

Impact of Fuel Quality Regulation and Speed Reductions on Shipping Emissions: Implications for Climate and Air Quality

Journal:	<i>Environmental Science & Technology</i>
Manuscript ID:	es-2011-013424.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Lack, Dan; NOAA, Earth System Science Laboratory Cappa, Christopher; University of California - Davis, Civil and Environmental Engineering Langridge, Justin; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory Bahreini, Roya; CU CIRES- NOAA ESRL, Chemical Sciences Division Buffaloe, Gina; University of California - Davis, Civil and Environmental Engineering Brock, Chuck; NOAA; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory Cerully, Kate; Georgia Tech, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Coffman, Derek; NOAA PMEL Hayden, Katherine; York University, Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry and Chemistry Department Holloway, John; NOAA/ESRL/CSD Lerner, Brian; NOAA ESRL, CSD Massoli, Paola; Aerodyne Research Li, Shao-Meng; Environment Canada; York University, Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry and Chemistry Department McLaren, Robert; York University, Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry and Chemistry Department Middlebrook, Ann; NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Chemical Sciences Division Moore, Richard; Georgia Tech, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Nenes, Athanasios; Georgia Tech, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Nuaaman, Ibraheem; York University, Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry and Chemistry Department Onasch, Timothy; Aerodyne Research Peischl, Jeff; CU CIRES- NOAA ESRL, Chemical Sciences Division Perring, Anne; CU CIRES- NOAA ESRL, Chemical Sciences Division Quinn, Patricia; NOAA PMEL Ryerson, Thomas; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory Schwarz, Joshua; NOAA/CIRES Spackman, Ryan; CU CIRES- NOAA ESRL, Chemical Sciences Division</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Wofsy, Steven; Harvard University Worsnop, Douglas; Aerodyne Research Xiang, Bin; Harvard University Williams, E.J.; NOAA/ESRL/CSD7

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Impact of Fuel Quality Regulation and Speed Reductions on Shipping Emissions: Implications for Climate and Air Quality

Daniel A. Lack^{1,2*}, Christopher D. Cappa³, Justin Langridge^{1,2}, Roya Bahreni^{1,2}, Gina Buffaloe³, Charles Brock¹, Kate Cerully⁴, Derek Coffman⁵, Katherine Hayden⁶, John Holloway¹, Brian Lerner^{1,2}, Paola Massoli⁷, Shao-Meng Li⁶, Robert McLaren⁸, Ann M. Middlebrook¹, Richard Moore⁴, Athanasios Nenes^{4,9}, Ibraheem Nuaanan^{6,8}, Timothy B. Onasch⁷, Jeff Peischl^{1,2}, Anne Perring^{1,2}, Patricia K. Quinn⁵, Tom Ryerson¹, Joshua P. Schwartz^{1,2}, Ryan Spackman^{1,2}, Steven C. Wofsy¹⁰, Doug Worsnop⁷, Bian Xiang¹⁰, and Eric Williams^{1,2}

¹NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Boulder, CO, USA

²University of Colorado, CIRES, Boulder, CO, USA

³Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

⁴School of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

⁵NOAA Pacific Marine Environment Laboratory, Seattle, WA, USA.

⁶Air Quality Research Division, Environment Canada, 4905 Dufferin St., Toronto, Canada

⁷Aerodyne Research Inc., Billerica, Massachusetts, USA

⁸Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry, York University, 4700 Keele St., Toronto, Canada

⁹Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

¹⁰Department of Earth and Planetary Science, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Abstract

Atmospheric emissions of gas and particulate matter from a large ocean-going container vessel were sampled as it slowed and switched from high-sulfur to low-sulfur fuel as it transited into regulated coastal waters of California. Reduction in emission factors (EFs) of sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter, particulate sulfate and cloud condensation nuclei were substantial (≥90%). EFs for particulate organic matter decreased by 70%. Black carbon (BC) EFs were reduced by 41%. When the measured emission reductions, brought about by compliance with the California fuel quality regulation and participation in the vessel speed reduction (VSR) program, are placed in a broader context, warming from reductions in the indirect effect of SO₄ would dominate any radiative changes due to the emissions changes. Within regulated waters absolute emission reductions exceed 88% for almost all measured gas and particle phase species. The analysis presented provides direct estimations of the emissions reductions that can be realized by California fuel quality regulation and VSR program, in addition to providing new information relevant to potential health and climate impact of reduced fuel sulfur content, fuel quality and vessel speed reductions.

