Building Energy Efficiency, Ventilation Strategies, and Indoor VOC Accumulation: A Data-Driven Assessment

Miguel Burton
School of Computing, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA.
miguel1978@clemson.edu

Brooks D. Hughes
School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA.
brooksmail@oregonstate.edu

Abstract

The pursuit of energy efficiency in buildings has transformed envelope design, mechanical systems, and operational control strategies. However, the same interventions that reduce heating, cooling, and ventilation energy can also alter indoor pollutant dynamics, particularly for volatile organic compounds emitted by building materials, furnishings, finishes, and consumer products. This paper presents a data-driven assessment of the coupled relationships among building energy efficiency, ventilation strategies, and indoor VOC accumulation. It examines buildings as socio-technical systems in which energy codes, ventilation standards, occupant behavior, sensor infrastructure, and indoor chemistry interact in ways that are not captured by conventional single-domain performance metrics. The analysis addresses emission source behavior, air exchange variability, sensor deployment, machine learning integration, and governance challenges. It further considers structural trade-offs between envelope tightening and pollutant dilution, robustness of automated ventilation, fairness in exposure distribution, and policy instruments needed to avoid unintended health consequences in low-energy buildings. The paper argues that indoor air quality should be treated as a coequal performance dimension with energy efficiency, supported by interoperable data infrastructure, transparent modeling practices, and institutional routines that protect occupants across diverse building types. The assessment highlights opportunities for digital twins, urban-scale building modeling, and dynamic ventilation standards while cautioning against excessive reliance on algorithmic control without independent commissioning and audit structures.

Keywords

building energy efficiency; ventilation; volatile organic compounds; indoor air quality; data-driven assessment; socio-technical systems; building governance.

1. Introduction

The global building sector remains a principal consumer of energy, and its operational patterns are shaped by a complex interaction among climate, envelope performance, mechanical systems, occupant schedules, and regulatory frameworks. Reliable building energy consumption information has long demonstrated that heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, and equipment do not operate independently; rather, they form a tightly coupled system in which changes in one domain propagate into others [1]. Energy efficiency policies have therefore encouraged improved insulation, reduced envelope leakage, high-performance windows, and more efficient mechanical equipment. These actions can deliver measurable energy savings, but their effects on indoor environmental quality are not automatically positive. Building occupants continuously adjust windows, thermostats, and shading devices, introducing behavioral variability that can amplify or erode predicted energy benefits [2]. The relationship between energy performance and ventilation is especially sensitive. In educational settings, insufficient ventilation has been associated with reduced cognitive performance and elevated symptom prevalence, while corrective ventilation often requires additional energy expenditure for conditioning outdoor air [3]. Controlled office studies likewise indicate that higher outdoor air supply rates can improve perceived air quality and reduce sick building syndrome symptoms, yet these improvements may introduce heating and cooling penalties [4].

The significance of indoor pollutant exposure is underscored by human activity pattern research showing that people spend the overwhelming majority of their time indoors [5]. Among indoor pollutants, volatile organic compounds occupy a distinctive position because many of their sources are embedded in common building materials, furnishings, finishes, and consumer products. Long-term changes in material composition, coupled with tightened building envelopes and modified ventilation practices, have altered the concentration profiles of indoor volatile organic compounds over recent decades [6]. This paper provides a systems-level assessment of the coupled dynamics among building energy efficiency, ventilation strategies, and indoor VOC accumulation. It does not rely on a single empirical case but instead develops an interdisciplinary analytical framework that addresses physical source behavior, data infrastructure, modeling architectures, structural trade-offs, governance, and policy implications. The goal is to show why effective management of indoor VOC accumulation requires moving beyond isolated energy or air quality metrics toward integrated data-driven evaluation of buildings as dynamic socio-technical infrastructures.

