



Development of a new Plume-in-Grid model for roadways combining an Eulerian Model with a Gaussian line-source model.

92nd American Meteorological Society Annual Meeting (January 22-26, 2012)
17th Conference on Air Pollution Meteorology with the A&WMA

Régis Briant & Christian Seigneur

CEREA École des Ponts ParisTech / EDF R&D Université Paris-Est, France

#### Introduction

- Gaussian plume model for line source
- Modeling platform Polyphemus (http://cerea.enpc.fr/polyphemus/)
- Comparisons to measurements
- Plume-In-Grid model using line sources

Point source formulation Line source formulation Improvement of the line source formulation

# **Hypotheses**

- Emission rate (Q in g s<sup>-1</sup>) and meteorological parameters are constant.
- The plume is at steady state
- The wind (u in m s<sup>-1</sup>) is strong enough so that the turbulent diffusion in the wind direction is not significant (slender plume approximation)

#### Point source Gaussian formula

$$c(x, y, z, t) = \frac{Q}{2\pi u \sigma_y \sigma_z} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\sigma_y^2} - \frac{z^2}{2\sigma_z^2}\right)$$

 σ<sub>y</sub>, σ<sub>z</sub>: standard deviation coefficients along y and z axes computed with Briggs parameterization.

Point source formulation Line source formulation Improvement of the line source formulation

## Integration of the point source equation

## $\Rightarrow$ Horst-Venkatram approximation (HV approximation)

[1] Venkatram, A. and Horst, T.W. (2006). Approximating dispersion from a finite line source. *Atmospheric Environment.*, 40:2401-2408.

#### Line source Gaussian formula

$$C(x, y, z) = \frac{Q}{2\sqrt{2\pi}u\cos\theta\sigma_z}\exp\left(\frac{-z^2}{2\sigma_z^2}\right) \times \left[\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{(y-y_1)\cos\theta - x\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_{y_1}}\right) - \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{(y-y_2)\cos\theta - x\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_{y_2}}\right)\right]$$

 cosθ makes the solution diverges when the wind is parallel to the road

Régis Briant, CEREA

Development of a new Plume-in-Grid model for roadways

Point source formulation Line source formulation Improvement of the line source formulation

# $\Rightarrow$ Parameterization of the error induce by the HV approximation detailed in:



• If  $\theta \in [80, 90]$ , concentration =  $\alpha c_{line} + (1 - \alpha)c_{discretized}$  $\Rightarrow \alpha$  varies between 0 and 1

Development of a new Plume-in-Grid model for roadways

Point source formulation Line source formulation Improvement of the line source formulation

#### Line source / discretized source combination



 Briant, R., Korsakissok, I. & Seigneur, C., (2011). An improved line source model for air pollutant dispersion from roadway traffic. *Atmospheric Environment*, 45:4099-4107.

#### **Additional features**

- Romberg integration to model the line source width
- Simple NO<sub>2</sub> chemistry

Simulation set up Comparisons to measurements Comparison to ADMS model

## Simulation set up

## Paris region

- 1371 road sections divided in 5425 segments (831 km).
- NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the European model COPERT3.
- NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations measurement at 242 locations with passive diffusion tubes.
- NO<sub>2</sub>, NO and O<sub>3</sub> background concentrations from on air quality model (Polair3D).
- Meteorological data simulated with the Weather Research and Forecasting model (WRF).

Data provided by the Centre d'Étude technique de l'Équipement (CETE) Nord Picardie, France

Simulation set up Comparisons to measurements Comparison to ADMS model



Scatter plot of measure versus both Polyphemus using the rural option in  $\mu$  g m<sup>-3</sup> (summer campaign on the left and winter campaign on the right).

Simulation set up Comparisons to measurements Comparison to ADMS model

Polyphemus performance indicators (Root Mean Square Error and averaged

concentrations in  $\mu g m^{-3}$ )

Summer	Measurement	Polyphemus
Correlation	1.	0.74
Root Mean Square Error	0.	11.93
Averaged concentrations	26.0	20.7
Mean Normalized Error	0.	0.31
Mean Normalized Bias	0.	-0.2
		l
Winter campaign	Measurement	Polyphemus
Winter campaign Correlation	Measurement 1.	Polyphemus 0.79
Winter campaign Correlation RMSE	Measurement 1. 0.	Polyphemus 0.79 21.59
Winter campaign Correlation RMSE Averaged concentrations	Measurement 1. 0. 40.5	Polyphemus 0.79 21.59 21.6
Winter campaign Correlation RMSE Averaged concentrations Mean Normalized Error	Measurement 1. 0. 40.5 0.	Polyphemus 0.79 21.59 21.6 0.47

Simulation set up Comparisons to measurements Comparison to ADMS model

Performance indicators of Polyphemus and ADMS for the winter campaign only (62

passive tubes only)

	Measurement	Polyphemus	ADMS
Correlation	1.	0.81	0.79
RMSE	0.	18.47	19.12
Averaged concentrations	35.15	19.87	19.4
Mean Normalized Error	0.	0.38	0.4
Mean Normalized Bias	0.	-0.38	0.39

Underestimation of emission by the traffic model in winter.

Uncertainty of measurement

Gaussian model / Eulerian model coupling Results

#### **Plume-In-Grid model**

- Better representation of sources in an Eulerian model
- Coupling between:
  - Gaussian model using line sources  $\Rightarrow$  constant with time
  - Eulerian model (Polair 3d) ⇒ time dependent model
- No discretization of the plume with puffs

Gaussian model / Eulerian model coupling Results



Gaussian model / Eulerian model coupling Results



(a) Polair3D results in  $\mu$ g m<sup>-3</sup>



(b) PinG results in  $\mu g m^{-3}$ 



Development of a new Plume-in-Grid model for roadways

## Conclusion

 Improved line source model, already implemented and available online

(http://cerea.enpc.fr/polyphemus/).

 New Plume-In-Grid model fully implemented and tested on simple cases

## **Ongoing work**

- Use this new model for a longer period
- Compare results with Polair 3d model results



Thank you for your attention.