1. Introduction

Regulations on the atmospheric emissions from the transportation sector are motivated by the desire to reduce emissions of ozone (O_3)-forming chemicals, particulate matter (PM), acid rain- and PM-forming sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and other emissions harmful to human health and welfare. Regulation of fuel quality (sulfur, ash or aromatic hydrocarbon content) is one of several approaches that can be used to achieve reductions in these harmful emissions [1]. Commercial shipping has had limited fuel quality (or emissions) regulation until recently, even though the shipping industry emits (globally) 3 times more SO_2 than road traffic [2]. Commercial shipping, although fuel-efficient, mostly consumes low-quality residual fuel (or heavy fuel oil, HFO), which can have fuel sulfur content (S_F) exceeding 3 or 4% (by weight) [3], contain elevated concentrations of heavy metals [4] and emit significantly more PM (SO_4 , particulate organic matter (POM) and black carbon (BC)) than more refined fuels [5].

In recent years, the contribution of commercial shipping to air pollution has been recognized as significant [e.g. 6]. In 2005 the International Maritime Organization (IMO) introduced a global cap to S_F of 4.5% (reducing to 3.5% in 2012 and 0.5% by 2020) [7], motivated by PM reductions for air quality improvements that reductions in sulfur emissions are expected to achieve. Emission control areas (ECAs) have been established through the IMO in the North and Baltic seas to improve regional air quality. These ECAs require consumption of fuels with $S_F < 1.0\%$ [8, 9]. In 2009 the US state of California introduced regulations that limit S_F consumed within 44.5 kilometers (km) of the Californian coast, which require the use of marine gas oil (MGO) or marine diesel oil (MDO) with a maximum S_F of 1.5% or 0.5% respectively (by January 2012 S_F must be $< 0.1\%$ [10]). In 2010 the IMO designated waters within 370 km of the United States and Canadian coast lines as an ECA requiring $S_F < 1\%$ by August 2011, reducing to 0.1% in January 2015 [11]. Expected benefits from the future global IMO regulations amount to ~41,200 avoided premature deaths annually (for 2012) [12], while up to 8,000 avoided premature deaths per year are expected as a result of the future North American ECA regulation (for 2020) [13].

1
2
3 Consideration of the climate impacts of such regulatory changes has begun only recently. SO₄ emissions have
4 a cooling effect on climate due to both light scattering by the particles (direct radiative effect) and from the
5 cloud-forming and modifying ability of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN, indirect radiative effects). *Eyring et*
6 *al.* [14] estimated the combined direct and indirect radiative forcing (RF) from shipping related SO₄ emissions
7 to be -0.44 W m⁻² (for 2005, globally averaged), with 90% of this from indirect effects. Concurrent emissions
8 of other species (CO₂, O₃ precursors and BC), were estimated to have a net warming effect of +0.07 Wm⁻².
9 These forcings are global averages of the effect of both short-lived (e.g. PM) and long-lived (e.g. CO₂)
10 forcing agents and have different spatial and temporal impacts [15]. Currently, there are no expectations that
11 BC emissions will be reduced due to fuel sulfur regulations (CO₂ emissions may decrease slightly due to
12 higher energy content of the more refined fuels), so IMO regulations are expected to decrease the net climate
13 cooling from shipping emissions [16].
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The newly-regulated coastal waters of California provide an opportunity to measure the influence of fuel
30 quality regulation and speed reduction incentive programs on the magnitudes of emissions. These
31 measurements will shed light on the potential air quality and climate effects of the impending regional and
32 global fuel quality regulation, and possible vessel speed reduction (VSR) programs. In previous studies [5, 17]
33 we showed that correlations between some shipping emissions (e.g. SO₄, CCN) and S_F are observable in real-
34 world operations. The variability around these correlations is largely due to inter-ship variations in operating
35 conditions, making a quantitative assessment of the potential impacts of fuel quality regulations challenging.
36 The analysis of *Winnes and Fridel* [18] supports our assessment of previous data, suggesting that detailed
37 characterization of emission factors from a single engine (or vessel) switching between high and low sulfur
38 fuel is required (ideally on multiple vessels) to more accurately assess the impact of regulations on emissions.
39 Here we provide emission factor comparisons from a container vessel where total exhaust emissions were
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measured as the vessel slowed and switched from high to low sulfur fuel near and within the California
4
5 regulated waters during the 2010 CalNEX field campaign (<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/csd/calnex/>).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2. Fuel Switch Experiment and Measurement of Emission Factors