2. System Boundaries and Data Infrastructure for Building Environmental Performance

Understanding VOC accumulation in energy-efficient buildings requires treating the building as a coupled socio-technical system rather than a static enclosure. Healthy building design principles emphasize that indoor air quality depends not only on pollutant sources but also on envelope characteristics, mechanical ventilation, occupant practices, and maintenance regimes [7]. The physical processes governing VOC emissions from materials are well documented. Early mass transfer models for carpets established that emission rates are not simply constant but depend on internal diffusion, partition coefficients, and boundary layer conditions, meaning that source strength changes over time and with environmental conditions [8]. Subsequent reviews extended these ideas across a broad class of volatile and semivolatile organic compounds, highlighting the influence of material composition, temperature, humidity, and material age [9]. Formaldehyde, a priority indoor VOC, illustrates the coupling between material chemistry and exposure risk because its sources include resins, pressed wood products, coatings, and insulation, and its emission can persist for long periods in tightly sealed indoor environments [10]. Beyond primary emissions, indoor chemistry can generate secondary pollutants through reactions among cleaning agents, terpenes, and oxidants, making the measured VOC mixture a dynamic outcome rather than a fixed source signature [11]. Population health studies have associated residential chemical emissions with respiratory and allergic outcomes, particularly among children, reinforcing the need for exposure assessment that accounts for both source intensity and ventilation conditions [12].

Data infrastructure for such assessment has expanded considerably. Field measurement of ventilation rates has advanced through tracer gas decay, occupant-generated carbon dioxide, and continuous sensing, but methodological uncertainty remains a central challenge in interpreting measured air change rates across different building types [13]. Residential ventilation and energy characteristics have been surveyed to quantify the distribution of air exchange rates and the energy penalties attached to mechanical ventilation systems [14]. At the same time, envelope airtightness has been recognized as an influential parameter in models of commercial building energy consumption, because reductions in infiltration shift the balance between natural and mechanical ventilation and can increase the concentration of internally generated pollutants if outdoor air supply is not adjusted accordingly [15]. A recent examination of residential VOC from building materials further documents the dual character of indoor emissions as both exposure hazards and contributors to ambient air pollution when ventilated outdoors, connecting individual buildings to neighborhood-scale environmental burdens [16]. These diverse data streams can only be integrated if buildings are instrumented, modeled, and managed as part of broader data infrastructure rather than as isolated assets. Without such integration, energy efficiency programs may produce buildings that perform well on energy bills while accumulating VOC concentrations that remain invisible to conventional performance tracking.

3. Energy Efficiency and Ventilation as Coupled Technical Regimes

Mechanical ventilation standards such as ASHRAE Standard 62.1 define minimum outdoor air rates intended to maintain acceptable indoor air quality, but they operate alongside energy codes that encourage load reduction and envelope tightening [17]. This dual obligation creates a structural tension because the same air exchange that dilutes indoor pollutants also represents a thermal load in most climates. In practice, ventilation rates are not solely determined by design specifications. Occupants interact with operable windows, occupancy sensors, and demand-controlled ventilation in ways that can diverge significantly from engineering assumptions, introducing a layer of behavioral complexity that is difficult to capture in standard simulation workflows [18]. Urban-scale building energy modeling increasingly relies on automated data integration and archetype generation, enabling planners to evaluate efficiency retrofits across thousands of buildings, yet these models often treat indoor air quality and VOC accumulation as secondary or excluded variables [19]. Contextual factors such as thermal history, access to controls, clothing habits, and perceived air quality further shape occupant-driven ventilation behavior, implying that policy instruments based only on technical capacity may miss important implementation dynamics [20].

Carbon dioxide based methods have been widely used as a practical proxy for ventilation adequacy, especially in schools, because occupant-generated carbon dioxide can be measured with inexpensive sensors and used to estimate outdoor air exchange under defined assumptions [21]. Although useful, these methods do not directly quantify VOC concentrations or source strength, and they can misrepresent ventilation in spaces with variable occupancy or strong indoor sources. Envelope tightening and mechanical ventilation retrofits have been shown to produce complex energy outcomes in the residential sector, with savings from reduced infiltration partially offset by fan energy and conditioned outdoor air [22]. The assessment of ventilation strategies therefore cannot be reduced to a simple trade-off between energy and air quality. It requires a dynamic understanding of how standards, technologies, occupant practices, sensor reliability, and data governance interact under different building typologies, climates, and social contexts. A data-driven assessment can support this understanding by integrating energy meter data, ventilation signals, occupancy information, and pollutant measurements, but such integration raises significant architectural and institutional challenges.

