234 **Equation 7** shows the fraction of material released indoors that exits the building and enters  
235 the outdoor atmosphere. This equation is based on (a) the appropriate (normalized) indoor  
236 concentration (**Equation 5**), (b) the rate at which indoor air (and airborne material) leaves the  
237 building, and (c) particle losses to the building envelope that occur while airborne particles  
238 suspended in the indoor air are exiting the building.

239 **(Equation 7)**

$$240 \quad [Building\ Exit\ Fraction] = \frac{\int_0^{\infty} (C_{Indoor}(t) \times [Building\ Volume]) \times (\lambda_{out} \times L_{out}) dt}{[Total\ Particles\ Released]}$$

$$241 \quad = [Indoor\ Normalized\ TSIAC] \times [Room\ Height] \times \lambda_{out} \times L_{out}$$

$$242 \quad = \frac{\lambda_{out} \times L_{out}}{(\lambda_{out} + \lambda_{internal})}$$

243

244 For buildings with filtered recirculation, outdoor air enters the building only through the  
245 infiltration pathway and so  $\lambda_{out} = \lambda_{inf}$  and **Equation 8R** specifies the building exit fraction. We  
246 assume here that most of the indoor air that exits the building does so via the exfiltration  
247 pathway (as opposed to other exit pathways such as bathroom or kitchen exhaust fans, and  
248 dryer vents) and therefore  $L_{out} = L_{inf}$ .

249 **(Equation 8R)**

$$250 \quad [Building\ Exit\ Fraction] = \frac{\lambda_{inf} \times L_{inf}}{\lambda_{inf} + (F_{filter} \times F_{r, fan} \times r_{fan} + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}$$

251

252 For buildings with an active HVAC system, indoor airborne material exits the building through  
253 either infiltration or through mechanical means, e.g., the HVAC system exhaust; **Equation 8H**  
254 specifies the building exit fraction. Again we note that the entrance and exit airflow paths may  
255 differ, but as a practical matter assume (a) that they are the same ( $\lambda_{out} = \lambda_{inf}$ ;  $L_{out} = L_{inf}$ )  
256 and (b) no particles are lost while the indoor air is exiting through the exhaust system.

257 **(Equation 8H)**

$$258 \quad [Building\ Exit\ Fraction] = \frac{(\lambda_{inf} \times L_{inf} + v_{fan} \times F_{oa})}{\lambda_T + (F_{filter} \times v_{fan} \times (1 - F_{oa}) + \lambda_{dep} + \lambda_{decay})}$$

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

259 where

260

261 [*Building Exit Fraction*] = fraction of material released within a building that exits the building and  
262 enters the outdoor atmosphere. (no units)

263  $L_{out}(particle\ size)$  = the particle-size-dependent efficiency by which particles in indoor air exit the  
264 building through cracks and other penetrations in the building shell (dimensionless)

265

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

### 266 3.4. Regional Exposures

267 **Equation 9** describes the fraction of indoor airborne particles that exit a source building, are  
 268 transported downwind, and enter another building’s indoor air space. This metric incorporates  
 269 both the source Building Exit Fraction (the fraction of indoor airborne particles that exit the  
 270 source building) and the downwind Building Transmission Factor (the fraction of outdoor  
 271 airborne particles that enter the second building’s air space). The *[Outdoor Normalized TSIAC]*  
 272 term in **Equation 9**, which requires analysis beyond that presented here, assesses the degree to  
 273 which particles, once emitted from the source building, are transported and diluted in the  
 274 outdoor atmosphere. **Equation 10** defines the Improvement in Downwind Indoor Exposure  
 275 metric as a ratio to the baseline scenario and so the *[Outdoor Normalized TSIAC]* terms drops  
 276 out. This metric can be used to assess the degree to which improved filtration scenarios  
 277 decrease downwind indoor exposures relative to the baseline scenario.

278 **(Equation 9)**

279 *[Downwind Indoor Exposure](source building, downwind building)*

$$280 = \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{[Total Particles Released Indoors](source building)} \\ \times \text{[Building Exit Fraction](source building)} \\ \times \text{[Outdoor Normalized TSIAC](source building, downwind building)} \\ \times \text{[Building Footprint](downwind building)} \\ \times \text{[Building Transmission Factor](downwind building)} \end{array} \right)$$

281 **(Equation 10)**

282 *[Improvement in Downwind Indoor Exposure] =*

$$283 \frac{\text{[Downwind Indoor Exposure](source building, downwind building)}_{\text{baseline scenario}}}{\text{[Downwind Indoor Exposure](source building, downwind building)}_{\text{improved filtration scenario}}} =$$

$$284 \left( \frac{\text{[Building Exit Fraction](source building)}_{\text{baseline scenario}}}{\text{[Building Exit Fraction](source building)}_{\text{improved filtration scenario}}} \right) \times$$

$$285 \left( \frac{\text{[Building Transmission Factor](downwind building)}_{\text{baseline scenario}}}{\text{[Building Transmission Factor](downwind building)}_{\text{improved filtration scenario}}} \right)$$

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

286 where

287

288 [*Building Footprint*](*building*) = the projected area of the building onto the Earth's surface. ( $m^2$ )

289 [*Downwind Indoor Exposure*](*source building, downwind building*) = the number of airborne  
290 particles in the breathing volume (respiratory second volume) of an individual in the downwind  
291 building that were emitted within the source building. (particles  $s\ m^{-3}$ )

292 [*Improvement in Downwind Indoor Exposure*] = ratio of indoor downwind exposure for the  
293 baseline scenario to the improved filtration scenario. (no units)

294 [*Outdoor Normalized TSIAC*](*source building, downwind building*) = particle air concentration  
295 outside the downwind building integrated over the passage of the airborne particulate plume and  
296 the building footprint assuming a single particle was released to the outdoor atmosphere from the  
297 source building. ( $s\ m^{-3}$ )

298 [*Total Particles Released Indoors*](*source building*) = total number of airborne particles released  
299 within the source building. (particles)

300



## 301 **4. Building Parameter Values**

302 Our modeling is based on the building use type categories and parameters values described in  
303 our earlier report [7] and briefly summarized here. The tables that follow are adapted from that  
304 report, where additional discussion and descriptive details may be found. We provide building  
305 air flow and particle parameters for most of the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS)  
306 HAZUS convention of 33 building use types (termed building occupancy types in the HAZUS  
307 documentation), see **Table 1**; and for individuals outdoors [13]. These parameters are used  
308 when calculating the Building Transmission Factor, Indoor Normalized TSIAC, and Building Exit  
309 Fraction values from the **R** and **H** airflow equations.

310 To assess the benefits from increasing building filter efficiencies, this report compares the  
311 effects on indoor airborne particulate concentrations arising from the existing US building stock  
312 filter efficiencies – as a baseline scenario – to the concentrations yielded from using higher  
313 efficiency filtration scenarios that could be implemented. The only differences in parameters  
314 between the baseline scenario and the 3 improved filtration scenarios analyzed are (a) different  
315 furnace duty cycles ( $F_{r, fan}$ ) in **Table 3** below and (b) the choice of filtration categories in **Table 9**  
316 below. Room height, used in the calculation of the Indoor Normalized TSIAC metric, is assumed  
317 to be 3 m for all buildings.

318

### 319 **4.1. Building Model Assignment**

320 The **Table 2** column “Building airflow type” assigns the appropriate airflow equation type (**R** =  
321 filtered recirculation; **H** = HVAC system) to most US FEMA HAZUS building use type categories  
322 specified in **Table 1**, and also specifies the appropriate airflow parameter values associated with  
323 building infiltration, ventilation, and filtration. We note that the prior studies of building  
324 performance and/or indoor pollutant behavior (discussed below) were not performed to  
325 explicitly conform to HAZUS building use type categories. For some HAZUS building use type  
326 categories, e.g., RES1, the mapping between the prior work and the HAZUS category is  
327 straightforward. The mapping for other HAZUS categories is less clear and for some categories  
328 there are limited published data available. For these cases, we made estimates based on best  
329 engineering judgment and adapted the available input data to conform to the HAZUS building  
330 types (as discussed below and in [7]). Single box modeling may not adequately represent the  
331 indoor airborne particle concentrations for some parking garages (COM10) and so we exclude  
332 this building use type from our analysis.

333

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

334 **Table 1. Mapping between HAZUS provided occupancy class and specific building use types. This**  
335 **information is adapted from Table 13.2 presented in [13].**

Occupancy class	Building use type	Building use type description
<b>Residential</b>	RES1	Single family dwelling
	RES2	Manufactured (Mobile) home
	RES3A	Multi-family dwelling: duplex
	RES3B	Multi-family dwelling: 3–4 units
	RES3C	Multi-family dwelling: 5–9 units
	RES3D	Multi-family dwelling: 10–19 units
	RES3E	Multi-family dwelling: 20–49 units
	RES3F	Multi-family dwelling: 50+ units
	RES4	Temporary lodging (e.g., hotel/motel)
	RES5	Institutional dormitory (e.g., military, college, jails)
RES6	Nursing home	
<b>Commercial</b>	COM1	Retail trade (e.g., stores)
	COM2	Wholesale trade (e.g., warehouses)
	COM3	Personal and repair services (e.g., service station/shop)
	COM4	Professional/technical services (e.g., offices)
	COM5	Banks
	COM6	Hospital
	COM7	Medical office/clinic
	COM8	Entertainment and recreation (e.g., restaurants/bars)
	COM9	Theaters
	COM10	Parking (e.g., garages)
<b>Industrial</b>	IND1	Heavy industry (e.g., factory)
	IND2	Light industry (e.g., factory)
	IND3	Food/drugs/chemicals (e.g., factory)
	IND4	Metals/minerals processing (e.g., factory)
	IND5	High technology (e.g., factory)
	IND6	Construction (e.g., office)
<b>Agricultural</b>	AGR1	Agriculture
<b>Religious</b>	REL1	Church/non-profit
<b>Governmental</b>	GOV1	General services (e.g., office)
	GOV2	Emergency response (e.g., police/fire station/eoc)
<b>Educational</b>	EDU1	Grade schools
	EDU2	Colleges/universities (does not include group housing)

336  
337

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

338 **Table 2. Equation and corresponding parameter values associated with building use types. See [7] for**  
339 **a more detailed discussion of the building use types taken from HAZUS.**