Experiment Details

On the 21st of May, 2010, in collaboration with the Maersk Line shipping company, the NOAA *WP-3D* research aircraft [19] intercepted the *Margrethe Maersk (MM)* vessel on its way to the Port of Los Angeles, prior to the vessel starting the fuel switching procedure required by California state law (Figure 1a). The *MM* is a 371 meter, 96500 tonne container vessel running a 12 cylinder, 68.7 megawatt (MW) main diesel engine (3, 3.8 MW auxiliary engines). The *MM* was consuming HFO containing 3.15% sulfur and 0.05% ash (by weight) before a gradual blending of MGO containing 0.07% sulfur and <0.01% ash occurred over an 60 minute period just outside California regulated waters [20]. On average, 60% of emissions were from the main engine, 10% from the auxiliary engines and 30% from boilers [20] (all engines switched fuels). The *MM* also participated in the Californian VSR incentive program [23], changing speed across the fuel switch operation (22 knots prior and 12 knots after). These speed changes and differences in the relative fuel consumption between engines complicates the interpretation of results (discussed in more detail below). The emissions reductions reported here are due to both compliance with regulation (3.15% down to 1.5% S_F) as well as the choice of the vessel operator to use MGO with lower S_F than required by regulation (1.5% down to 0.07% S_F).

The *WP-3D* sampled the emissions plume of the *MM* before and during the fuel switching operation at approximately 100 meters above sea level, 1 – 3 kilometers downwind of the vessel (2 – 5 min). These times downwind are insufficient for significant atmospheric processing of SO_2 , SO_4 , BC or POM [5, 17, 21, 22]. Due to aircraft operational issues the flight was aborted before sampling of low S_F emissions could occur. Four days later (24th May, 2010) the NOAA-sponsored Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute research vessel *R/V Atlantis* sampled the *MM* emissions 2.5 – 7.5 minutes after emission while within the low-sulfur regulated zone (shown in figures as a triangle data point). The *R/V Atlantis* sample inlet was approximately 15 meters

1
2
3 ASL. A direct inter-comparison between *WP-3D* and *R/V Atlantis* instrumentation was not possible during the
4
5 campaign. The supplemental material contains details of common calibrations used between instruments on
6
7 both platforms. Due to these common calibrations we assume that measurements on both platforms are
8
9 equally accurate to within the stated uncertainties. Calculation of emissions changes before and after the
10
11 experiment therefore include these uncertainties.
12
13
14
15
16

