



Evaluation of emission factors for light-duty gasoline vehicles based on chassis dynamometer and tunnel studies in Shanghai, China



Cheng Huang^{a,*}, Shikang Tao^a, Shengrong Lou^a, Qingyao Hu^a, Hongli Wang^a, Qian Wang^a, Li Li^a, Hongyu Wang^b, Jian'gang Liu^c, Yifeng Quan^c, Lanlan Zhou^d

^a State Environmental Protection Key Laboratory of Cause and Prevention of Urban Air Pollution Complex, Shanghai Academy of Environmental Sciences, Shanghai, 200233, China

^b School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Donghua University, Shanghai, 20620, China

^c Shanghai Motor Vehicle Inspection Certification & Tech Innovation Center Co., Ltd, Shanghai, 201805, China

^d Shanghai Pujiang B&T Tunnel Management Co., Ltd, Shanghai, 200120, China

HIGHLIGHTS

- 51 in-use LDGVs were tested using a chassis dynamometer in Shanghai, China.
- Continuous monitoring in a gasoline vehicle dominated tunnel were conducted in Shanghai, China.
- Emission factors of LDGVs were determined based on dynamometer test and tunnel experiment.
- High-emitting vehicles contributed the majorities of emissions from older vehicles in Shanghai, China.
- Emission factors of LDGVs were underestimated due to the overlook of high-emitting vehicles in the previous studies in China.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 March 2017

Received in revised form

23 August 2017

Accepted 12 September 2017

Available online 18 September 2017

Keywords:

Emission factor

Light-duty gasoline vehicle

Chassis dynamometer

Tunnel experiment

High-emitting vehicle

ABSTRACT

CO, THC, NO_x, and PM emission factors of 51 light-duty gasoline vehicles (LDGVs) spanning the emission standards from Euro 2 to Euro 5 were measured by a chassis dynamometer. High frequencies of high-emitting vehicles were observed in Euro 2 and Euro 3 LDGV fleet. 56% and 33% of high-emitting vehicles contributed 81%–92% and 82%–85% of the emissions in Euro 2 and Euro 3 test fleet, respectively. Malfunctions of catalytic converters after high strength use are the main cause of the high emissions. Continuous monitoring of a gasoline vehicle dominated tunnel in Shanghai, China was conducted to evaluate the average emission factors of vehicles in real-world. The results indicated that the emission factors of LDGVs were considerably underestimated in EI guidebook in China. The overlook of high-emitting vehicles in older vehicle fleet is the main reason for this underestimation. Enhancing the supervision of high emission vehicles and strengthening the compliance tests of in-use vehicles are essential measures to control the emissions of in-use gasoline vehicles at the present stage in China.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Vehicle emission has been an important source of air pollution. Their NO_x, VOCs and primary PM emissions have been recognized the key precursors of PM_{2.5} and ozone pollution in the regions of China (Zhang et al., 2015a; Cheng et al., 2016; Sun et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016a; Shao et al., 2016). Light-duty gasoline vehicles (LDGVs) dominate the total motor vehicle fleet in China. The

statistic data show that the population of motor vehicle in China reached 172 million in 2015, of which LDGVs were 140 million, accounting for 86.2% of the total. Correspondingly, their CO, HC and NO_x emissions occupied 83.7%, 71.5%, and 26.7% of the total vehicle emissions, respectively (MEP, 2016). Their primary PM emissions also cannot be ignored according to recent studies (Huang et al., 2013). Furthermore, the SOA productions of gasoline exhaust even exceeded their primary emissions according to the smog experiment studies (Platt et al., 2013; Gordon et al., 2014; Presto et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2015a). LDGVs are now experiencing rapid growth in China, which has increased by 1.2 times in the last 5 years. It will be very important to accurately

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: huangc@saes.sh.cn (C. Huang).

Table 1
Specifications and emission factors of test vehicles in this study.

