

VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS (VOCS) EMISSIONS FROM SOURCES IN A PARTITIONED OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AND THEIR IMPACT ON IAQ

I.T. Berrios, J.S. Zhang, B. Guo, J. Smith, and Z. Zhang

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA

ABSTRACT

Mid and full-scale stainless steel chambers were used to characterize emission sources in a partitioned office environment, including personal computers, printers, copiers, and an office workstation components (desk, chair, cabinet, partition panels) and carpet. Results show that the emission rates for the computers were 10 to 120 times higher when the computers were on than off. The computers with CRT monitors emitted slightly more than those with TFT monitors. The emission rates for the copiers and printers can be negligible during the off and idle periods compared to the on period. The emissions from the furniture components decreased slowly over time, following a power-law decay curve. Major compounds emitted from the tested sources include: 1,3-dichlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, m-xylene, p-xylene, pentadecane, phenol, styrene and toluene. Simulations indicated that operation of the copier, printer and computer would contribute most to the total TVOC and toluene concentrations in a typical office environment.

INDEX TERMS (MAXIMUM OF 5 KEYWORDS)

VOC, office workstation, emissions, office equipment, Indoor Air Quality (IAQ)

INTRODUCTION

VOCs represent a major type of indoor pollutants. Many potential sources of VOCs exist in an office environment including construction materials, furniture, polluted outdoor air, and office equipment. Emissions from construction materials have been measured in many previous studies (e.g., Zhang et al. 1999, Hodgson 1999, Tucker 2000), but data are relatively limited for computers, printers, computers and workstation systems.

Chemical emission rates of Personal Computers (PC) and other electronic appliances were reported by Funaki et al. (2003), finding that the formaldehyde emissions were 9 times higher when the PC was on than when it was off. Nakagawa et al. (2003) compared the PCs with Thin Film Transistor (TFT) monitors and Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) monitors, finding that the CRT monitors had slightly higher emission rates of formaldehyde and acetaldehyde than the TFT monitors. Nineteen monitors were tested by Wensing et al. (2002) for phenol, toluene and TVOC emissions, finding that the VOC emission rates of monitors decreased as a result of ageing. A large chamber emission test method for office equipment was developed by Leovic et al. (1998), and evaluated by testing four photocopiers in different labs. Emission rates from commercial office workstations have been reported by Mason and Black (1995) and Zhang et al. (1997). Personal computers and printers may be considered as “active” sources because they also emit heat as well as pollutants. Their emissions also depend on the

operation modes as well as the materials used; their effects on the microenvironment are more complicated than “passive” sources such as building materials and furnishings.

This study is focused on sources that are close to the occupants in a partitioned office environment. The objectives were to identify the VOCs emitted, measure the emission rates over time, and estimate the relative impacts of the tested sources on the VOC concentrations.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Facilities

Tests were conducted in a mid or a full-scale stainless steel chamber. The mid-scale chamber has dimensions of 5.5ft x 6ft x 5.5ft high and an interior volume of 161.6 ft³. Two full-scale chambers were used depending on the tests and availability. One has dimensions of 6.5ft x 12ft x 10ft high (780 ft³), and the other 16ft x 12ft x 10ft high (1920ft³). All chambers have environmental controls that maintain the standard test conditions used, i.e., 23°C, 50% RH and constant air change rates (0 to 1 ach) depending on the specific test, as verified by the tracer gas decay test (ASTM D6670).

Test Procedures

The general procedures described in ASTM D6670 were followed, while the specific test procedure differed, depending on the type of sources tested. For the “active” sources, two different methods were used. The computer tests included two periods, each of twelve hours; the first was when the computers were “on” and the second was when the computers were “off”. For the copier and printers, the experimental method included three periods, two of twelve hours and a third of four hours; the first was when they were “off”, the second was when they were “idle” (i.e., power on but not operating) and the third period includes the operating and post-operating period. For “passive” sources (workstation components and carpet), each test was 120 hours, with samples being taken every 24 hours.

Sampling and Analysis Method

For the identification and quantification of the VOCs, the air samples collected by sorbent tubes were analyzed using a thermal desorber-GC/MS system according to ASTM D6196. VOCs were identified using the NIST MS library and an in-house database of the GC retention times for the compounds confirmed previously. After the air samples were analyzed, the amount of VOCs determined by the GC/MS was divided by sampling volume for respective tube sample to calculate the VOC concentrations.

For each test, the VOCs with highest concentrations were selected to determine their emission rates over time. To calculate the average emission rate, the mass balance equation was used for the “active” sources assuming perfect mixing conditions in the chamber and neglecting the sink effect and any minor mass loss due to the chamber leakage and sampling. For the “passive” sources the power-law decay model was used to represent the emission rate data (Zhang et al. 1999, and Magee et al. 1999): $EF(t) = at^{-b}$, where EF(t) is the emission factor ($\mu\text{g}/\text{h}/\text{m}^2$ or $\mu\text{g}/\text{h}/\text{unit}$) at time t, and a and b are empirical constants from regression analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Identification of emitted VOCs

For “active” sources, some components were found in every computer test such as m-xylene, p-xylene, pentadecane, phenol, toluene, and unidentifiable VOC while others were found in only one or two of them (Table 1). Toluene was the only common VOC found in every printer

test. Printer 2 was the one with highest emission rates but approximately 50% of the total emission factor was from d-limonene. Different computers and printers may have very different compounds emitted. Printers tested emitted less number of VOCs, but more TVOC than the computers tested. For “passive” sources, d-limonene was the most common VOC identified and was present in 60% of the tests.

