The National Institutes of Health | Division of Technical Resources | Office of Research Facilities

Design Requirements Manual **News to Use**

March 2026
Vol. 03, No. 3

The formulae $\frac{\partial \rho U_i}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho U_i U_j)=-\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_i}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(\mu\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j}\right)+g_i(\rho-\rho_0)$ *for building* $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho \bar{U}_i \bar{U}_j)=-\frac{\partial \bar{P}}{\partial x_i}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(\mu\frac{\partial \bar{U}_i}{\partial x_j}-\rho\overline{u_i u_j}\right)+g_i(\rho-\rho_0)$ *state of the art* $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(\rho \bar{U}_i \bar{H})=\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\lambda\frac{\partial \bar{T}}{\partial x_i}-\rho\overline{u_i h}\right)$ *biomedical research facilities.*

Elevator Piston Effect: Designing and Commissioning Pressure Resilient Suite Boundaries: Part II

Part 1 of this series treated piston effect as a source-to-endpoint (boundary) pathway problem: elevator motion produces bipolar pressure pulses that move through the pathway of elevator car, hoistway, lobby, and corridor/plenum to impact network-pressure-critical suite doors. Architecture is the first lever because it seeks to decouple the suite boundary from the pulse source through planning and detailing. Part 2 assumes that architectural decoupling has reduced the disturbance as much as practical and addresses what remains: how the suite boundary is supported by mechanical system design and verified through commissioning (Cx) to prevent airflow reversal during realistic elevator operation.

Performance Objective: Define Success as Airflow Direction at the Boundary

A recurring failure mode is treating “pressure sign flipped briefly” as synonymous with “airflow reversed.” During transients, that equivalence can break down. A useful verification mindset appears in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) BSL-3/ABSL-3 HVAC and facility verification policy: brief pressure excursions may require interpretation, and Airflow Visualization Studies (AVS) can be used to confirm whether reversal occurs at the door.[1]

For elevator-adjacent biomedical suites, the transferable objectives are:

1. **During defined elevator movement scenarios (including multi-car events, where applicable), airflow across the pressure-critical boundary must not reverse.** Pressure measurement supports diagnosis; airflow direction is the acceptance metric. This statement also makes the boundary explicit: is it the suite door, an anteroom door, a corridor door, or an airlock door? Define it early, design to it, then test to it[2].

2. **Mechanical engineering and controls: engineer the “pressure circuit,” not just the setpoint.** A practical pressure-network analogy helps align design intent:
   - **Volumes** behave like capacitance (they resist rapid pressure change).
   - **Openings and leakage paths** behave like resistance (they govern how pulses propagate).
   - **Supply/exhaust/relief** establish the operating point and can add damping when paired with intentional pathways.

   This model is useful because the piston effect is not a steady offset, but a repeating disturbance. A robust design doesn’t “fight every pulse” in real time; it defines where and how the pulse energy can be absorbed and released, promoting timely re-equilibration to a static state.

3. **Confronting the common instinct to increase supply air to the buffer.** A common instinct is to increase supply air to a buffer zone to “maximize the capacitor effect.” This is understandable, but the physics is nuanced in practice:
   - More supply air does not increase volume, so it does not increase “capacitance” in the strict sense.
   - It can increase noise (e.g., keep a corridor slightly more positive so a negative pulse does not cross the threshold that threatens directionality).
   - It can also create side effects: door force complaints, energy penalty, and new unintended transfer paths if relief is not intentional.

   In many cases, pulse attenuation improves most reliably when sources of pressure waves are paired with intentional relief/transfer paths that allow the buffer to “breathe” without pushing/pulling through the suite boundary.

4. **Defined transfer paths: let the pulse equalize somewhere else.** The controlling principle is to provide the easiest equalization path somewhere other than to/from the pressure-sensitive biomedical space. “Defined transfer paths” are intentional, sized, documented routes for air movement so piston pulses equalize in lower-risk mediator zones, not through the suite boundary. Examples (project-specific selection required) include:
   - **Transfer grille or ducted transfer** between elevator lobby and a mediator buffer zone (not directly into the suite corridor).
   - **Dedicated relief/return path** from the buffer to a stable return plenum or return duct (with controls tuned to avoid hunting).
   - **Pressure relief dampers** at the buffer boundary so pulses can be “dumped” without driving through the suite door.
   - **Intentional leakage placement**, e.g., door undercuts or transfer openings at the buffer boundary (lower risk) while tightening leakage at the suite boundary (higher risk).