No.	Manufacturers	Model year	Odometer (km)	Emission standard	CO (g/km)	THC (g/km)	NO _x (g/km)	PM (mg/km)	Fuel Con. (L·100 km ⁻¹)
1	Volkswagen	2000	254,606	Euro 2	2.73	0.456	0.860	1.35	6.91
2	Volkswagen	2003	176,427	Euro 2	0.25	0.081	0.060	1.85	6.40
3	Buick	2003	139,898	Euro 2	7.38	1.212	1.619	2.30	9.15
4	Chery	2004	216,261	Euro 2	5.90	1.127	2.256	94.5	6.93
5	Volkswagen	2004	165,337	Euro 2	1.75	0.235	0.623	4.96	7.96
6	Buick	2004	130,963	Euro 2	32.7	2.345	2.096	516	14.3
7	Buick	2004	102,923	Euro 2	5.87	1.087	1.300	13.6	6.74
8	Zhonghua	2007	118,153	Euro 2	1.98	0.106	0.173	0.81	8.12
9	Volkswagen	2007	109,440	Euro 2	21.8	2.818	0.181	49.7	8.48
10	Nissan	2006	314,110	Euro 3	6.87	0.705	2.159	61.1	9.64
11	Buick	2006	229,187	Euro 3	0.02	0.006	0.373	3.55	10.4
12	Hyundai	2007	182,649	Euro 3	10.6	1.536	2.485	123	8.87
13	Peugeot	2007	161,637	Euro 3	1.87	0.221	0.101	20.6	6.57
14	Santana	2007	146,916	Euro 3	0.57	0.055	0.119	4.34	7.99
15	Peugeot	2007	98,389	Euro 3	1.23	0.038	0.048	0.11	8.19
16	Volkswagen	2008	354,988	Euro 3	1.74	0.092	0.078	0.65	8.88
17	Audi	2008	248,132	Euro 3	0.34	0.041	0.039	12.7	9.41
18	Peugeot	2008	117,422	Euro 3	0.26	0.022	0.447	2.28	7.34
19	Hongxing	2009	84,685	Euro 3	1.65	0.025	0.688	36.8	5.35
20	BYD	2009	54,201	Euro 3	0.44	0.055	0.054	4.82	6.40
21	BYD	2010	227,715	Euro 3	14.2	0.784	0.530	28.1	7.26
22	Chevrolet	2008	139,692	Euro 4	1.77	0.121	0.087	3.53	6.57
23	Volkswagen	2008	119,755	Euro 4	0.03	0.000	0.042	0.66	7.62
24	Chevrolet	2008	65,261	Euro 4	0.70	0.025	0.070	2.48	6.33
25	Mazda	2009	193,880	Euro 4	0.42	0.013	0.034	2.76	7.83
26	Nissan	2009	99,096	Euro 4	0.39	0.039	0.021	5.42	9.83
27	Skoda	2009	83,145	Euro 4	0.37	0.043	0.008	11.2	6.83
28	Buick	2009	67,382	Euro 4	0.74	0.001	0.086	0.26	7.47
29	Toyota	2010	209,169	Euro 4	1.34	0.097	0.181	3.14	9.27
30	Chevrolet	2010	147,359	Euro 4	1.30	0.081	0.083	2.81	8.22
31	Passat	2011	153,529	Euro 4	4.78	0.075	0.108	0.01	8.72
32	Chery	2011	126,838	Euro 4	1.23	0.028	0.088	1.20	7.20
33	Toyota	2011	62,323	Euro 4	0.07	0.002	0.004	9.97	5.94
34	Passat	2011	60,159	Euro 4	0.99	0.048	0.025	2.72	7.88
35	Chery	2011	31,774	Euro 4	0.04	0.008	0.018	1.30	6.45
36	Chevrolet	2012	48,741	Euro 4	0.41	0.040	0.024	8.87	7.15
37	Mazda	2012	26,526	Euro 4	0.74	0.001	0.086	3.84	7.83
38	Hyundai	2013	145,999	Euro 4	0.59	0.056	0.040	15.7	6.24
39	Chery	2013	81,460	Euro 4	0.93	0.045	0.143	1.87	6.82
40	Audi	2013	78,018	Euro 4	0.74	0.119	0.070	28.8	7.82
41	Volkswagen	2013	16,779	Euro 4	1.04	0.074	0.064	9.03	6.95
42	Buick	2012	36,902	Euro 5	0.17	0.036	0.012	3.35	8.12
43	Soueast	2014	57,840	Euro 5	0.08	0.012	0.016	0.65	5.57
44	Buick	2014	46201	Euro 5	1.38	0.038	0.036	27.3	10.2
45	Buick	2014	45,820	Euro 5	1.99	0.025	0.006	7.39	8.73
46	Audi	2016	75,021	Euro 5	0.26	0.049	0.039	31.3	8.32
47	Buick	2016	51,151	Euro 5	1.69	0.052	0.024	0.86	6.91
48	Hyundai	2016	13,596	Euro 5	0.85	0.054	0.029	8.19	6.72
49	Hyundai	2016	10,276	Euro 5	0.69	0.026	0.012	8.18	6.75
50	Honda	2016	7,857	Euro 5	0.90	0.044	0.006	11.9	7.89
51	Kia	2016	5,109	Euro 5	0.69	0.028	0.018	2.18	6.22

quantify their emissions.

Accurate vehicle emission factors are essential to recognize their contribution to air pollution. Vehicle emission models, such as MOVES, COPERT, EMFAC, and IVE, have been widely used to develop vehicle emission inventory in previous studies (Wang et al., 2008; Wallace et al., 2012; Cai and Xie, 2013; Jing et al., 2016). In China, the MEP (Ministry of Environmental Protection of People's Republic of China) released an on-road vehicle emission inventory guidebook (shortened as EI guidebook) which recommended a series of vehicular emission factors based on the local studies (MEP, 2014). However, some measurements on LDGVs demonstrated that the modeled emission factors still have some differences with the measured ones (Fujita et al., 2012; Liu and Frey, 2015). Most of the results from real world measurements by remote sensing and chasing studies indicated that high emitters caused by deterioration of emission control devices tended to be underestimated in

vehicle emission inventories (Park et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2015; Pujadas et al., 2017). To understand the emission factors of LDGVs, some measurement studies have been conducted in recent studies in China (Huo et al., 2012; Shen et al., 2014; Qu et al., 2015; Li et al., 2016a). However, the test samples were limited and the results still show big differences compared with the

Table 2
Adjustment factors of EFs under different speed ranges.

Pollutants	Average speed (km·h ⁻¹)							
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80
CO	2.72	1.36	1.00	0.84	0.72	0.56	0.48	0.41
THC	2.93	1.47	1.07	0.89	0.75	0.60	0.52	0.45
NO _x	2.46	1.23	0.97	0.88	0.77	0.65	0.56	0.52
PM	2.25	1.13	1.03	1.02	0.91	0.66	0.56	0.45

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5752814>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5752814>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)