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ABSTRACT: Ocean going vessels (OGVs) operating within emission control areas (ECA) are required to use fuels with ≤0.1 wt % sulfur. Up to now only distillate fuels could meet the sulfur limits. Recently refiners created a novel low-sulfur heavy-fuel oil (LSHFO) meeting the sulfur limits so questions were posed whether nitric oxide (NOx) and particulate matter (PM) emissions were the same for the two fuels. This project characterized criteria pollutants and undertook a detailed analysis of PM emissions from a very large crude oil carrier (VLCC) using a distillate ECA fuel (MGO) and novel LSHFO. Results showed emission factors of NOx were ∼5% higher with MGO than LSHFO. PM1.5 emission factors were ∼3 times higher with LSHFO than MGO, while both were below values reported by Lloyds, U.S. EPA and CARB. A detailed analysis of PM revealed it was >90% organic carbon (OC) for both fuels. Elemental carbon (EC) and soot measured with an AVL microsoot sensor (MSS) reflected black carbon. PM size distributions showed unimodal peaks for both MGO (20–30 nm) and LSHFO (30–50 nm). Particle number (PN) emissions were 28% and 17% higher with the PPS-M compared to the SMPS for LSHFO and MGO, respectively.

INTRODUCTION

Ocean Going Vessels (OGVs) contribute significantly to port emissions inventories and ∼15% of the global NOx emissions and 5–8% of global SO2 emissions, 1,2 Furthermore, crude oil carriers comprise ∼29% of the worldwide OGV fleet 3 and approximately 40% 4 of the total ship emissions. Corbett at al. estimates that approximately 70% of ship related emissions occur within 400 km of land or port communities. 2 This has significant implications toward pollution and health effects for communities near large port areas. For instance, Corbett et al. 2,4 estimated that PM emissions from ocean going ships contribute to approximately 60 000 deaths from cardiopulmonary and lung related diseases. Similarly, Pope et al. 5,6 determined that PM emissions contribute to respiratory illnesses and death. OGVs are also a major source of NOx emissions, which is a precursor to atmospheric ozone (O3) formation.

While emissions from port on-land activities were being heavily regulated, the percentage of emissions from port activities has increased. 7 MARPOL Annex VI 8 regulates NOx and SO2 emissions from ships, and in 2008, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) adopted a policy limiting the sulfur content of emissions allowed in Emissions Control Areas (ECA), including: The Baltic Sea, North Sea and English Channel, plus the U.S., most of Canada, the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. From first January 2015, every ship operating within ECA had to use fuels with ≤0.1% sulfur content or existing fuels with the installation of a gas cleaning system that removes sulfur from the exhaust.

Although Annex VI does not directly regulate PM mass emissions, the IMO limited the amount of sulfur content in the fuel and at the time of the regulation, only distillate fuels met the strict sulfur limits. Environmentalists and the shipping community generally supported the regulations for the ECA areas and the expected benefits as sulfur levels were reduced from ∼1.5% before 2010 to 0.10% in 2015. Previous studies have shown that PM emissions from engines burning a low-sulfur, distillate fuels were significantly lower when compared with emissions from burning a high-sulfur HFO.

This study provides real world measurements of criteria pollutants and a detailed analysis of the PM and ultrafine particles emitted from a modern, double hull, very large crude oil carrier (VLCC) sailing along the Pacific Coast while burning either a MGO or a low-sulfur HFO (LSHFO), both fuels being ECA-compliant.
## EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

**Vessel and Engine Description.** The OGV platform used in this study was a supertanker/VLCC, which is representative of the 2006+ crude oil tankers. The vessel is approximately 941 feet long, has a dead weight (dwt) of 180,000 to 320,000 MT and carries 1.3 million barrel of crude. The vessel is equipped with four main propulsion diesel-electric MAN B&W 6L48/60, 6.3 MW, medium speed engines resulting in a total power of 25.2 MW at 512 rpm and meeting Tier 1 emissions. Additionally, the engines are equipped with variable injection timing (VIT) for lower NO\textsubscript{x} emissions. In this study, the emissions from MGO were measured from the starboard side engine and the emissions from the LSHFO were measured from the port side engine.