Building use type <sup>(a)</sup>	Building airflow type	R airflow parameters $(\lambda_{inf}, F_{r, fan}, f_{fan})$ <sup>(b)</sup>	H airflow parameters $(v_{fan}, \lambda_T, F_{oa})$ <sup>(c)</sup>	Deposition adjustment factor <sup>(d)</sup>	Filtration category <sup>(e)</sup>
Outdoors <sup>(f)</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RES1	R	SFH	N/A	1	Single family
RES2	R	MH	N/A	1.2	Single family
RES3A	R	SFH	N/A	1	Single family
RES3B	R, H	APT w/o corridors	Apt w corridors	1.2	Low quality
RES3C	R, H	APT w/o corridors	Apt w corridors	1.2	Low quality
RES3D	R, H	APT w/o corridors	Apt w corridors	1.2	Low quality
RES3E	R, H	APT w/o corridors	Apt w corridors	1	Low quality
RES3F	R, H	APT w/o corridors	Apt w corridors	1	Low quality
RES4	H	N/A	Hotel	1	Low quality
RES5	H	N/A	Hotel	1	Low quality
RES6	H	N/A	Hotel	1	Low quality
COM1	H	N/A	Retail	1	Medium quality
COM2	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
COM3	H	N/A	Retail	1	Low quality
COM4	H	N/A	Office	1	Standard office
COM5	H	N/A	Office	1	Standard office
COM6	H	N/A	Health Care	1	Very high quality
COM7	H	N/A	Health Care	1	Standard office
COM8	H	N/A	Restaurant	1	Medium quality
COM9	H	N/A	Retail	1	Medium quality
COM10 <sup>(g)</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IND1	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
IND2	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
IND3	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	High quality
IND4	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
IND5	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Very high quality
IND6	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
AGR	H	N/A	Warehouse	0.6	Low quality
REL1	H	N/A	Retail	1	Low quality
GOV1	H	N/A	Office	1	Standard office
GOV2	H	N/A	Office	1	Medium quality
EDU1	H	N/A	School	1	Medium quality
EDU2	H	N/A	School	1	Medium quality

340 <sup>(a)</sup> HAZUS building occupancy type; <sup>(b)</sup> **R** = filtered recirculation. Values selected from the distributions  
341 defined in **Table 3**; <sup>(c)</sup> **H** = HVAC system. Values selected from the distributions defined in **Tables 3 to 6**;  
342 <sup>(d)</sup> See discussion in text below; <sup>(e)</sup> Values selected from the distributions defined in **Tables 9 and 10**; <sup>(f)</sup> In  
343 this analysis, the outdoor protection factor and exit fraction is defined to be one (1); <sup>(g)</sup> Not included in  
344 the present analysis.  
345

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

346 **4.2. Air Flow Parameters ( $\lambda_{inf}$ ,  $F_{r, fan}$ ,  $r_{fan}$ ,  $v_{fan}$ ,  $\lambda_T$ ,  $F_{oa}$ )**

347 There are two mechanisms by which indoor and outdoor air is exchanged – via (largely)  
348 uncontrolled infiltration and via controlled mechanical means (typically HVAC or exhaust fan  
349 systems). For the single family residences, manufactured homes, duplexes, and apartments  
350 without corridors (the RES1, RES2, RES3A, and a portion of the RES3B to RES3F HAZUS building  
351 use types), **Table 3** provides the natural air infiltration rate ( $\lambda_{inf}$ ), furnace recirculation fan duty  
352 cycle ( $F_{r, fan}$ ), and furnace system recirculation rate ( $r_{fan}$ ) appropriate for scenarios in which  
353 windows and doors are closed. The reported geometric standard deviation accounts for  
354 variation in homes across the US and for the different seasons and times of the day.

355

356 **Table 3. Select parameters used in R type airflow equations (filtered recirculation). These parameters**  
357 **assume a log-normal distribution.**

Parameter	Geometric mean (units)	Geometric standard deviation (dimensionless)	Reference
$\lambda_{inf}$ – SFH <sup>(a)</sup>	0.44 (h <sup>-1</sup> )	2.04	[14], [15]
$\lambda_{inf}$ – MH <sup>(a)</sup>	0.42 (h <sup>-1</sup> )	1.86	[14]
$\lambda_{inf}$ - APT w/o corridors <sup>(a)</sup>	0.23 (h <sup>-1</sup> )	1.82	[14]
$r_{fan}$	5.7 (h <sup>-1</sup> )	1.26	[15]
$F_{r, fan}$ (baseline scenario)	0.25 (dimensionless)	1.85	[15]
$F_{r, fan}$ (Min MERV 7 scenario)	1 (dimensionless)	1.0	N/A
$F_{r, fan}$ (Min MERV 11 scenario)	1 (dimensionless)	1.0	N/A
$F_{r, fan}$ (Min MERV 14 scenario)	1 (dimensionless)	1.0	N/A

358 <sup>(a)</sup> This parameter value assumes doors and windows are closed.

359 SFH = single family home (used for RES1 and RES3A)

360 MH = manufactured home (used for RES2)

361 APT w/o corridors = multifamily dwelling buildings that do NOT have corridors (RES3B to RES3F w/o  
362 corridors)

363

364 **Table 4** provides our estimates for the average, minimum, and maximum values for the  $\lambda_{inf}$ ,  $v_{fan}$ ,  
365  $F_{oa}$ , and  $\lambda_T$  parameters for 9 representative US building types or subtypes: Restaurants, Offices,  
366 Schools, Retail, Health Care, Hotels (guest rooms and common spaces), Apartments with  
367 corridors, and Warehouses. [7] derives and discusses these values. As we lack a robust estimate  
368 for the functional form of the probability distribution, we assume a triangular distribution for  
369 each parameter.

370 For each of the given HAZUS apartment building use types (RES3B to RES3F), there is a mixture  
371 of buildings with and without internal corridors. We estimate the key building parameter  
372 metrics by combining both building types using the building height as a proxy for the presence  
373 of a corridor: apartment buildings greater than 3 stories are assumed to have interior corridors  
374 and apartment buildings less than 3 stories do not have them (3 story buildings were not  
375 included in the reference dataset) [14]. For the latter, we use the **R** equations as described in  
376 the prior paragraph. For the former, we use the **H** equations to incorporate a mechanical means  
377 of supplying air to the internal corridors, following *Persily et al.* [16]. **Table 5** gives the  
378 percentile distributions for the total building air ventilation rates for apartments that do have  
379 corridors. **Table 6** summarizes the fraction of buildings in each category by HAZUS building  
380 type.

381 Hotels (RES4), and presumably other institutional residential buildings such as dormitories and  
382 nursing homes (RES5 and RES6), can have different air handling mechanisms in the common  
383 use spaces (e.g., lobby, restaurants/dining areas, corridors) compared to the sleeping areas  
384 (e.g., guest rooms). As discussed in [7], there is minimal mixing between these two regions, and  
385 so we develop two, independent sets of building protection estimates – one for guest rooms  
386 and the other for the rest of the building, see **Table 4**. We note that the population in these two  
387 building areas varies by the time of day – with nearly all people in the guest room at night and  
388 more evenly distributed throughout the building during the day [17]. As a result, the  
389 appropriate building protection factors vary by time of day.

390

391 **Table 4. Select parameters used in H type airflow equations (active HVAC). These parameters**  
392 **assume a triangular distribution. See [7] for more details.**

	average	maximum	minimum
supply fan rate, $v_{fan}$ ( $h^{-1}$ )			
Restaurant	7.0	13	6.1
Office	3.8	25	1.1
School	3.1	11	2.8
Retail	3.7	9.1	2.0
Health care	5.8	18	3.9
Warehouse	0.9	1.0	0.6
Hotel, guest rooms	1.0	1.4	0.6
Hotel, common spaces	4.2	6.6	1.9
Apt w corridors	7.4	7.6	7.2
fraction of outside air entering the building, $F_{oa}$ (dimensionless)			
Restaurant	0.5	0.7	0.0
Office	0.1	1.0	0.0
School	0.2	0.6	0.1
Retail	0.1	0.6	0.0
Health care	0.1	0.2	0.1
Warehouse	0.05	0.06	0.04
Hotel, guest rooms	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hotel, common spaces	0.13	0.17	0.09
Apt w corridors	0.05	0.08	0.02
natural air infiltration rate, $\lambda_{inf}$ ( $h^{-1}$ )			
Restaurant	0.5	1.9	0.01
Office	0.12	1.2	0.0
School	0.3	1.2	0.02
Retail	0.2	0.8	0.0
Health care	0.05	0.9	0.0
Warehouse	0.3	1.0	0.05
Hotel, guest rooms	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hotel, common spaces <sup>(a)</sup>	0.3	1.2	0.0
Apt w corridors	$\lambda_T - v_{fan} \cdot F_{oa}$ (see Table 5 for $\lambda_T$ )		

393 <sup>(a)</sup> Assumes infiltration rates are the same for the (i) other rooms and (ii) whole building

394

395 **Table 5. Percentile distribution for the total building air ventilation rate,  $\lambda_T$  ( $h^{-1}$ )**  
396 **for Apartments that DO have Corridors (RES3B-F) from [14].**

P1%	P5%	P25%	P50%	P75%	P95%	P99%
0.23	0.33	0.42	0.46	0.54	0.71	0.87

397

398 **Table 6. Fraction of apartment buildings by HAZUS building use type that are either less than or**  
399 **greater than 3 stories in height (from [16]).**

HAZUS building use type	HAZUS building use type description	Fraction of buildings less than 3 stories (dimensionless)	Fraction of buildings greater than 3 stories (dimensionless)
RES3B <sup>(a)</sup>	Multi-family dwelling: 3–4 units	0.87	0.13
RES3C	Multi-family dwelling: 5–9 units	0.80	0.20
RES3D	Multi-family dwelling: 10–19 units	0.60	0.40
RES3E <sup>(b)</sup>	Multi-family dwelling: 20–49 units	0.24	0.76
RES3F <sup>(c)</sup>	Multi-family dwelling: 50+ units	0.10	0.90

400 <sup>(a)</sup> *Persily et al.* [16] results correspond to buildings with 2 to 4 units.

401 <sup>(b)</sup> *Persily et al.* [16] results correspond to buildings with 20 to 39 units.

402 <sup>(c)</sup> *Persily et al.* [16] results correspond to buildings with 40+ units.

403

#### 404 4.3. Particle Size Specific Parameters ( $\lambda_{dep}$ , $L_{inf}$ , $F_{filter}$ )

405 Indoor particle concentrations are affected by three parameters: deposition to indoor surfaces,  
406 losses that occur when airborne particles penetrate through the building envelope, and losses  
407 that occur during filtration. Particle deposition loss rates are primarily controlled by particle  
408 size, the indoor surface to volume ratio, and, to some extent, turbulence conditions within a  
409 given space. We treat airborne particles as chemically inert, with negligible thermophoretic or  
410 electrostatic interactions with indoor surfaces in buildings. **Table 7** provides the particle  
411 deposition loss rate distributions for residential buildings and is based on experiments  
412 conducted in actual homes or room-sized chambers. There are almost no comparable, size-  
413 resolved particle deposition rate data reported for other building types. For these buildings, we  
414 have used the residential loss rates and, for some cases, multiplied the residential loss rates by  
415 our estimated deposition adjustment factor. This factor is based on our estimates of the  
416 differences in surface-to-volume ratios in those buildings compared with those in residences  
417 and accounts for the quantity and type of furnishings. These factors are shown in the next to  
418 the last column of **Table 2**.

