





Session 7: Mobile sources

Development of road traffic emission inventories for urban air quality modeling in Madrid (Spain)

<u>R. Borge</u>, C. Quaassdorff, J. Pérez, D. de la Paz, J. Lumbreras, J.M. de Andrés, A. Narros, E. Rodríguez

Laboratory of Environmental Modelling Technical University of Madrid (UPM) <u>rborge@etsii.upm.es</u>

San Diego, California. April, 16th





OUTLINE

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Methodology
 - 2.1. Emission models
 - 2.2. Measurement campaign
- 3. Results and discussion
- 4. Conclusions





1. INTRODUCTION



 Madrid city (Spain): 3.2 million inhabitants in the city, more than 5 million people in the metropolitan area

•Positive trend of AQ in the city. Remaining issues: NO₂

> Annual evolution of NO₂ levels in Madrid cin (average by station type; relative to 2005)





21st USEPA International Emission Inventory Conference. April 13-16, 2015. San Diego (California)





Figures from Borge et al., 2014 (STOTEN)

•The main responsible to high NO_2 ambient air concentration values is road traffic



Accurate and updated road traffic emission inventories are needed to define and simulate abatement measures



60

50

40

20

10

38

NO2 Annual mean (2014)

^еш/³

51



•Emission inventories have been developed to support the simulation of city-scale measures, but also complementary local measures to deal with particular issues in specific hot-spots such as Fernandez Ladreda (FL) square

42

35

Traffic stations in the Madrid City Council Air Quality Network

41

40







2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Emission models

•The development of emission inventories for on-road mobile sources is particularly complex, since emissions depend on multiple factors:

- road type and traffic conditions
- vehicle type, age and maintenance conditions
- driving patterns / driving stage
- meteorology











•There are many emission models based on alternative approaches for emission computation; according to Smit (2009):

-'Average-speed' models (e.g. COPERT, MOBILE, EMFAC) – macroscopic description

-'Traffic-situation' models (e.g. HBEFA, ARTEMIS) – link level

-'Traffic-variable' models (e.g. TEE, Matzoros model) – traffic flow variables defined by macro or microscale traffic models

-'Cycle-variable' models (e.g. MEASURE, VERSIT+) – individual vehicle driving patterns

-'Modal' models – engine operation, also microscale approach

•The choice of the modeling approach would depend on the purpose of the computation (detail needed, scale of interest, etc)





- •The COPERT model (COmputer Programme to calculate Emissions from Road Transport) (currently v.4.11) is the reference model according to the EMEP/EEA methodology for the computation of road traffic emission inventories in Europe
- Average speed model, more than 100 vehicle categories



• It has been integrated with the regional traffic model (TDM) for emission computation at link level





Mesoscale road traffic emission computation scheme







- Link-level, 1h intensity and speed from a macroscopic traffic model
- Fleet composition and age from field campaigns (characterization





 Fleet composition is a key input for emission computation and also from the policy making perspective





- Outputs from COPERT are routinely used for the compilation of the Madrid emission inventory and mesoscale modeling activities (e.g. Madrid's Air Quality Plan)
- It has been found to perform reasonably well and similar to trafficsituation models (HBEFA)



Figures from Borge et al., 2012 (AtmosEnv)





Microscale emission computation

- Further computation detail is needed to understand pollution dynamics in urban hotspots (e.g. FL square; a heavily-trafficked roundabout)
- •High temporal and spatial resolution emissions from cycle-variable models are needed to simulate air quality at this scale







- Computation of microscale emissions require additional information to describe the behaviour of single vehicles to produce individual braking-acceleration patterns
- The PTV VISSIM 6.00-19 microscale traffic flow model was selected to generate realistic traffic data
- In addition to fleet composition this model needs information on:
 - Detailed network definition
 - Vehicle fluxes and routes within the modeling domain
 - Traffic signs
 - Traffic lights phases







- Emissions are computed through VERSIT+ emission factors
- The link between traffic variables and emission factors is done by the ENVIVER interface







- •12 scenarios were selected to perform 1-h length simulations
- Representative of working and weekend days, peak and valley hours







2.2. Measurement campaign



- •A 10-day field campaign (May 22-June 2, 2013) was carried out to:
 - update vehicle fleet characterization in Madrid and in FL specifically
 - detailed traffic flows within the microscale modeling domain



- •The sampling points were selected to be representative of each of the areas defined in the TDM (merged into 5: A to E)
- Already available equipment was used as much as possible
- Additional cameras were only deployed in FL



21st USEPA International Emission Inventory Conference. April 13-16, 2015. San Diego (California)









- Public buses were excluded. This information was provided by the Municipal Transport Company (EMT):
 - number and mileage of buses on each line
 - detailed routes and frequency in each line
 - plate number and characteristics of each bus