17 ***Instrumentation***

19
20 Measurements taken onboard the NOAA *WP-3D* research aircraft and the *R/V Atlantis* included
21
22 concentrations of CO₂, SO₂, SO₄, POM, BC, particle number (N_{Tot}) and CCN as well as particle size
23
24 distributions (note: NO_x data was not available for this analysis). Measurement techniques, uncertainties and
25
26 references are provided in supplemental material (Table S1). PM₁ mass is estimated as the sum of BC, SO₄
27
28 and POM mass. CCN are reported at a super saturation (SS) of 0.3%, a SS relevant for pristine stratocumulus
29
30 and trade-wind cumulus clouds [e.g. 24]. We determined emission factors (EF: amount emitted per kilogram
31
32 of fuel burnt) by first determining the ratio between the integrated areas of the data of the plume intercepts for
33
34 the species of interest and CO₂. An example plume encounter from the *WP-3D* is shown in Figure 1b. The
35
36 average of CO₂ integrated areas from two independent measurement methods were used for *WP-3D* data.
37
38 Maximum difference between the integrated areas of the two methods was 10% = CO₂ plume integration
39
40 uncertainty. The measured emission ratios are converted to EFs according to *Williams et al.* [22] and *Lack et*
41
42 *al.* [5]. Instrument and CO₂ plume integration (10%) uncertainties are propagated through the calculation of
43
44 the EF. Background pollutant levels and plume dilution/mixing are inherently accounted for via normalization
45
46 of the emission to the measured CO₂ concentration. EFs are missing for some plume intercepts due to
47
48 instrument filter or calibration periods. Engine load as a fraction of maximum load (f_{Load}) was estimated from
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the vessel speed (as load ~ speed³ [25]) recorded from the regular Automated Information System (AIS) radio
4
5 broadcasts from the *MM*, where the maximum vessel speed is 25 knots.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1, a) Map showing section of California fuel sulfur regulation zone (dashed grey), course of the sampled MM for both inbound and outbound days (solid and dashed Red), the flight track of the NOAA WP-3D aircraft (black) and the track of the R/V Atlantis (solid grey). Red triangles mark the

approximate location of the start and end of the fuel switch on the inbound journey (reported by Maersk). b) Example plume data for SO₂ (blue), SO₄ (red) and CO₂ (black).

3. Results

Summary of Emissions

A summary of EFs and a comparison across the experiment is presented in Table 1. Detailed discussion is presented in the sections that follow. As the *MM* transitioned from high sulfur to low sulfur fuel and slowed, EFs for SO₂, SO₄ and CCN dropped by 91%, 97% and 97.5% respectively. PM, POM and BC EFs dropped by 90%, 71% and 41% respectively. EF_{NTOT} change was variable and possibly increased after the fuel switch was complete. The various PM EFs for the *MM* prior to the fuel switch fall within the range of values observed in the comprehensive study by *Lack et al.* [5], although the POM and BC prior to the fuel switch are about 1/3 of the reported averages (Table 1). Measured PM EFs also compare well to other studies utilizing high *S_F* fuels [e.g. 4, 18, 26, 27-29].

Table 1, Summary of Emission Factors Measured from the *MM* Outside and Within Regulated Waters

Fuel or Emission Component	Before Fuel Switch (Outside Regulated Waters)		After Fuel Switch (Within Regulated Waters)		Unit	% Change
Fuel Sulfur (<i>S_F</i> – Reported)¹	3.15		0.07		%	-98%
Fuel Sulfur (<i>S_F</i> – Calculated)²	2.6 (±0.4)		0.21 (±0.03)		%	-92%
Sulfur	25.6 (±4)		2.1 (±0.3)		g kg ⁻¹	-92%
SO₂	49 (±7.5)		4.3 (±0.6)		g kg ⁻¹	-91%
	<i>Measured</i>	<i>Lack et. al.(2009)⁴</i>	<i>Measured</i>	<i>Lack et. al.(2009)⁵</i>		
SO₄	2.94 (±1.0)	1.5 (±1.6)	0.08 (±0.03)	0.06 (±0.05)	g kg ⁻¹	-97%
POM	0.58 (±0.2)	1.5 (±1.0)	0.17 (±0.06)	0.9 (±1.2)	g kg ⁻¹	-71%
BC	0.22 (±0.09)	0.7 (±0.8)	0.13 (±0.05)	1.1 (±0.8)	g kg ⁻¹	-41%
PM³	3.77 (±1.3)	3.0 (±1.7)	0.39 (±0.14)	1.8 (±1.4)	g kg ⁻¹	-90%
<i>N_{Tot}</i>	1.0x10 ¹⁶ (±0.2x10 ¹⁶)	1.4x10 ¹⁶ (±1.0x10 ¹⁶)	1.4x10 ¹⁶ (±0.2x10 ¹⁶)	1.0 x10 ¹⁶ (±0.7x10 ¹⁶)	# kg ⁻¹	+40%
CCN (<i>SS</i> = 0.3%)	4.0x10 ¹⁵ (±0.4x10 ¹⁵)	2.4 x10 ¹⁵ (±2.0 x10 ¹⁵)	0.1 x10 ¹⁵ (±0.01x10 ¹⁵)	0.2x10 ¹⁶ (±0.1 x10 ¹⁵)	# kg ⁻¹	-97.5%
CCN / <i>N_{Tot}</i>	40 (±10)	34 (±27)	0.7 (±0.2)	7.4 (±6.0)	%	-98%