419

420 **Table 7. Cumulative frequency distribution of airborne particle deposition loss rates in buildings ( $\lambda_{dep}$ ,**  
421  **$h^{-1}$ ) by particle size (aerodynamic diameter). See [7] for more details.**

Airborne particle size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Percentile distribution for the indoor deposition particle loss rate ( $\lambda_{dep}$ , $h^{-1}$ )						
	P <sub>1%</sub>	P <sub>5%</sub>	P <sub>25%</sub>	P <sub>50%</sub>	P <sub>75%</sub>	P <sub>95%</sub>	P <sub>99%</sub>
0.1	0.07	0.07	0.39	0.59	0.72	1.57	1.67
0.3	0.02	0.11	0.27	0.46	0.93	1.31	1.35
1	0.04	0.15	0.28	0.40	0.89	2.39	2.68
3	0.05	0.31	0.72	1.31	1.87	3.60	3.89
10	0.08	0.08	1.83	4.12	6.78	10.83	11.45



422 Airflow pathways into buildings depend upon a number of building features, primary among  
423 them is whether the building has an HVAC system, as most commercial buildings do. Residential  
424 buildings, on the other hand, largely do not and thus the major airflow pathway is infiltration  
425 through cracks and penetrations in the building shell. As discussed in greater detail in [7],  
426 particle losses are parameterized by the particle penetration efficiency, which is particle-size-  
427 dependent; values for these parameters are presented in **Table 8** and are used here for all  
428 building types.

429

430 **Table 8. Cumulative frequency distribution of the building particle penetration efficiency ( $L_{inf}$ ,**  
431 **dimensionless) by particle size (aerodynamic diameter). See [7] for more details.**

Airborne particle size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Percentile distribution for the particle penetration efficiency ( $L_{inf}$ , dimensionless)						
	P <sub>1%</sub>	P <sub>5%</sub>	P <sub>25%</sub>	P <sub>50%</sub>	P <sub>75%</sub>	P <sub>95%</sub>	P <sub>99%</sub>
<b>0.1</b>	0.52	0.52	0.55	0.63	0.69	1.02	1.04
<b>0.3</b>	0.51	0.51	0.64	0.72	0.83	0.97	0.99
<b>1</b>	0.56	0.59	0.80	0.94	0.99	1.02	1.03
<b>3</b>	0.27	0.34	0.50	0.69	0.83	0.95	0.97
<b>10</b>	0.09	0.09	0.17	0.42	0.56	0.84	0.87

432

433 For buildings with HVAC systems, a major pathway for outdoor air entering the building is  
434 through the mechanical air handling system which typically contains some particle filtration  
435 capability. As discussed in [7], the performance of these particle filters is typically categorized  
436 by their Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating, as specified by ASHRAE [18]. MERV  
437 ratings correspond to the fraction of airborne particles captured in a single pass through the  
438 filter. Filters with numerically larger MERV ratings are more efficient at removing airborne  
439 particles than filters with numerically smaller MERV ratings. For our purposes here, we consider  
440 6 filtration categories – single family, standard office, low quality, medium quality, high quality,  
441 and very high quality – each with a different distribution of filter MERV ratings. For our baseline  
442 scenario calculation purposes, we assign each HAZUS building use type the filtration category  
443 corresponding to our estimated distribution of the filter media types and quality that are in  
444 general use (see last column in **Table 2**).

445 As we are analyzing the effects of improved filtration efficiency, the filtration category specific  
446 distribution of MERV rated filters varies for each scenario analyzed as shown in **Table 9**. The  
447 *baseline scenario* distribution is compatible with prior literature surveys of US building filtration  
448 efficiency and is discussed in [7]. The other three scenarios assume that the currently existing  
449 lower efficiency furnace and HVAC filters are replaced with progressively higher efficiency  
450 filters. The difference between the latter three scenarios is the minimum filter rating  
451 considered. The *Minimum MERV 7 scenario* replaces all filters with MERV ratings below MERV 7



M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

452 with a MERV 7 or 8 filter (other filters are not changed). The *Minimum MERV 11 scenario*  
453 replaces all filters with a MERV rating below 11 with a MERV 11 or 12 filter (other filters are not  
454 changed). The *Minimum MERV 14 scenario* replaces all filters with a MERV rating below 14 with  
455 a MERV 14 or 15 rated filter. We note that 35% of single family homes do not have recirculating  
456 air furnaces – e.g., radiators, in-wall heaters – and so their building filtration remains  
457 unchanged in all scenarios. The computed results for each filtration scenario include these  
458 homes.

459 For each MERV filter rating shown in **Table 9**, **Table 10** provides the single pass filtration  
460 efficiency distributions which, for each MERV rating, considers the efficiency variation both (a)  
461 within similarly rated filters and (b) due to filter loading over the filter lifetime (note, our  
462 filtration parameters are for media-type filters). See [7] for more details.  
463

464 **Table 9. Distributions of MERV-rated filters by building use type filtration categories for the baseline**  
465 **[7] and for the improved filtration (Minimum MERV) analysis scenarios.**

Analysis Scenario	Building Use Type Filtration Category	MERV Distribution Fractions (dimensionless)					
		No Filter	MERV0 <sup>(b)</sup>	MERV5	MERV7 to MERV8 <sup>(c)</sup>	MERV11 to MERV12 <sup>(c)</sup>	MERV14 to MERV15 <sup>(c)</sup>
Baseline	Single family <sup>(a)</sup>	0.35	0.16	0.20	0.20	0.07	0.03
	Standard office	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.55	0.10	0.15
	Low quality	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.30	0.05	0.00
	Medium quality	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.45	0.05	0.05
	High quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.50	0.25
	Very high quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Minimum MERV 7	Single family <sup>(a)</sup>	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.07	0.03
	Standard office	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.10	0.15
	Low quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.05	0.00
	Medium quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.90	0.05	0.05
	High quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.50	0.25
	Very high quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Minimum MERV 11	Single family <sup>(a)</sup>	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.03
	Standard office	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.15
	Low quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	Medium quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.05
	High quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.25
	Very high quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Minimum MERV 14	Single family <sup>(a)</sup>	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.65
	Standard office	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
	Low quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
	Medium quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
	High quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
	Very high quality	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00

466 <sup>(a)</sup> This distribution includes both the MERV filter rating distribution for the 65% of US homes with  
467 furnace/AC systems as well as the 35% of the US homes that lack a HVAC system (no filter).  $F_{filter}$   
468 for the no filter homes is 0.

469 <sup>(b)</sup> Indicates that the system is capable of having a filter, but the filter is absent.

470 <sup>(c)</sup> We have combined filtration efficiencies for 2 MERV ratings when considering these categories.

471 Analysis Scenarios: Baseline scenario represents estimated current US filter usage. Minimum MERV  
472 scenarios show how overall US building filtration capability improves assuming that all buildings with  
473 forced air systems use a filter equal to or greater than the stated MERV rating.

474

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

475 **Table 10. Filtration efficiency ( $F_{filter}$ , dimensionless) by air filter MERV rating and particle size. See [7]**  
476 **for more details.**

Air-filter MERV rating	Airborne particle size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Percentile distribution for the filtration efficiency ( $F_{filter}$ , dimensionless)						
		P <sub>1%</sub>	P <sub>5%</sub>	P <sub>25%</sub>	P <sub>50%</sub>	P <sub>75%</sub>	P <sub>95%</sub>	P <sub>99%</sub>
<b>0</b>	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5</b>	0.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.18	0.29
	0.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.18	0.29
	1	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.18	0.69	0.83
	3	0.28	0.28	0.32	0.40	0.64	0.95	0.98
	10	0.22	0.22	0.29	0.45	0.83	0.94	0.98
<b>7 to 8</b>	0.1	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.20	0.24	0.33	0.37
	0.3	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.20	0.24	0.33	0.37
	1	0.15	0.27	0.51	0.69	0.81	0.90	0.92
	3	0.51	0.58	0.93	0.96	0.98	0.99	1.00
	10	0.61	0.62	0.95	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>11 to 12</b>	0.1	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.40	0.56	0.92	0.94
	0.3	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.40	0.56	0.92	0.94
	1	0.22	0.25	0.42	0.76	0.91	0.99	0.99
	3	0.67	0.68	0.87	0.95	0.99	1.00	1.00
	10	0.67	0.67	0.85	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>14 to 15</b>	0.1	0.64	0.68	0.80	0.86	0.92	0.99	0.99
	0.3	0.64	0.68	0.80	0.86	0.92	0.99	0.99
	1	0.86	0.90	0.96	0.98	0.99	1.00	1.00
	3	0.98	0.99	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	10	0.99	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

477

## 478 5. Results

479 Using the equations, input assumptions, and data described in the previous two sections, we  
480 estimate the benefits of improving building filtration efficiency using off-the-shelf air filter  
481 technology across 32 of the 33 major FEMA HAZUS building use types shown in **Table 1**. In this  
482 section we present these benefits by comparing three improved filtration scenarios, each with  
483 increasingly higher minimum filtration efficiency, against a baseline scenario, which reflects our  
484 understanding of the existing filtration distribution in the US building stock and normal furnace  
485 operating conditions. Three primary metrics are considered here: (1) the passive protection  
486 provided by buildings against outdoor airborne particulate hazards (Building Transmission  
487 Factor), (2) the degree to which indoor individuals are exposed to indoor-origin airborne  
488 particles (Indoor Normalized TSIAC) and (3) the fraction of indoor airborne particles that exit  
489 the building and enter the outdoor atmosphere (Building Exit Fraction). We also discuss the  
490 potential improvement on regional exposures due to particles exiting the building and exposing  
491 downwind building occupants. For each of the 32 building use types, our modeling covers five  
492 aerosol sizes (0.1, 0.3, 1, 3, 10  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter) and four airborne loss rates (0, 0.1, 1, 10  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ). The  
493 entire set of results are provided in **Supplemental Material A: Detailed Results**.

494 We focus the discussion of these results on six common building types, two aerosols sizes (1  $\mu\text{m}$   
495 and 3  $\mu\text{m}$  aerodynamic diameter), an airborne aerosol decay rate of 0  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ , and the US average  
496 (expectation value) result for each building metric. The six building types consist of three  
497 residential building categories: single family houses (RES1), small apartment buildings with 3 to  
498 9 units (average of RES3B and RES3C), and large apartment buildings with 20 to 50+ units  
499 (average of RES3E and RES3F). It is important to note that the modeling results for the two  
500 types of apartment buildings are based on combinations of buildings with different air handling  
501 systems. The three non-residential building categories are: retail stores (COM1), office buildings  
502 (average of COM4, COM5 and GOV1), and schools (EDU1).

503 Results are presented graphically for the baseline scenario and then as the fractional  
504 improvements resulting from better filtration. Summary tables are provided in **Supplemental**  
505 **Material B: Results Summary**. Additional figures showing the improved filtration scenario  
506 results are provided in **Supplemental Material C: Additional Building Metric Figures**. Finally,  
507 the systematic influence of particle size and airborne decay rate on the improvement ratio for  
508 the Building Transmission Factor is illustrated for MERV 14-15 filters in **Supplemental Material**  
509 **D: Improvement Sensitivity to Particle Size and Airborne Loss Rate**.