- A total of 4,911,708 plate readings was made during the campaign
- Up to 1,304,112 different plates were identified (after data cleaning and duplicates removal)
- Vehicle information was retrieved from the vehicle registration database managed by the national traffic authority (DGT):
 - date of first registration
 - brand and model
 - vehicle type (segment)
 - service (public / private)
 - number of seats / weight
 - engine size
 - propulsion technology
 - hybrid indicator (yes/no)
 - ZIP codes (vehicle & owner)







- Vehicles were mapped into COPERT categories (plus some others interesting for policy purposes; e.g. taxis)
- 199 vehicle type in this study

| COPERT | Fuel/ | Emissionstandards | European Emission Standard time frame | | | COPERT | Fuel | |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|------------|
| Sector | Propulsion | Emissions and as | Europe | | | | Sector | Propulsion |
| Light | Garalina | Conventional | - 1992 | | | Passenger | Gasoline | |
| vehicles | Gasoline | Conventional | - 1552 | | | 00.5 | | |
| < 3.5t | | Euro 1 - 93/59/EEC | 1993 - 1996 | | | | | |
| | | Euro 2 - 96/69/EC | | 1997 - 1999 | | | | |
| | | Euro 3 - 98/69/EC S 2000 | | 2000 - 2 | 2004 | | | |
| | | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | | 2005 - 2 | 2010 | | | |
| | | Euro 5 - 715/2007/EC S 2011 | | 2011-2 | 2014 | | | |
| | | Euro 6 - 715/2007/EC S 2015 | 2015 - | | | | | |
| | Diesel | Conventional | - 1992 | | | | | |
| | | Euro 1 - 93/59/EEC | | 1993 - 1995 | | | | |
| | | Euro 2 - 96/69/EC | | 1997 - 1 | 1999 | | | |
| | | Euro 3 - 98/69/EC S 2000 | | 2000 - 2 | 2004 | | | |
| | | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | | 2005 - 2 | 2010 | | | |
| | | Euro 5 - 715/2007/EC S 2011 | | 2011-2 | 2014 | | | Diesel |
| | | Euro 6 - 715/2007/EC S 2015 | | 2015 | - | | | |
| Heavy-duty trucks | Gasoline | Conventional | | | | | | |
| > 3.5t | Diesel | | <=7.5t | 7.5t-16t | 16t-32t | >32t | | |
| | | Conventional | - 1991 | - 1991 | - 1991 | - 1991 | | |
| | | Eurol - 91/542/EECS | 1992 - 1994 | 1992 - 1994 | 1992 - 1994 | 1992 - 1994 | | |
| | | Euro II - 91/542/EEC S II | 1995 - 1999 | 1995 - 1999 | 1995 - 1999 | 1995 - 1999 | | |
| | | Euro III - 1999/96/EC S I | 2000 - 2004 | 2000 - 2004 | 2000 - 2004 | 2000 - 2004 | | LPG |
| | | Euro IV - 1999/96/EC S II | 2005 - 2007 | 2005 - 2007 | 2005 - 2007 | 2005 - 2007 | | |
| | | Euro V - 1999/96/EC S III | 2008 - | 2008 - | 2008 - | 2008 - | | |
| | | Euro VI – not proposed | | 1 | | | | |
| Buses | Diesel | | Urba | n | Coa | ches | | 1 |
| | | Conventional | - 1991 | 1 | - 1991 | | | Hybrid |
| | | Eurol - 91/542/EEC S I | 1992 – 1 | 994 | 1992 | - 1994 | | |
| | | Euro II - 91/542/EEC S II | 1995 – 1 | 999 | 1995 | - 1999 | | |
| | | Euro III - 1999/96/EC S I | 2000 - 2 | 004 | 2000 - 2004 2005 - 2007 2008 | | | |
| | | Euro IV - 1999/96/EC S II | 2005 - 2 | 007 | | | • In | diving |
| | | Euro V - 1999/96/EC S III | 2008 | | | | | |
| | | Euro VI – not proposed | | | | | | |
| | Gas natural | Euro I - 91/542/EEC S I | | 1992 – 1994 | | | | |
| | | Euro II - 91/542/EEC S II | 1995 - 1999 2000 - 2004 2006 - 2009 - | | | | | |
| | | Euro III - 1999/96/EC S I | | | | 1 venicie | | |
| | | Euro IV - 1999/96/EC S II | | | | • • | | |
| | | Euro V - 1999/96/EC S III | | | | | | |
| | | EEV - 1999/96/EC | | 2000 | - | | " | |
| Mopeds | Gasoline | Conventional | - 1998 | | | "ct | and | |
| < 50cm* | | Euro 1 - 97/24/ECS I | 1999 - 2001 | | | ວເ | anu | |
| | | Euro 2 - 97/24/EC S II | 2002 - | | | | | |
| | | Euro 3 - Proposed | | | | | | |
| Motorcycles | Gasoline | | 2-stroke | 4-stroke | 4-stroke | 4-stroke | | |
| | | | > 50cm* | 50-250cm ³ | 250-750 cm ³ | > 750 cm ³ | | |
| | | Conventional | - 1998 | - 1998 | - 1998 | - 1998 | — | 1 - 1 - |
| | | Euro 1 - 97/24/EC | 1999 - 2002 | 1999 - 2002 | 1999 - 2002 | 1999 - 2002 | • 10 | ากลา |
| | | Euro 2 - 2002/51/ECS | 2003 - 2005 | 2003 - 2005 | 2003 - 2005 | 2003 - 2005 | | |
| | | Euro 3 - 2002/51/EC S II | 2006 - | 2006 - | 2006 - | 2006 - | | |