<i>SO₄ / Sulfur</i>	4.1 (±0.7)	3.9 (±1.4)	1.2 (±0.2)	1.4 (±1.1)	%	-71%
---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---	------

¹ Provided by the Maersk.

² Calculated from $EF_S / 10$ [26]

³ Sum of SO_4 , POM and BC. Does not include SO_4 -bound water or ash.

⁴ Average and standard deviation EF_S from vessels using $>0.5\%$ S_F from Lack et al. [5].

⁵ Average and standard deviation EF_S from vessels using $<0.5\%$ S_F from Lack et al. [5].

Sulfur Dioxide Emissions

Compliance with the fuel sulfur regulation provides direct and large reductions in EF_{SO_2} of 91% (Figure 2a). Some fuel sulfur is directly emitted as SO_3 (and quickly forms SO_4) [5, 28] and so EF_{SO_4} and EF_{SO_2} are combined (accounting for stoichiometry) to determine an EF of total sulfur (EF_S). S_F as estimated from EF_S ($S_F \approx EF_S/10$ [26]) changed from 2.6% (HFO) to 0.2% (MGO) across the fuel switch. Maersk records indicate that S_F of the fuels dropped from 3.15% HFO to 0.07% MGO (98% drop). The source of this discrepancy is unknown, however several groups [18, 30] have observed discrepancies (of up to 0.5%) between the S_F reported in the fuel analysis and that calculated from emission measurements. Nonetheless, it is clear EF_{SO_2} is strongly correlated to S_F and we anticipate an equivalent reduction in secondary SO_4 produced from downwind oxidation of SO_2 . We fit the general trend in EF_S vs plume encounter (black line, Figure 2a) and estimate an S_F for each plume encounter from this fit, which is used as the x-axes for Figures 2b – 3.

Particulate Sulfate Emissions

EF_S of directly emitted SO_4 decreased by 97% during the experiment (Figure 2b). The fraction of total sulfur emitted as SO_4 [31] is 3.5% at high S_F ($f_{Load} = 0.7$) and 1.2% at low S_F ($f_{Load} = 0.1$) (Figure 2d). The observed variation in the SO_4 fraction with f_{Load} is in excellent agreement with the results of Petzold et al. [28] (grey line Figure 2d), although the f_{Load} effect does not account for the entire change observed. Therefore both S_F and f_{Load} contribute to the 97% reduction in EF_{SO_4} .




Figure 2, a) EF_{SO_2} and EF_S , b) EF_{SO_4} , c) EF_{CCN} @ 0.3% SS during fuel switching operation and d) fraction of fuel sulfur converted to SO_4 versus engine load. Grey line is the trend of previous data from Petzold et al. [28]. Note: Figure 2a uses a 3rd order polynomial fit $EF_S = -0.1 + -0.16x + 25.6x^2$