**Fuel Properties.** Selected fuel properties for both fuels are summarized in (Table 1). Both fuels have little sulfur, ash and vanadium. Ash and vanadium were not present in the sample analysis. The main differences in the fuel properties are viscosity, pour point and micro carbon residue (MCR). The LSHFO is a novel fuel that is available on the West Coast and some European ports. This fuel provides ship operators with viscosity, pour point and micro carbon residue (MCR). The emission measurements for the 10% load point were collected to represent typical conditions and are the only results included for PM. The Pegasor Particle Sensor (PPS-M) was used to measure PM. The AVL MSS and the PG-250. For the SMPS a ~6:1 ejector diluter (secondary diluter) was used in conjunction with the primary diluter for a combined dilution ratio of ~72:1. Due to the high dilution and lower limit of the PG-250, the dilution ratio of the secondary dilution tunnel was determined using a flame ionization detector (FID) to measure raw and dilute propane concentrations. The dilution ratios were measured twice at each load condition, before the first and after the third repeat run.

Real-time particulate matter measurements included an AVL model no. 483 Micro Soot Sensor (MSS), which employs a photocoustic method to measure the solid soot fraction of PM. The Pegasor Particle Sensor (PPS-M) was used to characterize both the solid and condensable fractions of total particulate matter mass and number. The PPS-M sensor uses an "escaping current" method where clean air is ionized and mixed with the sample stream thereby charging the particles. The escaping current from the sample is then measured at a fixed flow rate by a Faraday cup. A default trap voltage of 400 V was used for the PPS-M sensor. The manufacturer recommends a trap voltage of 800 V for most accurate PM mass concentrations and 400 V for particle number correlations. Particle size distributions were measured with a scanning mobility particle spectrometer (SMPS) comprised of a TSI model 3080 classifier, 3081 differential mobility analyzer (DMA) and TSI 3776 condensation particle counter (CPC). In conjunction with the primary diluter- partial flow venturi dilution system, a secondary ejector dilution system was added for additional dilution for the SMPS.

**Overall Weighted Emission Factors.** The weighted ISO 8178-E2\textsuperscript{12} cycle emission factors were calculated per equation:

\[
\text{EF}_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \cdot WF_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \cdot WF_i}
\]

where \(\text{EF}_i\) is the weighted mass emission level in g/kWh of each pollutant and \(m_i\) (g/h), WF, and \(p_i\) are the mass emission rate, weighting factor and engine load, respectively, for the \(i\)th operating mode. The ISO-8178 E2 test cycle specifies the steady state load points of 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%. Emissions from the 10% load point were collected to represent
values expected near idle or low VSR speeds; however, these values were not included in the overall emission factors.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Triplicate measurements were made as a function of engine load point and fuel type for the steady-state ISO-8178 E2 test cycle. Standard deviations denote the deviations from the average of triplicate measurements at each load point. Statistical significance was determined by a two-tailed, paired \( t \) test with \( p \approx 0.05 \).

### Table 3. Modal and Weighted Gaseous Emission Factors (g/kWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load (%)</th>
<th>MGO</th>
<th>LSHFO</th>
<th>MGO</th>
<th>LSHFO</th>
<th>MGO</th>
<th>LSHFO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10(^{\circ})</td>
<td>22.8 ± 0.16</td>
<td>15.3 ± 0.50</td>
<td>0.24 ± 0.01</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.53</td>
<td>1192 ± 10</td>
<td>913 ± 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.6 ± 0.05</td>
<td>8.9 ± 0.30</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.30</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.10</td>
<td>746 ± 7</td>
<td>725 ± 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.6 ± 0.06</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.84 ± 0.10</td>
<td>612 ± 4</td>
<td>609 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.5 ± 0.11</td>
<td>10.9 ± 0.11</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.05</td>
<td>662 ± 2</td>
<td>628 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.15</td>
<td>9.8 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.05</td>
<td>632 ± 10</td>
<td>613 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt. avg</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.03</td>
<td>10.2 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>652 ± 2</td>
<td>627 ± 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^{\circ}\)Not included in Wt. Avg. per ISO-8178 E2 cycle.