| COPERT Sector | Fuel/ Propulsion | Emission standards | European Emission Standard time frame | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|
| Passenger cars | Gasoline | | < 1.4I | >=1.4l y | <=2.01 | > 2.01 | |
| | | PRE ECE | - 1971 | - 197 | 71 | - 1971 | |
| | | ECE 15/00-01 | 1972 - 1977 | 1972 - 1 | 1977 | 1972 - 1977 | |
| | | ECE 15/02 | 1978 - 1979 | 1978 - 1 | 1979 | 1978 - 1979 | |
| | | ECE 15/03 | 1980 - 1984 | 1980 - 1 | 1984 | 1980 - 1984 | |
| | | ECE 15/04 | 1985 - 1992 | 1985 - 1 | 1992 | 1985 - 1989 | |
| | | Euro 1 - 91/441/EEC | 1993 - 1996 | 1993 - 1 | 1995 | 1990 - 1995 | |
| | | Euro 2 - 94/12/EC | 1997 - 1999 | 1997 - 1 | 1999 | 1997 - 1999 | |
| | | Euro 3 - 98/69/EC S 2000 | 2000 - 2004 | 2000 - 2 | 2004 | 2000 - 2004 | |
| | | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | 2005 - 2010 | 2005 – 2 | 2010 | 2005 - 2010 | |
| | | Euro 5-715/2007/EC S 2011 | 2011 - 2014 | 2011 - 2014 | | 2011 - 2014 | |
| | | Euro 6 - 715/2007/EC S 2015 | 2015 - | 2015 - | | 2015 - | |
| | | 2-stroke engine | | | | | |
| | Diesel | | <=2.0 | | | > 2.01 | |
| | | Conventional | - 1992 1993 - 1996 1997 - 1999 2000 - 2004 2005 - 2010 | | - 1992 | | |
| | | Euro 1 - 91/441/EEC | | | 1 | 1993 - 1996 1997 - 1999 | |
| | | Euro 2 - 94/12/EC | | | 1 | | |
| | | Euro 3 - 98/69/EC S 2000 | | | 2000 - 2004 | | |
| | | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | | | 2005 - 2010 | | |
| | | Euro 5 - 715/2007/EC S 2011 | 2011 – 2014 | | 2011 - 2014 | | |
| | | Euro 6 - 715/2007/EC S 2015 | 2015 - | | | 2015 - | |
| | LPG | Conventional | - 1992 | | | | |
| | | Euro 1 - 91/441/EEC | 1993 - 1995 | | | | |
| | | Euro 2 - 94/12/EC | 1997 - 1999 | | | | |
| | | Euro 3 - 98/69/EC S 2000 | 2000 - 2004 | | | | |
| | | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | 2005 - | | | | |
| | Hybrid | Euro 4 - 98/69/EC S 2005 | | 2005 | - | | |

- Individual readings were merge by vehicle type and zone to get a "standard vehicle" by zone
- Total mileage in each zone was not estimated but taken from the TDM





Additional data for the microscale simulation

• Video cameras (don't read plates) to account for vehicle fluxes in each possible route in the area of interest (FL square): movements





21st USEPA International Emission Inventory Conference. April 13-16, 2015. San Diego (California)

















3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

- Fleet composition and emissions in Madrid
- Despite a decreasing tendency, road traffic is still the main contributor of emissions in Madrid city (year 2013):
 - 56.3 % of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{NO}_{\mathsf{X}}}$
 - 65.1 % of PM_{2.5} (exhaust)
 - 40.6 % of CO₂

| Pollutant | Emission | Unit |
|-------------------|----------|------|
| CH₄ | 170 | t |
| CO | 6,524 | t |
| CO ₂ | 2,339 | kt |
| COVNM | 2,532 | t |
| N ₂ O | 79 | t |
| NH ₃ | 134 | t |
| NOx | 7,992 | t |
| PM ₁₀ | 624 | t |
| PM _{2.5} | 473 | t |
| SO ₂ | 14 | t |