Cloud Condensation Nuclei, Particle Number Emissions and Particle Size

EF_{CCN} are strongly correlated with EF_{SO_4} and were reduced by almost 98% across the experiment (Figure 2c). The ratio between EF_{CCN} and EF_{NTot} (f_{CCN}) gives an indicator of the efficacy of an emitted particle towards CCN formation and decreases from $f_{CCN} = 0.4$ to 0.007 (98% reduction). The ability of a given particle to act as a CCN (at a given %SS) depends on both the particle composition and size. Additionally, the ability of particles within a size distribution to act as CCN depends on the extent of internal vs. external mixing. The composition effect on hygroscopicity can be approximately characterized assuming complete internal mixing, through calculation of the effective “Kappa” parameter (κ_{eff}) from the observations as:

$$\kappa_{eff} = \sum_i \left(\frac{V_i}{V_{tot}} \right) \kappa_i = \sum_i \left(\frac{m_i \rho_{tot}}{m_{tot} \rho_i} \right) \kappa_i = \sum_i \left(\frac{EF_i \rho_{tot}}{EF_{tot} \rho_i} \right) \kappa_i \quad (\text{Eqn 1})$$

where V_x is volume, m_x is mass, ρ_x is density and κ_i is the species-specific hygroscopicity of species i (or of the total) [32]. We use $\rho_i = 1.7, 1.3$ and 1.8 g/cm^3 and $\kappa_i = 0.9, 0.1$ and 0.0 for SO_4 (from H_2SO_4), POM and BC, respectively [33]. Because the EFs for SO_4 , POM and BC all decrease with decreasing fuel sulfur, the calculated κ_{eff} does not change nearly as dramatically as either the observed EF_{CCN} or the f_{CCN} . In fact, κ_{eff} is stable around $0.68 - 0.73$ for all encounters, with the exception of the *R/V Atlantis* encounter, when S_F was minimum, where κ_{eff} drops to 0.2 . Thus it appears that the consistent decrease in EF_{CCN} and f_{CCN} with S_F is, in general, not being driven by changes to the particle composition despite the fact that the absolute EF_{SO_4} decreases continuously. Measured size distributions (Figure 3b) show that the median particle size decreased concurrent with the decrease in EF_{SO_4} (number-weighted particle diameter decreased from 60nm to 36nm). The calculated critical dry diameter for CCN activation of particles with the observed κ_{eff} at 0.3% SS is 60nm [32], which is consistent with the observation of $f_{CCN} = 40\%$ for the high S_F emissions. For a change in κ_{eff} to 0.2 , the critical dry diameter at 0.3% SS would increase to about 90nm . The combination of the decrease in particle size and the sudden drop in κ_{eff} leads to the very low f_{CCN} for the lowest S_F intercept. The measured reduction in EF_{CCN} during the experiment therefore results primarily from changes to the particle size distribution (which most likely result from changes in f_{Load}), but for the lowest S_F (and f_{Load}) both composition and size changes play a role. Similar to our results, for a test engine operating on HFO, *Petzold et al.* [28] observed a slight shift towards smaller particle sizes as f_{Load} was decreased (most notable at lower f_{Load}).

The EF_{NTot} do not show a strong dependence on S_F (Figure 3a). *Lack et al.* [5] showed reductions in EF_{NTot} between vessels burning high and low sulfur fuel, whereas *Winnes and Fridell* [18] report that the number of smaller particles may increase as S_F decreases. As shown in *Lack et al.* [5] these small particles quickly condense onto the larger particles, therefore although initial emissions of N_{Tot} may increase, the atmospheric

lifetime is shorter than the larger particles. *Petzold et al.* [28] found that EF_{NTot} increased by a factor of 1.65 as f_{Load} decreased from 85% to 50%. The variability across these studies suggest that N_{Tot} emissions are dependent on engine operating parameters including f_{Load} and S_F .




Figure 3, a) EF_{NTOT} during experiment, b) average size distributions (and log-normal fits) before and after the experiment, and median diameter (\otimes) evolution c) EF_{POM} and d) EF_{BC} during the experiment. For the lowest S_F EF_{BC} (*R/V Atlantis* intercept), three data points of almost identical magnitude are plotted (SP2 and two PAS instruments).