510 A formal uncertainty analysis was not performed for the metrics presented in this section. For  
511 each metric and filter scenario we have presented the average results from  $\sim 10,000$  Monte  
512 Carlo modeling runs because average values are commonly used in air quality exposure and

M Dillon and  
R Sextro


Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

513 health impact assessments. The corresponding modeling uncertainty in the mean value, the  
514 standard error, is a few percent. In contrast, robust estimates of the input parameter  
515 uncertainty are not available, see [7] for more detail, and so result uncertainty due to input  
516 parameter uncertainty was not generated. The model outputs shown in **Supplemental Material**  
517 **A: Detailed Results** are presented as the averages of five equally sized bins into which the  
518 model results are aggregated. These bins range from the lowest 20% of the model results to the  
519 highest 20% and so provide an estimate of the overall result variability. In most cases, this  
520 variation is within a factor of 1.5 to 4 of the average value.

521

522 5.1. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Outdoor Airborne Particles (Building Transmission  
523 Factor)

524 The baseline Building Transmission Factor results, shown in **Figure 1**, reflect our estimates of  
525 the ratio of the indoor exposures to the corresponding outdoor exposure for the existing  
526 filtration distribution and normal furnace operating conditions for the 6 common US building  
527 types we have chosen to highlight. There is a wide range of Building Transmission Factor  
528 estimates, with the best protection (lowest ratios) for apartments. For most small apartment  
529 buildings, infiltration rates are small, and so the source term (numerator) in **Equation 3R** is  
530 small, see **Table 3**. For most large apartments buildings, our analysis assumes an active HVAC  
531 system (**Equation 3H**), with a relatively larger recirculation rate, see **Table 4**. In general,  
532 buildings provide more protection against 3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter aerosols, as compared to 1  $\mu\text{m}$   
533 diameter aerosols, mainly due to higher filtration efficiencies for the larger particles – even for  
534 lower efficiency filters – and higher indoor deposition loss rates.



535 **Figure 1.** Baseline scenario results for the US Building Transmission Factors (dimensionless) –  
536 the ratio of the indoor exposures to the corresponding outdoor exposure – for selected building  
537 types; and two aerosol sizes: 1  $\mu\text{m}$  (solid bar) and 3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter (diagonal striped bar). Higher  
538 Building Transmission Factor values indicate more exposure.  
539


540 **Figure 2** presents the improvement associated with higher efficiency filtration using the ratio of  
541 Building Transmission Factor for the baseline scenario compared to the specified improved  
542 filtration scenario for selected residential and non-residential buildings. A value of 1 on the  
543 vertical axis indicates no improvement over the baseline scenario. A factor of 2 means that the  
544 improved filtration scenario results in half the Building Transmission Factor (and thus half the  
545 indoor exposure) relative to the baseline scenario. Recall that improved filtration scenarios  
546 assume the furnace fan duty cycle is increased to 100% (always on) in those buildings with  
547 forced air heating/cooling systems. **Figure 2** shows that for all building types, scenarios using a  
548 MERV 7 or greater filter provide at least a 35% reduction in indoor exposures for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  and 3  
549  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles. The reductions in indoor exposures vary by building type, minimum  
550 MERV filter rating, and particle size.

551 **Figure 2 (top panel)** shows that for single family dwellings, the progression across the improved  
552 filtration scenarios yields a factor of 1.6x to 1.8x improvement for the two particle sizes shown  
553 (i.e., ~40% reduction in indoor exposures). For apartments, the magnitude of the improvement  
554 is larger, a factor of 2.5x to 3.2x (~65% reduction) for the Minimum MERV 7 and Minimum  
555 MERV 11 scenarios. For large apartments, an even greater improvement occurs with the use of  
556 high efficiency MERV 14 or 15 rated filters, e.g., a factor of 3.5x to 7x improvement (~80%  
557 reduction). The larger improvement for apartments compared with single family residences is  
558 due, in part, to four factors. First, 35% of the modeled single family residences do not have  
559 forced air systems, and so improved filtration is possible only for 65% of these buildings.  
560 Second, 65% of the apartment filters in the baseline scenario have low particle filtration  
561 efficiency (MERV 5). Third, most smaller apartment buildings have lower infiltration rates.  
562 Fourth, most larger apartment buildings rapidly recirculate indoor air through a filter contained  
563 within the local heating/cooling system.


564 **Figure 2 (bottom panel)** shows the corresponding improvement for the three selected non-  
565 residential building types. Overall, the results show patterns similar to those discussed for the  
566 residential building types where the improvement for the Minimum MERV 7 and Minimum  
567 MERV 11 scenarios are similar, a factor of 1.7x to 2x improvement (~45% reduction) for retail  
568 stores and schools and somewhat lower, a factor of 1.4x to 1.7x improvement (~35%  
569 reduction), for office buildings. Again for most building types, notably greater improvement  
570 occurs with the use of high efficiency MERV 14 or 15 rated filters, i.e., a factor of 3x to 5x  
571 improvement (~70% reduction), and this effect is most noticeable for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  particles.  
572

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



573



574


575

576 **Figure 2.** Improvement in the US Building Transmission Factor for selected residential (top  
577 panel) and non-residential (bottom panel) for selected building types; two aerosol sizes: 1 μm  
578 (solid bar) and 3 μm diameter (diagonal striped bar); and 3 minimum MERV ratings. The vertical  
579 axis is the ratio of the Building Transmission Factors for the baseline to the specified improved  
580 filtration scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater  
581 improvement).



582 5.2. Reducing Indoor Exposures to Indoor Airborne Particles (Indoor Normalized  
583 TSIAC)

584 The baseline Indoor Normalized TSIAC results, shown in **Figure 3**, reflect our estimates of the  
585 indoor exposure to airborne particles released indoors for six common US building types. There  
586 is a wide range of Indoor Normalized TSIAC estimates, with the highest exposures (higher  
587 values) present in single family homes and small apartment buildings and the lowest exposures  
588 in office buildings. Exposures are lower for 3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter aerosols, as compared to 1  $\mu\text{m}$   
589 diameter aerosols. These results indicate that for particles released indoors, higher ventilation  
590 rates, combined with better particle filtration present in office and school buildings, provides  
591 lower exposures in non-residential buildings than is the case in residential buildings with lower  
592 ventilation rates and reduced filtration capability.



593 **Figure 3.** Baseline scenario results for the US Indoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air  
594 Concentration (Indoor Normalized TSIAC in  $\text{s m}^{-1}$ ) – indoor exposures to indoor-origin airborne  
595 particles – for selected building types; and two aerosol sizes: 1  $\mu\text{m}$  (solid bar) and 3  $\mu\text{m}$   
596 diameter (diagonal striped bar). Higher Indoor Normalized TSIAC values indicate more  
597 exposure.  
598  
599

600 **Figure 4** presents the improvements associated with higher efficiency filtration using the ratio  
601 of the Indoor Normalized TSIAC for the baseline scenario compared to the specified improved  
602 filtration scenario for selected residential and non-residential buildings. In general, all building  
603 types using a MERV 7 or higher rated filters have reductions in indoor exposures, however the  
604 reduction is greater in residential buildings, with apartment buildings showing the largest  
605 improvements.


606 **Figure 4 (top panel)** shows that for single family dwellings, the progression across the improved  
607 filtration scenarios yields a factor of 1.5x to 1.8x improvement for the two particle sizes shown  
608 (~40% reduction in indoor exposures). For apartments, the magnitude of the improvement is  
609 larger, a factor of 1.7x to 3.4x (~55% reduction) for the Minimum MERV 7 and MERV 11  
610 scenarios. Again, greater improvement occurs with the use of high efficiency MERV 14 or 15  
611 rated filters, e.g., a factor of 1.9x to 5x improvement (45% to 80% reduction) for apartment  
612 buildings. Again, the larger improvement for apartments compared with single family  
613 residences is due, in part, to our assumption that many apartments currently have low  
614 efficiency filters, and some, often smaller, US apartment buildings have lower infiltration rates  
615 while other, often larger, apartments rapidly recirculate indoor air through a filter contained  
616 within the local heating/cooling system.

617 **Figure 4 (bottom panel)** shows the corresponding improvement for the three selected non-  
618 residential building types. Overall, the results show smaller improvements than those discussed  
619 for the residential building types, a factor of 1.1x to 1.3x improvement (~15% exposure  
620 reduction) for the Minimum MERV 7 and Minimum MERV 11 scenarios. Greater improvement  
621 occurs with the use of high efficiency MERV 14 or 15 rated filters, e.g., a factor of 1.1x to 1.7x  
622 improvement (10% to 40% reduction). Exposures in non-residential buildings are less  
623 responsive to improved filtration because the baseline filter quality distribution for non-  
624 residential buildings is higher and because in most non-residential buildings the HVAC system is  
625 already assumed to be operating 100% of the time.

626

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



627

628  
629

630 **Figure 4.** Improvement in the US Indoor Normalized TSIAC for selected residential (top panel)  
 631 and non-residential (bottom panel) building types; two aerosol sizes: 1  $\mu\text{m}$  (solid bar) and 3  $\mu\text{m}$   
 632 diameter (diagonal striped bar); and 3 minimum MERV ratings. The vertical axis shows the ratio  
 633 of the Indoor Normalized TSIAC for the baseline scenario to the specified improved filtration  
 634 scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater  
 635 improvement). Note the factor of 2 difference in vertical scales between the top and bottom  
 636 panels.

637 5.3. Fraction of Indoor Airborne Particles Released to the Outdoors (Building Exit  
638 Fraction)


639 Indoor air containing airborne particles exfiltrates and/or is mechanically exhausted from  
640 buildings, providing a source of outdoor airborne particles. The baseline Building Exit Fraction  
641 estimates, shown in **Figure 5**, reflect our estimates of the fraction of indoor airborne particles  
642 that exit the selected US building types. There is a wide range of Building Exit Fraction  
643 estimates, with the highest fractions (higher values) present in offices and school buildings and  
644 the lowest in apartment buildings. Because the non-residential buildings have HVAC systems,  
645 typically with an integral exhaust pathway, these buildings release more particles to outdoors  
646 while for residential buildings, the exfiltration rate is lower and includes additional particle  
647 losses as the exfiltrating air passes through cracks and other openings in the building shell.  
648 Fewer 3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles, as compared to 1  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles, are released to the  
649 outdoors due to higher within-building losses for the 3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles.

650 The indoor exposures to an indoor airborne particle (Indoor Normalized TSIAC) and the fraction  
651 of indoor, airborne particles exiting the building are closely related, see **Equation 7**. As a result,  
652 the Building Exit Fraction reductions for the improved filtration scenarios, **Figure 6**, relative to  
653 the baseline scenario, are nearly identical to, but slightly lower than, the indoor exposure  
654 improvements shown in the previous section, **Figure 4**. The difference is due to the particle  
655 losses that occur during exfiltration.