4. VOC Accumulation Dynamics and Exposure Pathways

VOC accumulation indoors is governed by the balance among source emission, air exchange, sorption, and chemical reaction. The source landscape has changed as consumer products and air fresheners introduce fragrances and reactive terpenes into residential and commercial spaces [23]. These products can generate secondary organic aerosols and reactive oxygen species under certain indoor conditions, illustrating that VOC control cannot focus solely on building materials. Airborne particle measurements in homes, schools, offices, and aged care facilities demonstrate that exposure patterns vary strongly by indoor activity, source proximity, and ventilation, with cooking, cleaning, and occupant movement contributing to short-term peaks [24]. Although particulate matter is distinct from VOCs, the two are linked through secondary aerosol formation and shared source events, reinforcing the need for integrated pollutant monitoring rather than single-contaminant assessments.

Health-focused ventilation scholarship has emphasized that ventilation rates and health outcomes are not linearly connected, and that diverse endpoints such as infectious disease transmission, asthma, sick building syndrome, and cognitive performance respond differently to changes in air exchange [25]. This complexity matters for VOC policy because a ventilation rate sufficient to control carbon dioxide may not control source-specific emissions from furnishings, and may not account for episodic emissions from cleaning or renovation. A data-driven assessment should therefore combine time-resolved VOC measurements with contextual metadata about occupancy, source events, and ventilation modes. The resulting exposure profiles can support risk management strategies that prioritize source reduction before dilution and air cleaning, while recognizing that each intervention has energy, cost, and maintenance implications. In tightly sealed buildings, source control may be more effective and less energy intensive than continuous high ventilation, but source control requires material disclosure, product standards, and occupant awareness, all of which operate outside the traditional scope of building energy management.

5. Data-Driven Assessment Architectures

A data-driven assessment architecture for energy and indoor air quality must integrate multiple heterogeneous data layers, including building automation system signals, indoor environmental quality sensors, energy meters, weather feeds, material inventories, and maintenance records. The technical challenge is not only data volume but also semantic alignment across systems that use different temporal resolutions, naming conventions, and communication protocols. Building information models, asset registries, and operational sensor streams must be linked so that a VOC event can be interpreted alongside ventilation damper positions, fan energy, and envelope conditions. Machine learning models can be trained to identify emission patterns and forecast concentration peaks, but their value depends on rigorous data quality assurance, sensor calibration, and uncertainty reporting. Without such governance, predictive outputs may reproduce hidden biases from incomplete sensor coverage, varying occupancy schedules, or unequal maintenance resources across building portfolios.

A robust architecture should treat energy efficiency and indoor air quality as coequal performance dimensions rather than as separate optimization targets. This implies that model outputs should be evaluated not only by energy error metrics but also by their ability to detect high-exposure episodes and to avoid false reassurance. The system must accommodate nonstationary conditions, such as renovation events, new furnishings, and climate extremes, which can alter both source emission and ventilation behavior. It must also support equitable deployment, because data-poor buildings, low-income housing, and schools in under-resourced districts are often excluded from the advanced sensing and modeling systems that could detect harmful VOC accumulation. A system-level design therefore requires attention to hardware cost, interoperability standards, data ownership, operator training, and the institutional capacity of building managers. The most advanced machine learning pipeline will not improve indoor air quality if it depends on sensors that drift, communication networks that fail, or maintenance staff who cannot act on its outputs.

6. Structural Trade-offs, Robustness, and Governance

The structural trade-offs between energy efficiency and ventilation are embedded in building codes, incentive programs, and professional practices. In many jurisdictions, energy efficiency retrofits are supported by utility programs that reward envelope tightening and equipment upgrades, while ventilation improvements receive less direct financial support unless they are part of a health intervention. This asymmetry can produce unintended VOC accumulation in buildings where source reduction has not accompanied air sealing. For example, a newly renovated residential unit may consume less heating energy due to reduced infiltration, yet the lower air exchange can prolong the residence time of formaldehyde and other emissions from new cabinetry and flooring. The resulting exposure may not be visible to energy performance metrics, creating a governance gap in which a building can be classified as efficient and healthy without integrated measurement of indoor air quality.

Robustness in such systems requires redundancy and adaptive capacity. Buildings should be able to respond to high-pollution episodes through enhanced ventilation, temporary source isolation, or demand-driven filtration, while still maintaining thermal comfort and energy constraints. Data-driven controls can support this adaptability, but they also introduce risks if sensor failures or algorithmic errors produce incorrect ventilation reductions. Therefore, ventilation safety should not be entirely delegated to automated optimization. Instead, minimum ventilation standards, independent commissioning, and periodic indoor air quality audits should operate alongside data-driven performance management. This layered governance approach balances algorithmic flexibility with regulatory stability and ensures that energy savings do not depend on the continuous correct operation of complex sensing and control systems.