Particulate Organic Matter Emissions

Reductions in EF_{POM} (up to 71%) were observed across the experiment (Figure 3c). This reduction may be explained through two factors. First, the refining process for HFO concentrates aromatic and longer chain hydrocarbons, which have delayed burn times in some engines [34]. Thus, the higher POM emissions from

1
2
3 high S_F likely result, in part, from the incomplete combustion of the aromatic and long chain hydrocarbons at
4
5 high S_F . Second, there is larger consumption (and emission) of lubricating oils when HFO is used. However,
6
7 short-term use of distillate fuels does not always require lubrication oil changes [35] and the *MM* did not alter
8
9 the lube-oil regime for this fuel switch [20]. *Petzold et al.* [28] did not show any link between POM and f_{Load}
10
11 for a single test-engine operating on HFO while *Lack et al.* [5] observed a clear correlation between POM and
12
13 S_F . This suggests that the POM reductions observed in Figure 3c are likely due to organic composition
14
15 changes within the fuel, which correlate to S_F .
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ***Black Carbon Emissions***

23
24 EFs of BC appeared to decline across the experiment, although measurement uncertainties indicate a range
25
26 from 30 to 70% (average of 41%) (Figure 3d). Some measurements of BC were below instrument detection
27
28 limits despite having measurable CO₂ enhancements (the reason for which is currently unknown). To our
29
30 knowledge there are no published data that would suggest reductions in S_F should decrease EF_{BC}. However it
31
32 has been observed that reductions in slow burning aromatic hydrocarbons within jet turbine fuels reduces BC
33
34 emissions from these engines [36]. Ash, aromatic and long chain hydrocarbon compounds, which are
35
36 concentrated in HFO, are decreased in refined MGO. We suggest that reduction in these components
37
38 decreases the concentration of flame quenching nuclei, which decreases BC formation.
39
40
41
42

43 The results of *Righi et al.* [2] suggest that BC emissions are reduced for cleaner fuels (MGO, biodiesel)
44
45 relative to HFO. However, recent studies by *Agrawal et al.* [37] (in-use vessel running HFO) and *Petzold et*
46
47 *al.* [28] (medium speed diesel (MSD) engine running HFO) showed EF_{BC} increased 1.5 – 3 times respectively
48
49 when f_{Load} changed from 0.7 to 0.1. While there is a net gain to vessel speed reduction (VSR) in terms of
50
51 increased fuel efficiency (which acts to reduce *absolute* emissions of CO₂, SO₂ and PM, given a constant EF),
52
53 an increase in the emission *factors* of BC may actually offset some of the fuel efficiency gains. If the results
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of *Petzold et al.* [28] and *Agrawal et al.* [37] are applicable to this experiment, the observed decrease in EF_{BC} (Figure 3d) is a lower limit in overall BC reductions due to the change in fuel quality. Alternatively, other results for show MSD engines burning low sulfur MGO suggest that EF_{BC} may increase [38, 39]. Fuel efficiency gains to absolute BC emissions would then be enhanced by concurrent reductions in the EF_{BC} , and thus the influence of the fuel quality regulations alone on EF_{BC} would be smaller than shown in Figure 2d. Given that the observations in this study and those of *Petzold et al.* [28] and *Agrawal et al.* [37] were for engines or vessels burning HFO, it seems reasonable that the BC reductions observed here are linked to S_F rather than f_{Load} . Certainly more detailed investigation is necessary. Nonetheless, the overall effect of the fuel quality regulation and the VSR program appears to be a decrease in both EF_{BC} and absolute BC emissions. Any BC reduction due to improved fuel quality in ships will provide additional benefits for air quality although may have an uncertain impact of climate (see climate discussion below). Use of higher quality fuels by ships in the Arctic may result in less BC deposition to snow and ice (compared to the use of low quality fuels) resulting in positive climate benefits in that region [40].