### Gaseous Emission Factors

The modal and weighted gaseous emission factors of NO\(_x\), CO and CO\(_2\) for both fuels (g/kWh) are shown in Table 3. Overall, both fuels had the highest observed NO\(_x\) emissions at the 10% load point where engines are operating far from their peak efficiencies. NO\(_x\) emission factors (g/kWh) for main engine, medium speed OGVs from previous studies are compared against the current in Table 5. NO\(_x\) emissions for LSHFO and MGO are well below Lloyd's services data,\(^{23}\) U.S. EPA\(^{10}\) and CARB,\(^{11}\) but are similar to the emissions from Celos et al.\(^{25}\) (8.4 ± 0.03 and 10.7 ± 0.04 g/kWh) for IFO60 and MDO. Slight differences were

![Sampling system flow diagram.](Image)
observed in NO\textsubscript{x} emissions between MGO and HFO. MGO emissions were generally seen to exceed LSHFO for all loads (except 75%) resulting in a ∼5% statistically significant increase in the weighted average (MGO: 10.7 ± 0.03 g/kWh, HFO: 10.2 ± 0.03 g/kWh). These differences can be partially accounted for by the fuel density and viscosity, as fuel injection is a volumetric process. In addition, MGO has a slightly higher density (850.9 kg/m\textsuperscript{3}) than LSHFO (845.2 kg/m\textsuperscript{3}); higher density fuels (compared to lower density fuels) have more mass injection per unit volume resulting in higher combustion temperatures and higher thermal NO\textsubscript{x} emissions [24−26].

The CO emissions were low as expected for diesel engines. Celo et al.[23] found CO emissions to be 1.3 ± 0.02 g/kWh for IFO60 and 1.2 ± 0.02 g/kWh for MDO in comparison to 1.1 ±

### Table 5. Comparison of Main Engine Medium Speed Emission Factors with Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>main engines (MSD)</th>
<th>fuel</th>
<th>sulfur (%)</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measured (weighted)</td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSHFO</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>10.2 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds Services data</td>
<td>HFO</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HFO</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celo et al.</td>
<td>IFO60</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.4 ± 0.03</td>
<td>1.31 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.01</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.04</td>
<td>1.22 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Winnes et al. (35% load)&quot;</td>
<td>MDO</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0088 ± 0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HFO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Winnes et al. (25% load)&quot;</td>
<td>MDO</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0068 ± 0.0016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HFO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Winnes et al. (10% load)&quot;</td>
<td>MDO</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018 ± 0.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HFO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Run without thermal denuder (TD).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2. PM Correlations

(a) PPS-M sensor versus PM\textsubscript{2.5} (b) SMPS versus PM\textsubscript{2.5} (c) TC and hydrated sulfate versus PM\textsubscript{2.5} (d) MSS versus EC.
0.08 g/kWh and 0.9 ± 0.06 g/kWh for MGO and HFO respectively. Statistically higher CO emissions with HFO (compared with MGO) were noted at all loads except at the 100% load. This can be attributed to increased combustion efficiency at higher temperatures caused by fuel density and improved atomization with lower viscosity fuels. The CO emission factors are the lowest for both fuels at the 50% load point where these vessels spend most of their time.

**PM Mass Emission Factors.** The modal and weighted PM emission factors measured by off-line gravimetric analysis and real-time PM measured by the PPS-M sensor are summarized in Table 4. The highest emission factors were observed at the 10% load point for LSHFO (3.7 ± 0.13 g/kWh) and MGO (1.2 ± 0.12 g/kWh), which decreased with increasing load. PM emissions (g/kWh) for main engine, medium speed OGVs of residual carbon deposits formed during high internal combustion temperatures will form more PM than lower residue (MCR) of the fuel. Higher fuel sulfur content (LSHFO-to the higher sulfur content, density, viscosity and micro carbon oxidized PM. Fuels with higher viscosity are inherently more difficult to atomize into the piston leading to larger fuel droplets and less complete combustion which results in more PM and CO.9,27,28 In addition, fuels with higher MCR (amount of residual carbon deposits formed during high internal combustion temperatures) will form more PM than lower MCR fuels.29 It is worthy to note that results may vary with the type of engine tested. For example, it is expected that PM will be less for a slow speed engine (compared to medium or high speed engines) due to increased residence time in the combustion chamber and higher injection pressures.