656

M Dillon and  
R Sextro


Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration




657  
658 **Figure 5.** Baseline scenario results for the US Building Exit Fraction (dimensionless) – the  
659 fraction of indoor airborne particles that are released to the outdoor atmosphere – for selected  
660 building types; and two aerosol sizes: 1 μm (solid bar) and 3 μm diameter (diagonal striped bar).  
661 Higher Exit Fraction values correspond to more particles released to the outdoor atmosphere.

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



662



663

664

665

666

667

668

669

**Figure 6.** Improvement in the US Building Exit Fraction for selected residential (top panel) and non-residential (bottom panel) building types; two aerosol sizes: 1 μm (solid bar) and 3 μm diameter (diagonal striped bar); and 3 minimum MERV ratings. The vertical axis shows the ratio of Building Exit Fraction for the baseline scenario to the specified improved filtration scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater improvement). Note the factor of 2 difference in vertical scales between the top and bottom panels.

#### 670 5.4. Regional Exposures

671 Particles can exit a building, be transported downwind, and either expose outdoor individuals  
672 or enter a second building to expose indoor, downwind individuals. Improving building air  
673 filtration reduces indoor, downwind exposures through decreases in both the (a) fraction of  
674 indoor airborne particles that exit the source building (Building Exit Fraction) and (b) the  
675 fraction of outdoor airborne particles that enter the downwind building indoor air (the  
676 downwind Building Transmission Factor), see **Equation 9**.

677 In general particles can be emitted from, and expose downwind individuals in, a wide variety of  
678 different building types and a full Regional Shelter Analysis is required to model this common  
679 general case where emissions and exposures occur across multiple building types, e.g., [6], [7].  
680 While a full RSA is beyond the scope of the current study, estimates for overall air filtration  
681 improvement benefits can be obtained for neighborhoods in which the population resides in a  
682 homogenous housing stock.


683 **Figure 7** presents the improvement associated with higher efficiency filtration using the ratio of  
684 the Downwind Indoor Exposure for the baseline scenario compared to the specified improved  
685 filtration scenario for selected residential buildings, see **Equation 10**. A value of 1 on the  
686 vertical axis indicates no improvement over the baseline scenario. Larger numbers indicate  
687 greater improvement.

688 In neighborhoods populated with single family homes, the Minimum MERV 7 and Minimum  
689 MERV 11 scenarios provide a factor of 2.6x improvement for the two particle sizes shown (60%  
690 reduction in downwind indoor exposures). The Minimum MERV 14 scenario providing slightly  
691 more protection, a factor of 2.6x to 3.2x (65% reduction). The improvement is notably greater  
692 for neighborhoods populated with apartment buildings, with a 4x to 10x improvement (75% to  
693 90% reduction) for the Minimum MERV 7 and Minimum MERV 11 scenarios. The improvement  
694 for the Minimum MERV 14 scenario ranges from 5.8x to 25x (85% to 96% reduction). In the  
695 above results, the improvement for larger 3  $\mu\text{m}$  particles is less than that for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  particles,  
696 especially so for the MERV 14 or 15 rated filters.

697

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



698  
699  
700 **Figure 7.** Improvement in the US Downwind Indoor Exposure for homogenous residential  
701 neighborhoods comprised of the selected building use types; two aerosol sizes: 1 μm (solid bar)  
702 and 3 μm diameter (diagonal striped bar); and 3 minimum MERV ratings. The vertical axis  
703 shows the ratio of the Downwind Indoor Exposure for the baseline scenario to the specified  
704 improved filtration scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate  
705 greater improvement).  
706



## 707 **6. Discussion and Conclusion**

708 This work broadly evaluates the extent to which improved airborne particle filtration in US  
709 buildings may reduce airborne particle exposures. This work is based on an aggregation of  
710 building types and a general set of parameters that describes both airflows into and out of  
711 buildings as well as indoor particle behavior and removal processes. Our analysis suggests that,  
712 for most building types studied, upgrades to the filters currently used in furnaces or HVAC  
713 systems may reduce airborne particle exposures - although the degree of improvement varies  
714 by filter efficiency, particle size, building type, and specific building. Our modeling indicates that  
715 there is limited difference between scenarios which impose a minimum filter rating of MERV 7  
716 vs. MERV 11, although both improved filtration scenarios are expected to reduce exposures  
717 relative to the existing building stock. The largest reductions in airborne particulate exposures  
718 are associated with the use of high filtration efficiency (MERV 14 or 15 rated) filters and, in  
719 many cases, 1  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles, reflecting their typically larger improvements in filtration  
720 efficiency for this particle size.

721 As a building use type, apartments benefit the most from improved, within-building filtration, in  
722 part, due to our estimate that 65% of apartments currently have low efficiency (MERV 5 rated)  
723 filters. In addition, and relative to other building use types examined, most smaller apartment  
724 buildings have lower infiltration rates while most larger apartments rapidly recirculate indoor  
725 air through a filter contained within the local heating/cooling system. Note that in order to  
726 conform to the HAZUS building use types, we have modelled these two apartment categories  
727 with a mix of heating/cooling system and air infiltration characteristics.

728 In contrast, the calculated improvement for single family homes is relatively modest due, in  
729 part, to the estimated 35% of single family homes have heating systems, such as radiators and  
730 in-wall heaters, that do not have filters and therefore cannot benefit from the use of improved  
731 filters. This assumption limits the overall improvement, particularly for the Minimum MERV 14  
732 scenario. For example, the Building Transmission Factor improves by a factor of 1.8x for the  
733 Minimum MERV 14 scenario when considering the entire US building stock, but a factor of 5.8x  
734 when considering the best protected buildings with filtered air handling systems (60% of the  
735 building stock)<sup>1</sup>. This point is also pertinent when comparing our modeling results with other  
736 studies results as discussed below.

737

---

<sup>1</sup> The mean of the “Median,” “2<sup>nd</sup> Lowest,” and “Lowest” distribution categories is 0.06 for the Minimum MERV 14 scenario; RES1 building use type; 1  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter particles; and 0  $\text{hr}^{-1}$  airborne loss rate. For context, the mean of all distribution categories is 0.19. The corresponding mean for the baseline scenario is 0.35. See **Supplemental Material A: Detailed Results** for more details.

## 738 6.1. Comparison to Prior Work

739 While there are ample data on the filtration efficiency of various filters and filter types, there  
740 are fewer studies that have experimentally assessed the performance of filters in whole  
741 buildings. Most are research studies conducted in one or a small number of buildings. Hence  
742 the data available for comparison with our modeling results are not broadly representative of  
743 the building types studied here. We summarize below a selected (non-comprehensive) set of  
744 results from such studies to provide context for our current work. We compile the results from  
745 these studies – along with our comparative modeling results – in **Table 11**. The pertinent details  
746 of the previous studies are discussed below.

747 *Howard-Reed et al.* [19] performed one of the first experimental assessments of the effect of  
748 filter efficiency on indoor particle concentrations in a normally occupied home. *Howard-Reed et*  
749 *al.* compared the use of a ‘typical’ panel furnace filter (PFF) with that of an in-duct electrostatic  
750 precipitator (ESP). Although the authors did not provide filter ratings for these devices, the  
751 filtration efficiencies measured in their tests are approximately consistent with the MERV 5 and  
752 MERV 12 filtration efficiencies shown in **Table 10** above for the PFF and ESP, respectively. The  
753 furnace fan was operated only when particle concentration measurements were conducted,  
754 and then only following the times when particles were generated indoors. Similar tests were  
755 conducted in an unoccupied test house that had a lower indoor/outdoor air change rate than  
756 the occupied dwelling. Using the measured filtration rate and particle loss rate data, the  
757 authors estimated the effect of filtration on the ratios of the concentrations of indoor particles  
758 of outdoor origin to outdoor particle concentrations. The estimated indoor/outdoor ratios for  
759 the PFF and ESP cases are given in **Table 11** and are consistent with the range of Building  
760 Transmission Factors that we predict for single family homes.<sup>2</sup> The *Howard-Reed et al.* data  
761 show a definite improvement that is somewhat larger than the improvement predicted by our  
762 modeling work for the US single family home building stock. However, the reported  
763 improvement with the better (ESP) filter is similar to our prediction that considers only the  
764 portion of the single family building stock that has filtration-capable heating systems.

765

---

<sup>2</sup> Data from this study was used in developing the indoor deposition rate values used in our analysis.

766 **Table 11. Summary of Building Transmission Factors for current and prior analyses.**

Building	Particle Size (µm)	Baseline Transmission Factor (no units)	Improved Filtration Transmission Factor (no units)	Improvement Ratio (baseline / improved)	Study
<b>Detached Single Family Homes</b>					
occupied	1 to 2.5	0.4	0.2	2	<i>Howard-Reed [19]</i>
unoccupied test house	1 to 2.5	0.12	0.05	2.4	
unoccupied test house	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.25	0.07	3.6	<i>Singer [20]</i>
Modeled homes	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.35 (0.13-0.94) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.10 (0.02-0.80) <sup>(a)</sup>	3.5	<i>Macintosh [21]</i>
RES1	1	0.35 (0.09-0.67) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.19 (0.03-0.57) <sup>(b)</sup>	1.8	present study
	3	0.16 (0.04-0.38) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.10 (0.02-0.30) <sup>(b)</sup>	1.6	
<b>Office</b>					
occupied multi-story office	1 to 2	0.22	0.1	2.2	<i>Fisk [22]</i>
	> 2	0.42 <sup>(c)</sup>	0.4 <sup>(c)</sup>	1.2	
COM4	1	0.25 (0.04-0.63) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.06 (0.01-0.12) <sup>(b)</sup>	4.4	present study
	3	0.10 (0.01-0.29) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.03 (0.01-0.08) <sup>(b)</sup>	3.0	
<b>School</b>					
unoccupied classroom	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.73	0.42	1.7	<i>Van der Zee [23]</i>
occupied classroom	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.63	0.12	5.3	<i>Polidori [24]</i>
EDU1	1	0.34 (0.08-0.70) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.08 (0.03-0.15) <sup>(b)</sup>	4.4	present study
	3	0.14 (0.03-0.33) <sup>(b)</sup>	0.05 (0.02-0.10) <sup>(b)</sup>	2.9	present study

767 <sup>(a)</sup> median and 5 to 95% range from the CONTAM model results

768 <sup>(b)</sup> In the present work, model outputs are reported in five equally sized bins with the average value  
769 reported for each bin. The results provided are the average of all five bins and the range in the  
770 individual bin averages for the baseline and Minimum MERV14 scenarios.

771 <sup>(c)</sup> Study authors suspected the presence of indoor particle sources, particularly for > 2 µm diameter  
772 particles, resulting in higher indoor/outdoor ratio than would otherwise be expected based on the  
773 efficiencies of the baseline and upgraded filters.