• Fleet composition and emissions dominated by diesel passenger cars:

Mileage distribution







| 100% 90% | Inside M30 | | • NO _X emis basically, by (99% of NO ₂) | sions ar diesel vehi) | e driven, cles (89%) | |
|-------------|---------------|--------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 80% | | | PM emission | ns are also | generated | |
| 70% | | | by diesel veh | nicles (86%) | | |
| 60% | | | | | | |
| 50% | | | Gasoline | influence | on CO ₂ | |
| 40% | _ | | omissions | is high | er than | |
| 30% | | | | is nigi | iei than | |
| 20% | | | correspondin | ig mileag | ge share | |
| 10% | | | (39%) | | | |
| 0% | Petrol | Diesel | Hybrid & Electric | Othe | r | |
| Mileage | 34,74% 65,16% | | 0,08% | 0,029 | 0,02% | |
| NOx | 11,01% 88,99% | | 0,00% | | 6 | |
| NO | 17,00% 82,99% | | 0,00% 0,00% | | 6 | |
| NO2 | 1,03% 98,97% | | 0,00% | 0,00% | 6 | |
| PM exhaust | 13,94% | 86,04% | 0,02% | 0,019 | 6 | |
| CO2 | 38,79% | 61,17% | 0,03% | 0,01% | 6 | |





• Average age has considerably increase (from the last, pre-crisis, fleet characterization study)

| | | Previous study |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | Average age (years) | (2009) |
| Passenger cars | 9.3 | 5.7 |
| Light commercial vehicles | 10.0 | 5.1 |
| Heavy-duty trucks | 10.8 | 6.8 |
| Buses | 8.1 | 6.2 |
| Motorcycles | 9.8 | 31 |
| Taxis | 4.4 | |







Microscale emission simulation in Fernández Ladreda square

- The 12 simulations were successfully performed
- The model produces individual speed and acceleration patterns for every vehicle trip with a 0.2 sec. resolution





21st USEPA International Emission Inventory Conference. April 13-16, 2015. San Diego (California)



Distance: 430m. - Duration: 209s.



- This information is processed by ENVIVER to produce very high resolution emissions
- The result need to be aggregated in time as needed (requirements of the air quality model to be coupled)
- Emissions for every trip in each scenario were computed and the results were aggregated for the whole hour period for comparison (and 5 m horizontal resolution)





 Hourly average speed was also computed in order to compare the results with COPERT



NO_x emissions (E1): 111 gr/h

Average speed (E1): low traffic intensity, freeflow (Wednesday 4:00-5:00 AM)





 The inverse relationship between average speed and emission is clearly reproduced by the microscale model



NO_X emissions (E2): 1721 gr/h

Average speed (E2): high traffic intensity, saturated (Wednesday 8:00-9:00 AM)





- $\bullet\,\text{NO}_{\rm X}$ hourly emissions in the square range from 100 to more than 2000 grams
- Maximum emissions (afternoon peak hour) do not correspond to maximum traffic intensity
- •There is a significant variation in emissions per vehicle and distance travelled throughout the day / week
- Vehicle type emission contribution (not shown) also varies considerably







 Secondary emission factors as a function of speed have been computed for each scenario and compared with the corresponding outputs of the mesoscale model



- Mean normalized bias error = 15.5% (taking COPERT as a reference)
- Deviations of VERSIT+ at scenario level range between -5% and 40%





4. CONCLUSIONS

- Road traffic is the main emitting sector in Madrid
- The methodology applied to compute emissions at microscale shows promising results
- Good agreement with well-known average speed algorithms used for mesoscale modeling
- According to the results, complementary local measures in hot spots may play a relevant role in future air quality policies





Next steps (microscale emission modeling)

- Apply the methodology to other hot spot configurations (junctions, street canyons, etc.)
- Better understanding and refinement of emission computation algorithms to expand the vehicle type categories available and make full use of the data provided by the fleet characterization study
- Enhance emission results exportability and other issues for postprocessing and integration with CFD codes (numerical results, grid cell size) for hot-spot air quality modeling







Acknowledgments:





- The Madrid City Council provided the mesoscale traffic model outputs, traffic cameras and funded this studys
- The fleet characterization study was possible thanks to the collaboration of the national traffic authority (DGT), the Municipal Transport Company (EMT, S.A.), Madrid Calle 30, S.A.
- The TECNAIRE-CM research project was funded by the Madrid Greater Region (S2013/MAE-2972)
- VISSIM and VERSIT+micro (ENVIVER) ware licensed by PTV Group and TNO

Thank you for your attention!

rborge@etsii.upm.es