Emission factors as a function of time

Emission factors were calculated based on the measured concentrations during the tests. For the computer tests, the emission factors increased during the first hours in the “on” period and then approached their relatively stable values. During the “off” period, the emission factors can be negligible (Figure 1). For the printers and copiers, the emission factors increased quickly during the copying and printing period, respectively, and kept at relatively high level during the post-printing and post-copying periods. The “off” and “idle” periods can be negligible comparing with the printing and copying periods. The overall trend is similar to the computer tests (Figure 1). For the “passive” sources, the higher emission factors can be found in the first 24 hours, after that they decreased quickly approaching their quasi-steady state (Figure 2). The emission factors for the passive sources can generally be well represented by the power law model (Figure 2).

Comparison of Emission Factors of the Different Sources

The five most common VOCs were selected to compare their emission factors among different sources. In addition the TVOC and the summation of the IVOCs emission factors were compared too. The most common VOCs were d-limonene, pentadecane, styrene, toluene and m,p-xylenes, which were found in almost every test (Table 1). The sources with higher emission factors were the printers and copiers. The second printer had the highest emission rate, but almost 50% of its emissions were for d-limonene. Passive sources in general had lower emission factors with the chairs having the lowest among the test products.




Figure 1 IVOCs Emission factor for computer 2 (an example for “active” sources)




Figure 2 IVOCs Emission factor for carpet test (an example for “passive” sources)

Table 1 VOCs identification for passive and active sources

Category	VOC Name	Passive Sources ¹ (ug/hr/m ²)					Active Sources (ug/hr/unit)						
							Computers ²			Printers ³			Copier ⁴
		carpet	drawer	panels	table	chairs	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
ARH	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene					0.47							
ARH	Butylated Hydroxy Toluene					7.41							
ARH	Ethylbenzene						188	21.1					
ARH	m-xylene, p-xylene						11.8	237	70.3	520			1381
ARH	o-xylene							217		1128			1192
ARH	Pentadecane	4.34	6.75	1.68			31.5	59.4	20.4				
ARH	Styrene	3.72					29.9		81.9		1132		
ARH	Toluene	1.47	2.78	2.37			16.8	270	113	207	996.3	508.8	1336
ALH	Nonane,3,7-Dimethyl-			7.51									
ALH	Tetradecane	3.74											
ALH	Undecane, 3-methyl			10.8									
HLC	1,3-DichloroBenzene		38.9	2.18									
ALC	1-Octanol, 2-butyl	5.14		6									
ALD	Benzaldehyde						10.7						720
ALD	Nonanal			6.55		0.28							
TER	D-limonene		26.4*	0.83*	117		83.5		14.9		19237	58.8	
TER	α-Pinene				5.28		15.2						
O	2-Propanol,1-methoxy-											1370	
O	N-Butylether												1673
O	Phenol						10.8	125	100				
O	Unidentifiable 1						90.1	142	79.8				
O	Sum VOC	73.1	74.2	95.3	138	30	511	1712	760	2883	32158	2417	7593
O	TVOC	134	73	135	86.7	32.8	501	3261	1229	2536	43488	2684	9632

Categories: ARH=Aromatic hydrocarbons, ALH=Aliphatic hydrocarbons, HLC=Halocarbons, ALC=Alcohols, ALD=Aldehyde, TER=Terpenes, O=Others, *shadow cells were considered steady state emission rates

¹Emission factor at 24 hrs, using power law decay model, ²Computer emission factor values are the average at time equals to 8, 10 and 12 hours during the on period. ³Printer emission factor values are the average values during the printing and post-printing period, ⁴Copier emission factor values are during the copying period

Impact of Emissions on an Office Environment

Emission data from the tests were used to simulate the impact of the sources on the VOC concentrations in an office environment. First, all the data was added to the database of a simulation program, MEDB-IAQ (Zhang et al. 1999). Simulations were then conducted, modeling a typical workstation system consisting of partitions, work surfaces, shelves, and flipper and pedestal file cabinets. In addition, a computer, a printer, a copier and a carpet were included in the simulations. A 10ft x 13ft x 9ft high room was used with a ventilation rate of 0.66 ach during the working hours (8:00-17:00) and 0.25 ach during the non working hours (0:00-8:00 and 17:00-24:00). Ventilation rate during the working hours was based on the ASHRAE standard 62 (2004) (i.e. 5 cfm/person plus 0.06 cfm/ft²). The printer was active from 8:00 to 9:00 every morning and the copier was active from 13:00 to 14:00 during the afternoons. It is apparent that operations of the printer and copier significantly elevated the VOC concentrations (Figure 3). In addition, the concentration of the TVOC and the IVOCs are decreasing very slowly from day to day due to the decay sources. Table 2 shows that the operation of copier, printer and computer had significantly more contributions to the toluene concentration than the furniture components. The same results were observed for Sum VOCs, TVOC and IVOCs from the active sources.