774

775 *Singer et al.* [20] conducted an extensive set of ventilation and filtration system experiments in  
776 an unoccupied single family home. The reference furnace fan system contained a MERV 4 filter  
777 placed in the return duct to the air handler. The comparison system closest to the one modeled  
778 in the present work upgraded the MERV 4 filter to a higher particle removal efficiency (MERV  
779 13) filter (system E in their work). The ratios of indoor to outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub> particle concentrations  
780 – based on the 24-hour average of several days of continuous data – are shown in **Table 11**. The  
781 observed indoor/outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration ratios are within the range of single family home  
782 Building Transmission Fractions predicted by the present study, which includes some systems  
783 with no filters. The observed improvement factor is larger than our modeling estimates.

784 *Macintosh et al.* [21] modeled the effectiveness of forced-air furnace-system air cleaning on  
785 reducing indoor concentrations of outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The analysis was based on the use of actual  
786 24-hour average outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub> measurements during 2005 for three metropolitan areas in the  
787 state of Ohio, a set of single family prototypical dwelling designs, the CONTAM multizone air  
788 flow model, and two filtration assumptions. The first filtration assumption was a conventional  
789 furnace-system filter with an assumed PM<sub>2.5</sub> removal efficiency of ~14% (roughly equivalent to  
790 the MERV 5 filters used in the present analysis) and the second was an electrostatic precipitator  
791 (ESP) with an assumed filtration efficiency of ~90% (an efficiency similar to the MERV 11-12  
792 filtration category used here). The two systems were assumed to have different operating duty  
793 cycles – in the first, the forced air system operated only in response to heating/cooling demand  
794 while for the second, the system was assumed to have a variable speed fan that operated at  
795 high speed during heating/cooling demand and at half-speed during all other times. The  
796 simulation outputs, when combined across all prototypical buildings and the outdoor  
797 concentrations data from the three cities, yield the indoor/outdoor ratios shown in **Table 11**.  
798 The corresponding improvement factor is again similar to, but greater than, our modeling  
799 results.

800 Comparable tests in non-residential buildings are fewer. *Fisk et al.* [22] measured the ratio of  
801 indoor to outdoor particle concentrations in a large office building under two filtration  
802 scenarios: (a) the existing filter that had an estimated MERV rating of 5 to 6 and (b) a high  
803 efficiency filtration system corresponding to a MERV 15 filtration efficiency. The observed  
804 indoor/outdoor ratios for the two particle size categories are shown in **Table 11** along with our  
805 performance predictions for office buildings. The overall filtration efficiency and the  
806 improvement ratio observed by *Fisk et al.* are more modest than expected and are lower than  
807 our predictions. As discussed in [22], the experiments were conducted on two floors of the  
808 multistory building while both floors were occupied (160 to 280 people per floor). It is clear,  
809 especially from the data for particles larger than 2 μm in diameter, that there were important  
810 indoor sources for these particles that complicated the evaluation of the filtration performance

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

811 (and improvement). As this building was selected to have non-smoking occupants, a likely,  
812 though unverified, source of larger particles was resuspension.

813 Improvements to particle filtration in schools have also been investigated. *Van der Zee et al.*  
814 [23] evaluated improving classroom filtration to a MERV 14 rated filter (from a baseline MERV  
815 10 rated filter of dubious maintenance history) – along with other ventilation system  
816 performance changes. These changes resulted in a modest improvement in the indoor/outdoor  
817 PM<sub>2.5</sub> ratio based on the non-teaching hour data (indoor particle concentrations during the  
818 teaching hours are strongly influenced by indoor particle sources), see **Table 11**. *Polidori et al.*  
819 [24] measured the airborne particle removal effectiveness of MERV 16 filters installed in HVAC  
820 systems serving classrooms in three schools – replacing baseline MERV 7 filters in these  
821 schools.<sup>3</sup> The *Polidori et al.* study data collection was done entirely during school hours, though  
822 there were time periods during the day, such as outdoor recess and lunchtime, when the  
823 students were not in the classrooms. However, data during the empty classroom periods were  
824 not explicitly analyzed separately. The *Polidori et al.* measured ratio of real-time, concurrent  
825 indoor to outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations demonstrated notably larger improvement with the  
826 increased filtration efficiency than the prior *Van der Zee et al.* study, see **Table 11**.

827 Our modeling predictions are broadly consistent with these school studies. Most of the  
828 observed Building Transmission Factor values are consistent with the upper bound of our  
829 modeling results. Also if the *van der Zee et al.* baseline filtration is MERV 10 (as appears to be  
830 the case) or even higher (if the existing, baseline filters were heavily loaded), then the observed  
831 improvement factor of 1.7x is similar to our calculated improvement factor of 2.5x and 1.5x for  
832 1 and 3 μm diameter particles, respectively, using the Minimum MERV 11 scenario as the  
833 baseline filter. As seen in the analysis of single family homes, the improvement factor measured  
834 by *Polidori et al.* is similar to, but greater than, our modeling results.

835

---

<sup>3</sup> Data from this study was one of the data sources used in developing the airflow parameter values used in our analysis.

## 836 6.2. Other Considerations

837 While our US building type filtration modeling results are broadly consistent with those of  
838 previous, individual building studies, the details of a particular building and/or the heating and  
839 cooling system will strongly influence the overall improvement seen for any given building. A  
840 recent analysis of residential filter effectiveness found that the “context” in which the filtration  
841 occurs matters. Context in this sense refers to a variety of factors that affect indoor air quality,  
842 including the overall building indoor/outdoor air change rate. Essentially this approach argues  
843 that filtration effectiveness is a system parameter that depends upon the overall operating  
844 conditions of the house [25]. For example, in some systems/houses they found greater filtration  
845 effectiveness in increasing system run time (furnace fan duty cycle) rather than simply  
846 upgrading the filter efficiency. This finding is consistent with the order of magnitude variability  
847 predicted by our study for residences where we explicitly account for variability in air change  
848 rates, indoor deposition losses, and, in the baseline scenario, furnace fan duty cycles. We note  
849 that the improved filtration scenarios examined in our analysis assume a 100% system run time  
850 (i.e., the furnace fan is always on).

851 The California Air Resources Board and US Environmental Protection Agency provide additional  
852 guidance on practical measures to improve residential air filtration, including the use of  
853 portable air filtration devices in buildings without forced air systems [26]–[28]. While a  
854 complete analysis of portable air filtration devices is beyond the scope of this study, we briefly  
855 discuss the use of portable air cleaners with regards to typical US residences.<sup>4</sup> For discussion  
856 purposes, we use the Clean Air Delivery Rate (CADR) metric, which is the production rate of  
857 clean air ( $\text{ft}^3 \text{min}^{-1}$ ) by a filtration system [30], [31].<sup>5</sup> For typical residences with a MERV 7 rated  
858 filter and an always-on (100% duty cycle) furnace fan, the single family home and apartment  
859 furnace “CADR” values are  $\sim 1200$  and  $\sim 440 \text{ft}^3 \text{min}^{-1}$ , respectively.<sup>6</sup> In comparison, portable air  
860 cleaners intended for room cleaning have individual unit CADR ratings in the range of  $\sim 250$  to  
861  $400 \text{ft}^3 \text{min}^{-1}$ . Thus to achieve a comparable reduction in indoor airborne particle exposure, the  
862 use of one or more portable air cleaners would be needed. We note that individual portable air  
863 cleaners are typically intended to clean air in only one or two rooms, in contrast most furnace-  
864 based systems that are designed to distribute filtered air within the living space. Portable air  
865 cleaners can be useful alternatives for dwellings where forced air systems aren’t present, such

---

<sup>4</sup> Per [29], the typical US detached single family home and apartment has 2,200 and 840  $\text{ft}^2$  of heated floor area, respectively. Assuming an 8 ft room height, the corresponding building volumes are 18,000 and 6,700  $\text{ft}^3$ , respectively.

<sup>5</sup> We note that the formal AHAM CADR *testing standard* does not cover the whole-building filtration systems but the term can be applied to any forced air filtration system.

<sup>6</sup>  $\text{CADR} = F_{\text{filter}} \times F_{r,\text{fan}} \times r_{\text{fan}} \times \text{Building Volume}$ . Per **Table 3**, the furnace fan flow rate is  $5.7 \text{h}^{-1}$  and per **Table 10**, the median MERV 7 rated filter efficiency for  $1 \mu\text{m}$  particles is 0.69.



866 as single family homes that lack forced air furnace systems or as a supplement to existing  
867 whole-house filtration, e.g., [32]. For context, the Association of Home Appliance  
868 Manufacturers (AHAM) recommends that “appropriately sized” portable air cleaners are 2/3 of  
869 the floor area of the space being cleaned [33], which corresponds to an additional loss term of  
870  $5 \text{ h}^{-1}$  ( $\lambda_{\text{portable air filter}} = \text{CADR} / \text{Building Volume}$ ).

871 Another important simplifying assumption in our analysis is the use of a single, albeit well-  
872 mixed, box with closed windows and doors as the basis for modeling indoor particulate  
873 exposures. In the context of complex, multizone buildings; many larger buildings contain  
874 multiple HVAC systems which may vary in their filtration capabilities. In some cases, there is  
875 little air (and thus airborne particles) exchanged between zones and so the overall building can  
876 be modeled as the combination of independent, well-mixed zones as is done in this study with  
877 institutional housing (RES4, RES5, and RES6 building types). However, in other cases the effects  
878 of improved filtration may be physically localized in ways not captured in our estimates. As one  
879 example, we assume that HVAC filters in hospital air handling systems are uniformly rated  
880 MERV 14 or 15 and so, for this building type, no improvement is predicted (i.e., all hospitals  
881 already have the highest rated filters considered in our analysis). Future work could investigate  
882 the degree to which all zones have the same filtration capabilities and therefore if the air  
883 quality in some building zones could benefit from the use of higher rated filters.

884 Furthermore, the Indoor Normalized TSIAC results provided here are intended for use within a  
885 single-well mixed zone. As such they are not appropriate to assess within building, but cross  
886 zone contamination spread. For example, an apartment building may have many apartments,  
887 each with a separate HVAC system (zone). The Indoor Normalized TSIAC results presented here  
888 could be used to assess the degree to which particles released in one apartment exposes  
889 individuals in the same apartment. However, our Indoor Normalized TSIAC results, as calculated  
890 here, does not inform the degree to which individuals in a neighboring apartment are exposed.

891 Finally the parameters used in this study are representative descriptions of the factors affecting  
892 air flow and particle behavior in US buildings. In some cases, the parameter values chosen were  
893 based on limited information available in the literature and thus are thus based on the best  
894 existing data combined with our best engineering judgement. *Dillon et al.* [7] provides further  
895 discussion and suggestions for future research to improve these parameter values. We note  
896 that regardless of these uncertainties, our results broadly suggest that improving air filtration in  
897 buildings can reduce indoor airborne particle exposures across a wide range of building types.  
898 Further, the analysis methodology developed here could be applied to more detailed building  
899 models, including studies of specific buildings, where specific parameter values could be better  
900 characterized.

