

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

CHARACTERIZATION OF PARTICULATE EMISSIONS FROM SHIPS FROM IN SITU MEASUREMENTS (WITH A SPECIAL FOCUS ON BLACK CARBON)

Prof. Christopher D. Cappa

Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of California, Davis



EPA STAR-OTAQ Transportation
Emissions Research Forum
March 4-5, 2014



Why Ships?



- ca. 8% of primary organic particulate emissions from all global fossil and biofuels
- 2% of global black carbon emissions globally
- Emissions into
 - Pristine marine environments
 - Sea-ice
 - Ship tracks
 - Near large population centers (e.g. ports)
 - Estimated 60,000 premature deaths/year worldwide
- Traffic expected to increase substantially
- **Limited characterization of PM emission factors from in use vessels**


[Corbett et al., *ES&T*, 2007]

[Lack et al., *GRL*, 2008]

[Ito & Penner, *GBC*, 2005]

[Eyring et al. *JGR*, 2005]



Ocean-going vessel traffic density



Fuel Sulfur Regulations





- Allowable fuel sulfur content decreasing in **Emission Control Areas** and in global fuels
- Regulations in CA even more stringent/being implemented sooner
- Fuel sulfur content is often related to overall fuel quality (e.g. ash content)



Emission Control Areas



As of 1 August, 2012



Vessel Speed Reduction



- Various (mostly voluntary) vessel speed reduction efforts
- Typically provide incentives for vessels to reduce speed to ~12 knots (from a typical ~25 knots) within ~40 nm of the coast
- Decreased CO₂ and NO_x emissions; effects on PM?
- VSR in effect around Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach (our study area)



Objective



Characterize and quantify emissions of particulate matter in plumes from a suite of ocean going vessels around CA by:


- Vessel type
- Fuel type (new CA regulations requiring low sulfur fuel were in effect)
- Vessel speed



Our Research Platform during CalNex 2010: The Woods Hole R/V Atlantis



Measurements



Other particle measurements:

Particle Number (< 5 nm; < 13 nm; < 50 nm; < 100 nm), CPC, 1 second

Particle Size Distributions, SMPS, 3 minute

Cloud Condensation Nuclei (CCN), 1 second

Particle Scattering, Nephelometer, 1 second

Particle Absorption, PSAP, 1 second (w/ 30 second running mean)

Optical hygroscopicity, CRD-AES, 5 seconds


Single particle composition, ATOFMS, fast

Gas Phase:


SO₂, 1 second CO, 1 second NO_x, 1 second

CO₂, 1 second O₃, 1 second


CalNex 2010 Study Area



Sub 1 μm Particle Extinction (532 nm)



Ship Encounters






Quantifying Ship Emissions

- Determine **emissions factors** from measurements of species X and CO₂ in intercepted plumes from **in use** ships
- Plume ages range from < 1 min to 10 minutes

$$EF_X = \frac{([X]_{plume} - [X]_{bgd})}{([CO_2]_{plume} - [CO_2]_{bgd})} \cdot f_{fuel} = \frac{amt. X \text{ emitted}}{kg_{fuel} \text{ consumed}}$$




f_{fuel} = conversion factor accounting for fuel carbon content and MWs

Quantifying Ship Emissions




$$EF_X = \frac{([X]_{plume} - [X]_{bgd})}{([CO_2]_{plume} - [CO_2]_{bgd})} \cdot f_{fuel} = \frac{amt. X \text{ emitted}}{kg_{fuel} \text{ consumed}}$$

Area-Ratio Method



Slope Method



Three Stories



1. Emissions of black carbon from the in use fleet in the CA coastal waters [Buffaloe et al., 2014]



2. Case Study: Influence of fuel quality (fuel sulfur content) on PM emissions from an in use slow speed diesel container ship [Lack et al., 2011]



3. Case Study: Influence of vessel speed on PM emissions from an research vessel/fishing boat [Cappa et al., 2014]




Emissions of black carbon from the in use fleet in the CA coastal waters

FIRST STORY



Black Carbon Emissions from the CA Fleet

- Primarily target of opportunity study (i.e. sampled ship plumes when we could!)
- Total of 71 vessels and 135 plumes encountered
- Combination of *slow speed*, *medium speed* and *high speed* diesels
- All vessels operating on low sulfur fuels
- Multiple measurement methods (PAS, PSAP, SP2 and SP-AMS)




[Buffaloe et al., ACP, 2014]



BC Emissions: Technique Comparison

- Good agreement between PAS, PSAP and SP-AMS
- SP2 biased low relative to other methods




[Buffaloe et al., ACP, 2014]

Bias in SP2?



- Evidence for small particle mode not captured by SP2
- Limitations in BC source testing with SP2?




SP2 lower limit



BC Emission Factors during CalNex

- Good amount of ship-to-ship variability
- Little difference b/t ships with different engine types on average



Notes: - logarithmic averages (Parrish et al., JGR, 1998)
 - cut averages exclude statistical outliers




Can we use the CalNex dataset to say something about the influence of fuel sulfur?