Figure 3 Impacts of emissions of tested sources on VOC concentrations in a typical office environment

Table 2 Relative contributions of individual sources to the total of toluene concentration in the room

Component	Computer 2	Printer 2	Copier	Drawer + Cabinets	Table	Carpet	Chair	Panels	Room
Amount	1	1	1	2.36m ²	2.23m ²	12.08m ²	1	12 m ²	33.13 m ³
Conc- Toluene	16.274	60.146	80.653	0.396	0	1.073	0	1.715	160.25
$C_{Tol-comp}/C_{Tol-room}$	0.102	0.375	0.503	0.002	0	0.007	0	0.011	1.000

CONCLUSIONS

1. Emissions were 10 to 120 times higher when the computers were “on” than “off”. All three computers emitted m-xylene, p-xylene, pentadecane, phenol, and toluene.
2. Toluene was the only common VOC found in emissions from all three printers tested. Very high emission rates of d-limonene were found during the second printer test.
3. Styrene was found in the carpet test, two computer tests and one printer test.
4. d-limonene was the most common VOC found during the “passive” source tests.
5. Emission rates were highest when the copier and printers were in the operating mode while significant emission also existed immediately after the operating period.

6. Emission factors of the passive sources tested decreased over time following the power-law approximately.
7. The operation of the printer, copier and computer had most significant impact on the overall VOC concentrations in a typical office environment based on the simulations.

REFERENCES

1. ASTM D6196. Standard Practice for the Selection of Sorbents and Pumped Sampling/Thermal Desorption Analysis Procedures for VOCs in Air.
2. ASTM D6670-01. Standard Practice for Full-Scale Chamber Determination of Volatile Organic Emissions from Indoor Materials/Products.
3. Leovic, K.; Whitaker, D.; Norheim, C.; and Sheldon, L. 1998. Evaluation of a test method for measuring indoor air emissions from dry-process photocopiers. *Air & Waste Management Association*. Vol. 48, pp. 915-922
4. Funaki, R.; Tanaka, H.; Nakagawa, T. and Tanabe, S. 2003. Measurements of aldehydes and VOCs from electronic appliances by using a small chamber. *Proceedings of Healthy Buildings 2003*, Singapore, Vol. 1, pp. 319-324
5. Hodgson, A.T. 1999. Common indoor sources of volatile organic compounds: Emission rates and techniques for reducing consumer exposures. Contract No. 95-302, Final report. California Environmental Protection Agency. Air Resources Board, Sacramento, CA. Accessible at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/abstracts/95-302.htm>
6. Magee, R.J., J.P. Zhu, and J.S. Zhang. 1999. A Small Chamber Test Method for Measuring VOC emissions from "Dry" Building Materials. *CMEIAQ Report 1.2*, IRC/NRC, Ottawa, Canada
7. Mason, M. & M. Black. 1995. Evaluation of a source management strategy for a large building. *Proc. of the EPA-A&WMA Engineering Solutions to IAQ Problems conference*. RTP, NC.
8. Nakagawa, T.; Wargocki, P.; Tanabe, S.; Weschler, C.J.; Baginska, S.; Bakó-Biró, Z. and Fanger, P.O. 2003. Chemical emission rates from personal computers. *Proceedings of Healthy Buildings 2003*, Singapore, Vol. 1, pp. 468-473
9. Tucker, W.G. 2001. Volatile organic compounds. in *Indoor Air Quality Handbook*. ed. J. D. Spengler, J.M. Samet, and J.F. McCarthy. McGraw-Hill. New York.
10. Wensing, M.; Kummer, T., Rienman, A, and Schwampe, W. 2002. Emissions from electronic devices: Examination of computer monitors and laser printers in a 1m³ emission test chamber. *Proceedings of Indoor Air 2002*, Vol. 2, pp. 554-559
11. Zhang, J.S.; Kanabus-Kaminska, J.M.; Shaw, C.Y.; Luszyk, E.; Magee, R.J.; Brouzes, M.A.; Nong, G.; Wang, J. 1997. Characterizing the emissions of volatile organic compounds from a workstation system. *Healthy Buildings/IAQ'97 - Global Issues and Regional Solutions* (Washington, D.C., U.S.A.,1997) pp.521-526, 1997 v.3
12. Zhang, J.S.; Shaw, C.Y.; Sander, D.; Zhu, J.P. 1999. MEDB-IAQ: A material emission database and single-zone IAQ simulation program---A tool for building designers, engineers and manahers. *CMEIAQ Report 4.2*, IRC/NRC, Ottawa, Canada
13. Zhang, J.S.; Zhu, J.P.; Shaw, C.Y.; Plett, E. ; Bodalal, A.; Chen, Q. and Yang, X. 1999. Models for Predicting Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions from Building Materials. *CMEIAQ Report 3.1*, IRC/NRC, Ottawa, Canada