901

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

## 902 **7. Acknowledgements**

903

904 The authors also express their gratitude to their family for their support and enduring patience.  
905 The authors also thank Charles Dillon for his assistance during the development of this  
906 manuscript. Furthermore, the authors acknowledge the helpful reviews by Tarabay Antoun,  
907 Ron Baskett, Brooke Buddemeier, John Nasstrom, and Brenda Pobanz of the Lawrence  
908 Livermore National Laboratory; Dev Jani of the US Department of Homeland Security,  
909 Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office; Lance Wallace of Wallace Research; Woody  
910 Delp of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and Thomas Phillips of Healthy Building  
911 Research.

912

913 This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United  
914 States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National  
915 Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes  
916 any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any  
917 information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not  
918 infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process,  
919 or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily  
920 constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States  
921 government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors  
922 expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or  
923 Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product  
924 endorsement purposes.

925

926 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is operated by Lawrence Livermore National Security,  
927 LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration under  
928 Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.



M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

## 929 **8. Attestations**

930

### 931 **Ethics statement**

932 No humans or animals were used this in work

933

### 934 **Data accessibility**

935 No primary data were used in this analysis. The referenced supplemental material has been  
936 provided.

937

### 938 **Competing interests**

939 The authors have no competing interests for the material provided in this manuscript beyond  
940 being and/or previously employed at our respective organizations.

941

### 942 **Author's contributions**

943

944 Michael Dillon (MBD) was responsible for the study concept and design, model development  
945 and analysis and manuscript drafting and revision.

946

947 Richard Sextro (RGS) provided quality control review of building metric equations, developed  
948 both the graphs and comparison against prior results, and significantly contributed to the  
949 overall manuscript drafting and revision.

950

951 Charles Dillon (CFD) provided editorial review and feedback during the manuscript revision  
952 process.

953

954 All authors give approval for release.

955

### 956 **Funding statement**

957

958 MBD was supported, in part, by the US Department of Homeland Security for early related  
959 efforts.

960

961 RGS was self-supported.

962

963 CFD was self-supported.

964

## 965 9. References

- 966 [1] S. S. Nadadur and J. W. Hollingsworth, *Air Pollution and Health Effects*. London: Springer  
967 London, 2015.
- 968 [2] R. D. Brook *et al.*, “Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease: An Update  
969 to the Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association,” *Circulation*, vol. 121,  
970 no. 21, pp. 2331–2378, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181d8e1.
- 971 [3] C. A. Pope and D. W. Dockery, “Health effects of fine particulate air pollution: lines that  
972 connect,” *J Air Waste Manag Assoc*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 709–742, Jun. 2006, doi:  
973 10.1080/10473289.2006.10464485.
- 974 [4] J. D. Kaufman *et al.*, “Advances in Understanding Air Pollution and CVD,” *gh*, vol. 11, no. 3,  
975 p. 343, Sep. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ghheart.2016.07.004.
- 976 [5] “Wildfire Smoke: A Guide for Public Health Officials,” US Environmental Protection  
977 Agency, EPA-452/R-19-901, Aug. 2019.
- 978 [6] M. B. Dillon and C. F. Dillon, “Regional Shelter Analysis - Inhalation Exposure  
979 Methodology,” Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, LLNL-TR-786042,  
980 Aug. 2019.
- 981 [7] M. B. Dillon, R. G. Sextro, and W. W. Delp, “Regional Shelter Analysis - Inhalation Exposure  
982 Application (Particles),” Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, LLNL-TR-  
983 786237, Aug. 2019.
- 984 [8] C. B. Keil, “A Tiered Approach to Deterministic Models for Indoor Air Exposures,” *Applied  
985 Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 145–151, Jan. 2000, doi:  
986 10.1080/104732200301962.
- 987 [9] T. L. Thatcher, M. M. Lunden, K. L. Revzan, R. G. Sextro, and N. J. Brown, “A Concentration  
988 Rebound Method for Measuring Particle Penetration and Deposition in the Indoor  
989 Environment,” *Aerosol Science and Technology*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 847–864, Nov. 2003,  
990 doi: 10.1080/02786820300940.
- 991 [10] F. H. Shair and K. L. Heitner, “Theoretical model for relating indoor pollutant  
992 concentrations to those outside,” *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp.  
993 444–451, May 1974, doi: 10.1021/es60090a006.
- 994 [11] J. Alzona, B. L. Cohen, H. Rudolph, H. N. Jow, and J. O. Frohlinger, “Indoor-outdoor  
995 relationships for airborne particulate matter of outdoor origin,” *Atmospheric Environment  
996 (1967)*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 55–60, Jan. 1979, doi: 10.1016/0004-6981(79)90244-0.

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

- 997 [12] W. W. Nazaroff, "Indoor particle dynamics," *Indoor Air*, vol. 14, no. s7, pp. 175–183, Aug.  
998 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2004.00286.x.
- 999 [13] US Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency,  
1000 Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, "Multi-hazard Loss Estimation  
1001 Methodology, Earthquake Model, Hazus-MH 4 Technical Manual," US Department of  
1002 Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington DC, Aug. 2009.
- 1003 [14] A. Persily, A. Musser, and S. J. Emmerich, "Modeled infiltration rate distributions for U.S.  
1004 housing: Modeled infiltration rate distributions," *Indoor Air*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 473–485,  
1005 Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0668.2010.00669.x.
- 1006 [15] Z. El Orch, B. Stephens, and M. S. Waring, "Predictions and determinants of size-resolved  
1007 particle infiltration factors in single-family homes in the U.S.," *Building and Environment*,  
1008 vol. 74, pp. 106–118, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.01.006.
- 1009 [16] A. K. Persily, A. Musser, and D. Leber, "A Collection of Homes to Represent the U.S.  
1010 Housing Stock," US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and  
1011 Technology, Washington DC, NISTIR 7330, Aug. 2006.
- 1012 [17] L. C. Ng, A. Musser, A. K. Persily, and E. S. J. Emmerich, "Airflow and Indoor Air Quality  
1013 Models of DOE Reference Commercial Buildings," US Department of Commerce, National  
1014 Institute of Standards and Technology, Washington DC, NIST Technical Note 1734, Feb.  
1015 2012.
- 1016 [18] American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, "ASHRAE Test  
1017 Standard 52.2 2012." .
- 1018 [19] C. Howard-Reed, L. A. Wallace, and S. J. Emmerich, "Effect of ventilation systems and air  
1019 filters on decay rates of particles produced by indoor sources in an occupied townhouse,"  
1020 *Atmospheric Environment*, vol. 37, no. 38, pp. 5295–5306, Dec. 2003, doi:  
1021 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2003.09.012.
- 1022 [20] B. C. Singer, W. W. Delp, D. R. Black, and I. S. Walker, "Measured performance of filtration  
1023 and ventilation systems for fine and ultrafine particles and ozone in an unoccupied  
1024 modern California house," *Indoor Air*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 780–790, Jul. 2017, doi:  
1025 10.1111/ina.12359.
- 1026 [21] D. L. MacIntosh *et al.*, "The benefits of whole-house in-duct air cleaning in reducing  
1027 exposures to fine particulate matter of outdoor origin: A modeling analysis," *J Expo Sci*  
1028 *Environ Epidemiol*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 213–224, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1038/jes.2009.16.

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

- 1029 [22] W. J. Fisk, D. Faulkner, D. Sullivan, and M. J. Mendell, "Particle Concentrations and Sizes  
1030 with Normal and High Efficiency Air Filtration in a Sealed Air-Conditioned Office Building,"  
1031 *Aerosol Science and Technology*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 527–544, Jun. 2000, doi:  
1032 10.1080/027868200303452.
- 1033 [23] S. C. van der Zee, M. Strak, M. B. A. Dijkema, B. Brunekreef, and N. A. H. Janssen, "The  
1034 impact of particle filtration on indoor air quality in a classroom near a highway," *Indoor*  
1035 *Air*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 291–302, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1111/ina.12308.
- 1036 [24] A. Polidori, P. M. Fine, V. White, and P. S. Kwon, "Pilot study of high-performance air  
1037 filtration for classroom applications," *Indoor Air*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 185–195, Jun. 2013,  
1038 doi: 10.1111/ina.12013.
- 1039 [25] M. Alavy and J. A. Siegel, "IAQ and energy implications of high efficiency filters in  
1040 residential buildings: A review (RP-1649)," *Science and Technology for the Built*  
1041 *Environment*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 261–271, Mar. 2019, doi:  
1042 10.1080/23744731.2018.1526012.
- 1043 [26] California Air Resources Board, "Air Cleaning Devices For the Home: Frequently Asked  
1044 Questions," California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, CA, Jul. 2014.  
1045 [Online]. Available: <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/research/indoor/acdsumm.pdf>.
- 1046 [27] US Environmental Protection Agency, "Guide to Air Cleaners in the Home, 2nd Edition," US  
1047 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, EPA-402-F-08-004,  
1048 Jul. 2018.
- 1049 [28] T. Brennan, L. Harriman, B. Stephens, and V. Ilacqua, "Residential Air Cleaners: A Technical  
1050 Summary, 3rd Edition," US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Radiation and  
1051 Indoor Air, EPA 402-F-002, Jul. 2018. [Online]. Available:  
1052 [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-07/documents/residential_air_cleaners_-_a_technical_summary_3rd_edition.pdf)  
1053 [07/documents/residential\\_air\\_cleaners\\_-\\_a\\_technical\\_summary\\_3rd\\_edition.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-07/documents/residential_air_cleaners_-_a_technical_summary_3rd_edition.pdf).
- 1054 [29] "Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) - 2015 Data - U.S. Energy Information  
1055 Administration (EIA)." <https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2015/>  
1056 (accessed Jan. 19, 2020).
- 1057 [30] AHAM, "ANSI/AHAM AC-1: Method for Measuring the Performance of Portable Household  
1058 Electric Room Air Cleaners; Understanding its Scope and the Related AHAM Industry  
1059 Certification Program," Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, Washington DC,  
1060 Aug. 2014. [Online]. Available: [https://ahamverifide.org/wp-](https://ahamverifide.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Scope-of-Air-Cleaner-Certification.pdf)  
1061 [content/uploads/2019/07/Scope-of-Air-Cleaner-Certification.pdf](https://ahamverifide.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Scope-of-Air-Cleaner-Certification.pdf).