Fairness concerns arise because exposure burdens are unevenly distributed. Low-income households may be exposed to higher material emission intensities due to lower-cost furnishings and more crowded conditions, while also having less access to high-efficiency ventilation systems and real-time monitoring. Data-driven assessment can help identify such disparities, but only if monitoring programs are intentionally designed to include diverse housing types and neighborhoods. Privacy is another governance issue because high-resolution indoor environmental data can reveal occupancy patterns, activity schedules, and household behaviors. Transparent data governance, local data processing, and clear consent frameworks are essential to prevent the use of indoor environmental monitoring for surveillance or discriminatory purposes. Without these protections, the expansion of data-driven building assessment may create new forms of vulnerability even as it improves environmental performance.

7. Policy Implications and Future Systems

Policy frameworks must move beyond separate energy and indoor environmental quality standards. Building performance certificates could report ventilation adequacy, VOC concentration ranges, and peak exposure indicators alongside energy use intensity, enabling occupants and owners to make more informed choices. Building codes could require source-emission testing for high-emitting materials and finishes before they are installed in airtight or mechanically ventilated buildings. Renovation programs could include indoor air quality commissioning as a condition of receiving public incentives, ensuring that energy savings are not achieved through unintended reductions in pollutant dilution. Regional planning and urban building energy modeling can support this shift by mapping the combined energy and air quality consequences of retrofit programs at district scale, capturing both indoor exposures and the contribution of indoor VOC releases to ambient air pollution.

Future systems may incorporate digital twins that couple building automation, indoor environmental sensing, and dynamic maintenance schedules. Such systems could alert operators when material aging, temperature changes, or occupant activities increase VOC emissions, and could simulate the energy and exposure consequences of alternative ventilation strategies before implementation. However, these innovations must be grounded in realistic building operations. Maintenance resources are often limited, sensors drift, occupants may override controls, and legacy equipment may not support advanced communication protocols. Therefore, the research and policy agenda should prioritize fault-tolerant sensor systems, interoperable data standards, operator training, and equity-focused deployment. A successful data-driven strategy will not rely solely on algorithmic sophistication but will embed indoor air quality protection within institutional routines, financing instruments, and professional education. The integration of energy and indoor environmental performance should be understood not as a singular technological fix but as an ongoing process of negotiation among building owners, occupants, utilities, regulators, and public health authorities.

8. Conclusion

Energy efficiency and indoor VOC accumulation are governed by overlapping but often separately managed systems. Building energy policies typically optimize thermal loads, equipment performance, and envelope characteristics, while indoor air quality policies focus on ventilation standards and pollutant thresholds. This separation can create unintended outcomes in which tightened envelopes and reduced outdoor air supply lead to higher indoor VOC concentrations despite improved energy metrics. A data-driven assessment offers a path toward integration by coupling source emission models, ventilation measurements, occupant behavior data, and health-relevant exposure indicators. However, the technical integration of these data streams is only one part of the challenge. Structural trade-offs, robustness constraints, fairness considerations, and institutional governance are equally important. Future systems should treat energy and indoor air quality as coequal dimensions, supported by interoperable sensing infrastructure, transparent modeling practices, and policy instruments that reward healthy low-energy buildings rather than energy savings alone. The development of such systems will require sustained collaboration across engineering, public health, data science, and policy communities, with careful attention to the social distribution of both environmental benefits and monitoring burdens.

References

1. Pérez-Lombard, L., Ortiz, J., & Pout, C. (2008). A review on buildings energy consumption information. Energy and Buildings, 40(3), 394–398.

2. Hong, T., Taylor-Lange, S. C., D'Oca, S., Yan, D., & Corgnati, S. P. (2016). Advances in research and applications of energy-related occupant behavior in buildings. Energy and Buildings, 126, 694–702.

3. Fisk, W. J. (2017). The ventilation problem in schools: Literature review. Indoor Air, 27(6), 1039–1051.

4. Wargocki, P., Wyon, D. P., Sundell, J., Clausen, G., & Fanger, P. O. (2000). The effects of outdoor air supply rate in an office on perceived air quality, sick building syndrome symptoms and productivity. Indoor Air, 10(4), 222–236.