‘Design Requirements Manual (DRM) News to Use’ is a monthly ORF publication featuring salient technical information that should be applied to the design of NIH biomedical research laboratories and animal facilities. NIH Project Officers, A/E’s and other consultants to the NIH, who develop intramural, extramural and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects will benefit from ‘News to Use’. **Please address questions or comments to:** megan.teague@nih.gov

This is where mechanical and architectural intent must align. Architecture decides compartments, while mechanical design decides which compartments are allowed to equalize with which, and by what controlled path. The role of Cx is to ensure that the design operates as intended with the following considerations:

1. **Alarm logic and delays: tune to measured recovery behavior, not instantaneous sign flips.** Pressure alarms often become noisy near elevator cores because they are configured as if pressure was static. A more resilient strategy is to base alarms on the system's observed time behavior:
   - During commissioning, measure the recovery time after elevator pulses and multi-car events.
   - Configure alarms based on magnitude and duration, rather than instantaneous sign changes.

   This reduces nuisance while remaining conservative where it matters: at actual boundary reversal.

2. **Commissioning: include real elevator diversity and multi-car overlap.** A piston-effect-aware Cx plan must address the gap between steady testing, adjusting, and balancing (TAB) conditions and elevator operating diversity (car velocity, direction, door patterns, peak behavior). Published work notes that pressure change can be largest when multiple cars in a shaft move in the same direction simultaneously, an argument for testing overlap, not just a single car cycle. A minimum test matrix (scaled to project risk) should include[3]:
   - **Single car**: repeated approach/departure cycles at the target floor.
   - **Multiple cars in the same hoistway**: overlapping arrivals/departures and opposing directions.
   - **Express behavior**: express stop events and pass-by patterns relevant to the lobby configuration.
   - **Peak-like sequences**: repeated door cycles with frequent trips.

   Measurements should include[4] monitoring and trending pressure changes at the suite boundary (and buffer boundary if present); "worst excursion" and distribution of recovery times; and airflow direction confirmation at the boundary when excursions occur (smoke/indicator at the door) to determine whether a brief pressure event is a true reversal.

3. **Mockups and early validation: decide whether and where another pressure break is necessary.** Where the pressure-critical door is near an elevator lobby, especially with express stops, high trip density, or tight tolerance suites, consider an instrumented validation step early enough to change the architecture, if necessary, as follows:
   - Architect + MEP/controls + Cx plan an instrumented test condition as soon as a representative hoistway is operational (often before final finishes lock the layout).
   - Run the Cx traffic matrix and observe boundary behavior.
   - Use the results to decide whether another pressure break is necessary (e.g., a vestibule/anteroom ahead of the suite boundary) or whether transfer path sizing and control refinements provide sufficient resilience.

This is often the most cost-effective way to avoid post-occupancy discovery that the boundary is being used as the building's unintended pressure relief path.

Conclusion

The elevator piston effect is a core-to-suite coupling problem that must be addressed across disciplines. Developing a shared responsibility model that scales across suite types is the most effective way to ensure that facilities do not experience significant pressure change events, and each discipline plays a role in the comprehensive solution. Architecture attenuates the disturbance by reducing coupling and adding pressure breaks, while mechanical systems and controls define intentional equalization paths so that pulses do not use the suite boundary as the relief device. Finally, commissioning verifies realistic multi-car conditions and validates performance using airflow direction at the boundary as the acceptance criterion.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control. (2025). *BSL-3/ABSL-3 HVAC and Facility Verification.* https://www.cdc.gov/import-permit-program/media/pdfs/2024/08/Policy_Import_BSL3_ABSL3_Verification.pdf
2. Jensen, P.A., Lambert, L.A., Iademarco, M.F., & Ridson, R. (2005). Guidelines for preventing the transmission of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* in health-care settings. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 54*(RR17), 1-141. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5417a1.htm
3. Harada, K. & Terai, T. (1995). A study on the prediction of piston effect of elevator cars. *Bulletin of Japan Association for Fire Science and Engineering, 42* (2), 21-29. https://doi.org/10.11196/kasai.42.2_21
4. American Society of Health-System Pharmacists. (2018). *Compounding Sterile Preparations.* (E.C. Buchanan, P.J. Schneider, & R.A. Forrey, Ed.). ASHP. https://doi.org/10.37573/9781585284856.FM
5. American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineers. (2023). Fire and smoke control. In ASHRAE Handbook (HVAC Applications). https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/ashrae-handbook