**Measurement Comparison.** Linear regressions in Figure 2 (a) between the PPS-M sensor and PM2.5 measured gravimetrically showed good agreement with $R^2 > 0.99$ for both fuels. PPS-M sensor data was corrected with a custom calibration using size distribution measured from the SMPS (current study) as default calibration is based on size distributions with an average size of 50 nm.30 The weighted emission factors show that real-time PM mass measured by the PPS-M sensor is approximately 39% lower than PM2.5 Teflon mass for HFO and 57% lower with MGO. Previous studies31 have shown the PPS-M sensor to exhibit lower PM mass compared to filter based methods. These differences may be attributed to differences in measurement methods. PM filter collection followed ISO-8178 sampling protocol where the diluted sample stream is maintained at a temperature of <52 °C before the filters. Species collected on these filters include solid and semivolatiles. The PPS-M Sensor measures PM at 200 °C while only measuring the solid and some of the volatile species. At these higher temperatures, the PPS-M sensor will not measure the same volatile species collected on the Teflon filters. Amanatidis et al.30,31 stated from Giechaskiel et al. that heating the PPS-M sensor to 200 °C only partially removes the semivolatile and volatile species. It was concluded that the PPS-M sensor should lie between the AVL MSS and the PM measured gravimetrically.

Figure 2 (b) shows the linear regressions of the PM mass measured from the SMPS versus the PM2.5 gravimetric mass. Both methods show good agreement as a function of fuel type with $R^2 > 0.99$. For the weighted emission factors, PM mass measured by the SMPS is approximately 46% lower than gravimetric PM2.5 for LSHFO and 74% lower with MGO. This can be attributed to evaporation due to the high dilution ratios with the SMPS. The sample was diluted at approximately 72:1 before entering the SMPS. The ratio of PM mass calculated from the SMPS and measured gravimetrically for both fuels was compared (Figure 3). This ratio known as the “density correction factor” is the density needed for the SMPS PM mass to equate to the gravimetric PM mass. As the peak mass diameter from the SMPS decreases from HFO to MGO, the density correction factor increases. At smaller diameters (MGO), more evaporation occurs at these high dilution ratios. Previous studies32,33 have shown that dilution ratio can significantly influence PM mass measurements. Ristimaki et al.33 looked at the effects of dilution ratio on PM mass for a light fuel oil (LFO) and a HFO. They determined that at a dilution ratio above 40:1, PM measurements approached results of EPA Method 17 commonly used for stationary source measurements while PM mass was sensitive to changes in lower dilution ratios. At high dilution ratios, less condensable species are available for particle growth and formation due to evaporation and only the solid particles remain. This was similarly observed with the SMPS mass (Figure 2 (d)) which showed lower mass than the PM2.5 filter measurements. This can be attributed to the high dilution ratios used with the SMPS compared to the PM2.5 gravimetric filter samples.

**PM Constituents.** The modal and weighted emission factors for PM constituents: EC, OC, hydrated sulfate and real-time black carbon measured by the AVL MSS are summarized in Table 4. Overall, EC/OC ratios were very low ranging from 0.02 to 0.05 for HFO and from 0.03 to 0.14 for MGO, which was consistent with those measured in past studies with similar fuels.11 The sum of EC, organic matter (OM) and hydrated sulfate can be compared to the total PM2.5 measured gravimetrically on Teflon filters. The organic mass was estimated.
by multiplying the OC by a factor of 1.234 to account for the oxygen and hydrogen bound to the carbon. This comparison is possible as there is little ash and metals in both fuels, limiting their overall contribution to noncarbon PM$_{2.5}$. Linear regressions (Figure 2(c)) for both fuels show good agreement (slope = 0.83$^{\text{HFO}}$ and slope = 0.92$^{\text{MGO}}$) resulting in good correlations $R^2 > 0.99$.