5. Klepeis, N. E., Nelson, W. C., Ott, W. R., Robinson, J. P., Tsang, A. M., Switzer, P., Behar, J. V., Hern, S. C., & Engelmann, W. H. (2001). The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): A resource for assessing exposure to environmental pollutants. Journal of Exposure Analysis and Environmental Epidemiology, 11(3), 231–252.

6. Weschler, C. J. (2009). Changes in indoor pollutants since the 1950s. Atmospheric Environment, 43(1), 153–169.

7. Spengler, J. D., & Chen, Q. (2000). Indoor air quality factors in designing a healthy building. Annual Review of Energy and the Environment, 25(1), 567–600.

8. Little, J. C., Hodgson, A. T., & Gadgil, A. J. (1994). Modeling emissions of volatile organic compounds from new carpets. Atmospheric Environment, 28(2), 227–234.

9. Liu, Z., Ye, W., & Little, J. C. (2013). Predicting emissions of volatile and semivolatile organic compounds from building materials: A review. Building and Environment, 64, 7–15.

10. Salthammer, T., Mentese, S., & Marutzky, R. (2010). Formaldehyde in the indoor environment. Chemical Reviews, 110(4), 2536–2572.

11. Nazaroff, W. W., & Weschler, C. J. (2004). Cleaning products and air fresheners: Exposure to primary and secondary air pollutants. Atmospheric Environment, 38(18), 2841–2865.

12. Mendell, M. J. (2007). Indoor residential chemical emissions as risk factors for respiratory and allergic effects in children: A review. Indoor Air, 17(4), 259–277.

13. Persily, A. K. (2015). Field measurement of ventilation rates. Indoor Air, 25(1), 97–111.

14. Sherman, M. H., & Matson, N. E. (1997). Residential ventilation and energy characteristics. ASHRAE Transactions, 103(1), 717–730.

15. Ng, L. C., Persily, A. K., & Emmerich, S. J. (2015). Consideration of envelope airtightness in modelling commercial building energy consumption. International Journal of Ventilation, 14(1), 77–94.

16. Fan, Yi, et al. "Residential VOC from building materials: Exposures, health risks, and ambient hazards." Sustainable Cities and Society 119 (2025): 106080.

17. ASHRAE. (2019). ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019: Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers.

18. Gunay, H. B., O'Brien, W., & Beausoleil-Morrison, I. (2013). A critical review of observation studies, modeling, and simulation of adaptive occupant behaviors in offices. Building and Environment, 70, 31–47.

19. Chen, Y., Hong, T., & Piette, M. A. (2017). Automatic generation and simulation of urban building energy models based on city datasets for city-scale building retrofit analysis. Applied Energy, 205, 323–335.

20. O'Brien, W., & Gunay, H. B. (2014). The contextual factors contributing to occupants' adaptive comfort behaviors in offices: A review and proposed modeling framework. Building and Environment, 77, 77–87.

21. Batterman, S. (2017). Review and extension of CO2-based methods to determine ventilation rates with application to school classrooms. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14(2), 145.

22. Logue, J. M., Sherman, M. H., Walker, I. S., & Singer, B. C. (2013). Energy impacts of envelope tightening and mechanical ventilation for the US residential sector. Energy and Buildings, 65, 281–291.

23. Steinemann, A. (2017). Ten questions concerning air fresheners and indoor built environments. Building and Environment, 111, 279–284.

24. Morawska, L., Ayoko, G. A., Bae, G. N., Buonanno, G., Chao, C. Y. H., Clifford, S., Fu, S. C., Hänninen, O., He, C., Isaxon, C., Mazaheri, M., Mcgarry, P., Salonen, H., Salthammer, T., Waring, M. S., & Wierzbicka, A. (2018). Airborne particles in indoor environment of homes, schools, offices and aged care facilities: The main routes of exposure. Environment International, 108, 75–83.

25. Sundell, J., Levin, H., Nazaroff, W. W., Cain, W. S., Fisk, W. J., Grimsrud, D. T., Gyntelberg, F., Li, Y., Persily, A. K., Pickering, A. C., Samet, J. M., Spengler, J. D., Taylor, S. T., & Weschler, C. J. (2011). Ventilation rates and health: Multidisciplinary review of the scientific literature. Indoor Air, 21(3), 191–204.