BC Emission Factors: CalNex vs. TexAQS

- SSD vessels during CalNex (2010) operated on a much lower sulfur fuel than during TexAQS (2006) – 0.4%S vs. 1.6%S
- BC emission factors in CalNex statistically lower than in TexAQS for Tankers and Cargo SSD vessels ($p \leq 0.001$)





Case Study: Influence of fuel quality (fuel sulfur content) on PM emissions from an in use slow speed diesel container ship

SECOND STORY



Fuel Sulfur and the Margrethe Maersk

- Coordinated study between R/V *Atlantis*, the NOAA P-3B and the Margrethe Maersk (MM)
- MM switched from high sulfur (3.15% S, 0.05% ash) to low sulfur (0.07% S, <0.01% ash) over a period of 60 minutes
- Sample multiple times during the switch from the P-3B and after the switch was complete from the *Atlantis*





[Lack, Cappa et al., *ES&T*, 2011]



Fuel Sulfur and the Margrethe Maersk


- SO_2 emissions decrease as fuel sulfur decreases
- p-SO_4^{-2} emissions decrease as fuel sulfur decreases




Fuel Sulfur and the Margrethe Maersk




- Number of Cloud Condensation Nuclei decreases



Fuel Sulfur and Margrethe Maersk





- Change in CCN driven more by size/composition changes than particle number





Fuel Sulfur and Margrethe Maersk

- Decrease in POM and (slight) decrease in BC emission factors
- May be related to concurrent decrease in vessel speed, but most likely a result of fuel change



Case Study: Influence of vessel speed on PM and gas-phase emissions
from a research vessel/fishing boat

THIRD STORY

Influence of Vessel Speed: the Miller Freeman



- Coordinated study with NOAA ship R/V *Miller Freeman*
- Intercepted plumes emitted at different steady-state operating speeds
- Characterize changes in PM and gas emission factors



Ship Details


- 65.5 m vessel
- 11 knots cruising speed
- Medium Speed Diesel
- 2-stroke, 1.64 MW
- *Variable Pitch Propeller*
- $F_S \sim 0.1$ wt.%

[Cappa et al., ACP, 2014]



Influence of Vessel Speed: the Miller Freeman

- Decrease in PM, BC and POM EFs with decreasing vessel speed
- Slight increase in POM fraction as vessel speed increases
- No clear dependence of CN EF on vessel speed





[Cappa et al., ACP, 2014]



Influence of Vessel Speed: the Miller Freeman


- Decrease in particle size with decreasing speed
- Consistent with decrease in PM concentration
- Comparison b/t SMPS size distribution and SP2 (BC) size dist'n consistent with small BC mode



Influence of Vessel Speed: Broader View for BC




- Variation in EF_{BC} with vessel speed is not consistent between different studies
- Both increases and decreases in EF_{BC} with decreasing speed
- No clear engine dependence
- Wide range of absolute EF_{BC} between different vessels/studies



Influence of Vessel Speed: Broader View for POM



- Variation in EF_{POM} with vessel speed is not consistent between different studies
- Wide range of absolute EF_{POM} between different vessels/studies



Summary and Conclusions



- Characterized BC emissions factors for multiple vessels
 - No difference between engine types (SSD vs. MSD vs. HSD)
- Lowering sulfur in fuels (equivalent to cleaner fuels)...
 - Decreases overall PM emissions (primarily from sulfur ↓)
 - Decreases BC emission factors
 - May decrease POM emission factors
- Clear decrease in PM emissions as vessel speed decreases for R/V *Miller Freeman*
 - Substantial variability between different studies of individual vessels or test rig engines
 - *Miller Freeman* particular dependence may result from use of variable pitch propeller
- Follow-on work: Comprehensive characterization of broader suite of PM characteristics (number, composition) from vessels intercepted during CalNex

Gina Buffaloe (UC DAVIS)
Daniel Mellon (UC DAVIS)
Dan Lack (NOAA)
Eric Williams (NOAA)
Tim Onasch (Aerodyne)
Paola Massoli (Aerodyne)
Brian Lerner (NOAA)


Ibraheem Nuanmaan (York University)
Shao-Meng Li (Env. Canada)
Katherine Hayden (Env. Canada)
Derek Coffman (NOAA)
Trish Quinn (NOAA)
Tim Bates (NOAA)



This research is funded by
U.S. EPA - Science To Achieve
Results (STAR) Program
Grant # **RD834558**

Additional funding
support for CalNex
from NOAA,
Environment Canada
and the California Air
Resources Board


Vessel Speed: Gas Phase



Bias in SP2?



- Some evidence for small particle mode not captured by SP2
- Limitations in BC source testing with SP2?
- Need to account for size-dependent counting efficiency



Acknowledgments



Gina Buffaloe (UC DAVIS)
Daniel Mellon (UC DAVIS)
Dan Lack (NOAA)
Eric Williams (NOAA)
Tim Onasch (Aerodyne)
Paola Massoli (Aerodyne)
Brian Lerner (NOAA)

Ibraheem Nuanmaan (York University)
Shao-Meng Li (Env. Canada)
Katherine Hayden (Env. Canada)
Derek Coffman (NOAA)
Trish Quinn (NOAA)
Tim Bates (NOAA)



Additional funding support from NOAA, Environment Canada and the California Air Resources Board