The correlation between EC collected on quartz filters and analyzed by the NIOSH method and soot measured in real-time by the photoacoustic method AVL MSS are shown in Figure 2(d). For both HFO and MGO fuels, the resulting linear regressions show good agreement (slope = 1.01$^{\text{HFO}}$ and slope = 1.03$^{\text{MGO}}$) with excellent $R^2$ values > 0.99. Kamboures et al. measured an $R^2$ of 0.86 for the AVL MSS versus EC determined by the IMPROVE_A method, while Khan et al. measured an $R^2$ of 0.88 for PM measured by the AVL MSS.

Particle Size Distributions and Particle Number Emission Factors. Particle size distributions (Figure 4) measured by the SMPS for HFO show peak number concentrations at diameters ranging from 30 to 50 nm, compared to 20–30 nm with MGO. Error bars denote the standard deviation from the average of the triplicate load point repeats. At each repeat, the SMPS produced four scans. Previous research conducted by Kasper et al. showed size distributions for MGO from approximately 40 nm at 100% load to 25 nm at 10% load. They found that at 1% load HFO showed larger mean particle diameters than MGO, whereas at 100% load MGO showed larger mean particle diameters than HFO. Lyyränen et al. found peak number concentrations for HFO at approximately 40–45 nm independent of the load. Figure 4 shows the particle number and particle mass concentrations corrected for dilution ratio as a function of load and fuel type. For LSHFO, the 10% and 25% modes show similar concentrations at 30 nm compared to similar concentrations at 20 nm for the 50–100% load points. The increase in PM mass concentrations with decreasing load points for MGO and LSHFO in Figure 4(b, d) are consistent with the PM mass results in Table 4. For MGO, peak mass concentrations ranged from 41 and 39 nm with 10% and 25% load points compared to 33 nm with the 50%, 75%, and 100% load points. As the mass is proportional to the $D_p^3$, the 10% and 25% load points have the highest PM mass followed by the 50–100% load points, agreeing well with the PM$_{2.5}$ gravimetric mass in Table 4. For LSHFO, the peak mass diameters occur at 62 and 57 nm for 10% and 25% load points followed by 50 nm for the 50% and 75% load points and 46 nm with the 100% load point. Similar to MGO, these trends follow the gravimetric PM$_{2.5}$ in Table 4.

Total particle number emissions for the SMPS and PPS-M sensor are shown in Figure 5. The total particle number from the SMPS was determined by integrating the number concentration from the size distributions. Particle size distributions measured by Winnes et al. with HFO shows higher peak number concentrations at $\sim 1 \times 10^{11}$ particles/cm$^3$ for the 10% and 25% loads and $\sim 1 \times 10^9$ particles/cm$^3$ for the 35% load compared to the current study. Compared to Winnes et al., PN measured with the SMPS for HFO was almost an order of magnitude lower (at 25% load without a thermal denuder) and $\sim 40\%$ lower with the PPS-M sensor (at 25% load with a thermal denuder). Differences may be attributed to the higher aromatic content, viscosity, PAHs, sulfur and trace metals in the HGO fuel used in Winnes et al. Overall, the particle number for the PPS-M sensor compared to the integrated SMPS number is 28% higher with LSHFO and 17% higher with MGO. Differences in particle number between the PPS-M sensor and the SMPS are statistically significant for both fuels (except LSHFO at 10% load). As mentioned earlier in the experimental methods, the SMPS...
The PPS-M sensor was measured directly from the partial ejector diluter as the second stage of dilution (72:1 dilution). nucleation.41 Similar to this study, previous studies30,42 with the therefore less species will be available for heterogeneous particle conversions will be the dominant mode of growth. Higher dilution ratios will suppress particle growth and (50 nm) size range is very sensitive to changes in dilution °

The body of the sensor was maintained at 250 °C to sample PM, whereas condensation. This is compared to thermophoretic losses and condensation. This is compared to differences in measurement methodology, sampling parameters and sampling location. Real-time PM measurements should be used to supplement regulatory PM filter methods and characterize emissions trends in real-time.

In regards to policy considerations, the LSHFO is a viable alternative to conventional HFO with ~25% reduction in NOx emissions and ~50% reduction in PM mass emissions. Results suggest that PN emissions are lower than those of higher sulfur HFO fuels. Refs 24, 25, 26.
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Figure 5. Particle number emissions for HFO and MGO fuels.