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

- 1062 [31] R. J. Shaughnessy and R. G. Sextro, "What Is an Effective Portable Air Cleaning Device? A  
1063 Review," *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 169–181,  
1064 Apr. 2006, doi: 10.1080/15459620600580129.
- 1065 [32] D. E. Henderson, J. B. Milford, and S. L. Miller, "Prescribed Burns and Wildfires in Colorado:  
1066 Impacts of Mitigation Measures on Indoor Air Particulate Matter," *Journal of the Air &  
1067 Waste Management Association*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 1516–1526, Oct. 2005, doi:  
1068 10.1080/10473289.2005.10464746.
- 1069 [33] "Air Filtration Standards – AHAM Verifide." [https://ahamverifide.org/ahams-air-filtration-](https://ahamverifide.org/ahams-air-filtration-standards/)  
1070 [standards/](https://ahamverifide.org/ahams-air-filtration-standards/) (accessed May 09, 2020).
- 1071

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

## 1072 **Supplemental Material A: Detailed Results**

1073

1074

1075

1076 The companion spreadsheet contains our modeling results for four filtration scenarios (baseline  
1077 and three improvement scenarios) for each of the 32 building use types. The outputs for each  
1078 filter and building combination include five aerosol sizes (0.1, 0.3, 1, 3, 10  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter) and  
1079 four airborne loss rates (0, 0.1, 1, 10  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ).

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

1080 **Supplemental Material B: Results Summary**

1081 **Table B1. Summary of US Building Transmission Factors – the ratio of the indoor exposures to**  
1082 **the corresponding outdoor exposure – for selected building types, two aerosol sizes, and the**  
1083 **0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. (dimensionless)**

Select Buildings (Use Types)	Absolute Values			Relative Improvement from Baseline Scenario			
	Baseline Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario
<b>1 µm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	0.35	0.21	0.21	0.19	1.6	1.6	1.8
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	0.18	0.055	0.054	0.034	3.2	3.2	5.1
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	0.17	0.057	0.056	0.024	3.0	3.1	7.2
Retail Stores (COM1)	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.060	1.8	1.8	4.8
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	0.25	0.18	0.18	0.056	1.4	1.4	4.4
Schools (EDU1)	0.34	0.20	0.20	0.078	1.7	1.7	4.4
<b>3 µm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	0.16	0.10	0.10	0.10	1.6	1.6	1.6
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	0.066	0.025	0.025	0.022	2.6	2.6	3.0
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	0.052	0.020	0.020	0.015	2.5	2.6	3.4
Retail Stores (COM1)	0.11	0.055	0.055	0.036	2.0	2.0	3.1
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	0.10	0.059	0.057	0.032	1.6	1.7	3.0
Schools (EDU1)	0.14	0.073	0.071	0.048	1.9	2.0	2.9

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

1084 **Table B2. Summary of US Indoor Normalized Time and Space Integrated Air Concentrations**  
1085 **(Indoor Normalized TSIAC) – indoor exposures to indoor-origin airborne particles – for**  
1086 **selected building types, two aerosol sizes, and the 0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. (s m<sup>-1</sup>)**

Select Buildings (Use Types)	Absolute Values				Relative Improvement from Baseline Scenario		
	Baseline Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario
<b>1 μm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	18	11	10	9.8	1.7	1.7	1.8
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	15	4.5	4.5	3.0	3.3	3.4	5.0
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	9.6	4.0	4.0	2.6	2.4	2.4	3.7
Retail Stores (COM1)	6.3	4.8	4.7	3.7	1.3	1.3	1.7
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.4	1.1	1.1	1.4
Schools (EDU1)	5.0	4.1	4.0	3.2	1.2	1.2	1.5
<b>3 μm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	10	6.7	6.5	6.4	1.5	1.6	1.6
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	7.2	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	4.4	2.6	2.5	2.3	1.7	1.7	1.9
Retail Stores (COM1)	3.9	3.4	3.4	3.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Schools (EDU1)	3.4	3.0	3.0	2.8	1.1	1.1	1.2

1087



M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

1088 **Table B3. Summary of US Building Exit Fractions – the fraction of indoor airborne particles**  
1089 **that are released to the outdoor atmosphere – for selected building types, two aerosol sizes,**  
1090 **and the 0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. (dimensionless)**

Select Buildings (Use Types)	Absolute Values				Relative Improvement from Baseline Scenario		
	Baseline Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario
<b>1 µm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	0.34	0.21	0.21	0.19	1.6	1.6	1.8
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	0.18	0.060	0.059	0.040	3.0	3.0	4.5
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	0.19	0.087	0.086	0.057	2.2	2.2	3.4
Retail Stores (COM1)	0.40	0.32	0.31	0.25	1.3	1.3	1.6
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	0.47	0.43	0.43	0.37	1.1	1.1	1.3
Schools (EDU1)	0.49	0.40	0.39	0.32	1.2	1.2	1.5
<b>3 µm aerodynamic diameter</b>							
Single Family Homes (RES1)	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.10	1.6	1.6	1.6
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	0.070	0.030	0.030	0.028	2.3	2.4	2.5
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	0.079	0.051	0.050	0.046	1.6	1.6	1.7
Retail Stores (COM1)	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.21	1.1	1.1	1.2
Offices (COM4, COM5, GOV1)	0.36	0.34	0.34	0.33	1.1	1.0	1.1
Schools (EDU1)	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.27	1.1	1.1	1.2

1091

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

1092 **Table B4. Summary of US Indoor Downwind Exposure Improvements for selected building**  
1093 **types, two aerosol sizes, and the 0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. (dimensionless)**

Select Buildings (Use Types)	Relative Improvement from Baseline Scenario		
	Min MERV 7 Scenario	Min MERV 11 Scenario	Min MERV 14 Scenario
<b>1 μm aerodynamic diameter</b>			
Single Family Homes (RES1)	2.6	2.6	3.2
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	9.6	9.8	23
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	6.6	6.8	24
<b>3 μm aerodynamic diameter</b>			
Single Family Homes (RES1)	2.5	2.6	2.6
Small Apt (RES3B, RES3C)	6.2	6.2	7.5
Large Apt (RES3E, RES3F)	4.0	4.2	5.8

1094

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration

## 1095 **Supplemental Material C: Additional Building Metric Figures**

1096

1097 **Figure C1** shows the Building Transmission Factors for the improved filtration scenarios. The  
1098 indoor/outdoor exposure ratios are all smaller for the improved filtration scenarios than for the  
1099 baseline case for the six building types, **Figure 1**, by the factors illustrated in **Figure 2**.

1100

1101 **Figure C2** shows the Indoor Normalized TSIAC for the improved filtration scenarios. The indoor  
1102 exposure ratios are all smaller for the improved filtration scenarios than for the baseline case  
1103 for the six building types, **Figure 3**, by the factors illustrated in **Figure 4**. Note the change in  
1104 vertical scale from **Figure 3**.


1105

1106 **Figure C3** shows the Building Exit Fraction for the improved filtration scenarios. The Building  
1107 Exit Fractions are all smaller for the improved filtration scenarios than for the baseline case for  
1108 the six building types, **Figure 5**, by the factors illustrated in **Figure 6**.

1109

M Dillon and  
R Sextro


## Reducing Exposures to Airborne Particles Through Improved Filtration



1110  
1111 **Figure C1.** Improved filtration scenario results for the US Building Transmission Factor  
1112 (dimensionless) – the ratio of the indoor exposures to the corresponding outdoor exposure –  
1113 for selected building types; two aerosol sizes: 1 μm (solid bar) and 3 μm diameter (diagonal  
1114 striped bar); and a 0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. Higher Building Transmission Factor values  
1115 correspond to greater exposures.

M Dillon and  
R Sextro


Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



1116  
1117 **Figure C2.** Improved filtration scenario results for the US Indoor Normalized Time and Space  
1118 Integrated Air Concentration (Indoor Normalized TSIAC in  $s\ m^{-1}$ ) – indoor exposures to indoor-  
1119 origin airborne particles – for selected building types; two aerosol sizes: 1  $\mu m$  (solid bar) and 3  
1120  $\mu m$  diameter (diagonal striped bar); and a  $0\ h^{-1}$  airborne loss rate. Higher Indoor Normalized  
1121 TSIAC values correspond to greater exposures. Note the change in vertical scale from **Figure 3**.

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



1122  
1123 **Figure C3.** Improved filtration scenario results for the US Building Exit Fractions (dimensionless)  
1124 – the fraction of indoor airborne particles that are released to the outdoor atmosphere – for  
1125 selected building types; two aerosol sizes: 1 μm (solid bar) and 3 μm diameter (diagonal striped  
1126 bar); and a 0 h<sup>-1</sup> airborne loss rate. Higher Exit Fraction values correspond to more particles  
1127 released to the outdoor atmosphere.  
1128

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration


1129 **Supplemental Material D: Improvement Sensitivity to Particle Size and**  
1130 **Airborne Loss Rate**

1131 **Figures D1 to D3** illustrates how the improvements to (reduction in) indoor airborne particle  
1132 exposure varies with airborne loss rate and particle size using the Building Transmission Factor  
1133 metric, the Minimum MERV 14 scenario, and selected building types. Broadly, the improvement  
1134 decreases with increasing “generic” first-order airborne loss rate,  $\lambda_{decay}$  and particle size. The  
1135 small and large apartment building improvements are sensitive to airborne loss rate and  
1136 particle size. The single family home, retail store, office building and school improvements are  
1137 notably less sensitive.

1138

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration




1139  
1140 **Figure D1.** Improvement in the US Building Transmission Factor for two residential building  
1141 types; five aerosol sizes: 0.1 μm (horizontal striped bar), 0.3 μm (downward diagonal striped  
1142 bar, 1 μm (solid bar), 3 μm diameter (upward diagonal striped bar), and 10 μm diameter  
1143 particles (cross-hatched bar); and four airborne loss rates: 0, 0.1, 1, and 10 h<sup>-1</sup>. The vertical axis  
1144 is the ratio of the Building Transmission Factors for the baseline to the Minimum MERV 14  
1145 filtration scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater  
1146 improvement).  
1147



M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration




1148

1149 **Figure D2.** Improvement in the US Building Transmission Factor for large apartments and retail  
 1150 stores; five aerosol sizes: 0.1 μm (horizontal striped bar), 0.3 μm (downward diagonal striped  
 1151 bar, 1 μm (solid bar), 3 μm diameter (upward diagonal striped bar), and 10 μm diameter  
 1152 particles (cross-hatched bar); and four airborne loss rates: 0, 0.1, 1, and 10 h<sup>-1</sup>. The vertical axis  
 1153 is the ratio of the Building Transmission Factors for the baseline to the Minimum MERV 14  
 1154 filtration scenario (a value of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater  
 1155 improvement).

1156

M Dillon and  
R Sextro

Reducing Exposures to Airborne  
Particles Through Improved Filtration



1157

1158 **Figure D3.** Improvement in the US Building Transmission Factor for office buildings and schools;  
 1159 five aerosol sizes: 0.1 μm (horizontal striped bar); 0.3 μm (downward diagonal striped bar, 1 μm  
 1160 (solid bar), 3 μm diameter (upward diagonal striped bar), and 10 μm diameter particles (cross-  
 1161 hatched bar); and four airborne loss rates: 0, 0.1, 1, and 10 h<sup>-1</sup>. The vertical axis is the ratio of  
 1162 the Building Transmission Factors for the baseline to the Minimum MERV 14 scenario (a value  
 1163 of 1 indicates no improvement, larger numbers indicate greater improvement).  
 1164