4. Discussion

Information Relevant to Impacts of Regional Regulation

On a per-kilometer (km) basis, emissions of most gas and particle pollutants from the *MM* dropped significantly once the *MM* entered the region where it is required to be in compliance with the California regulations. Figure 4 (and Table S2) summarizes the emissions for a km of travel outside and inside the regulated waters, calculated from the emission factors presented in Table 1. Estimates of fuel consumption by the *MM* at the speeds traveled inside and outside of the regulated waters were calculated using equation 2 and data obtained from the Maersk [20]:

$$C_{Fuel} (kg hr^{-1}) = F_{cons} \times 1000 P_{MW} \times f_{Load} \quad (\text{Eqn. 2})$$

where

$$F_{cons}(\text{kgkw.hr}^{-1}) = 0.0142 \times \left(\frac{1}{f_{Load}} \right) + 0.195 \quad (\text{Eqn. 3})$$

The engine manufacturer literature suggests that a new engine of the type installed on the *MM* has a fuel consumption rate (F_{Cons}) at maximum load of $0.17 \text{ kg (kw.hr)}^{-1}$ although $0.195 \text{ kg (kw.hr)}^{-1}$ is estimated to be an appropriate average value for in-use slow speed diesel engines [41]. F_{Cons} varies with engine load according to equation 3 [42]. F_{Cons} for MGO is reduced by 6% due to the specific heat of MGO being 6% higher than HFO on this vessel [20]. P_{MW} is the maximum engine power in megawatts (68.7 MW). These data were converted to kilograms of fuel consumed per-kilometer (km) of travel, which were then converted to per-km emissions by multiplying C_{Fuel} with the measured EFs.

For all but CO_2 , BC and N_{Tot} , pollutant levels drop by 88% or more (58% for CO_2 , 75% for BC and 41% for N_{Tot}) as a result of the vessel observing both the fuel quality regulation and VSR program (Figure 4). Note that most CO_2 reductions arise from the change in f_{Load} . Importantly, we can differentiate some of the emissions reductions by the effects of the fuel quality regulation or VSR program. To make this assessment, we have assumed that the observed EF reductions for SO_2 and POM are due entirely to the S_F change. At high f_{Load} SO_4 formation is 2.9 times higher than at low f_{Load} (Figure 2d and *Petzold et al.* [28]) and this load factor is removed from SO_4 emissions by multiplying the low- S_F , low-load EF_{SO_4} by 2.9. It is apparent that the emissions of BC, N_{Tot} and CCN are complicated by S_F and f_{Load} and we do not separate by regulation for these species. Note that this analysis is specific to the *MM*, which was in compliance with the fuel quality regulation and was participating in the VSR program. We reiterate that these results are a snapshot for a single vessel with changing fuel type, fuel consumption distributions across main, auxiliary and boiler engines, and changing speed. Although these factors introduce uncertainty for detailed emissions analysis, the trends for the averaged vessel emissions are evident.




Figure 4, Emissions reductions (per km of travel) from the *MM* as a result of the State of California fuel sulfur regulation (grey), vessel speed reduction program (white) and combined (black).

Information Relevant to Health Impacts

Reductions in the direct emissions of SO₄, BC, and POM per-km of travel of 99%, 75% and 88% respectively will likely have influence on the ambient PM levels near the Californian coast where vessel traffic is significant, especially in the port regions. The reductions in EF_{BC} and EF_{POM} with improved fuel quality are significant variables that have not been considered in most assessments of the impact of shipping emissions on health. Assuming that reductions in PM emissions leads to reduced mortality, this new information would suggest that greater reductions in mortality would be found than reported in the North American ECA or global IMO regulation mortality assessments [11, 12] (that do not include the BC and POM reductions). In addition, the finding that SO₄ emissions decrease with both S_F and engine load [28] shows that primary SO₄ emissions will be further decreased if VSR regulation is introduced. Reductions in SO₂ will also significantly

1
2
3 reduce secondary SO₄ formation. Of further interest is the uncertainty surrounding EF_{NTOT} associated with
4
5 reductions in S_F and speed changes. Multiple studies (including the current data) show opposing trends in
6
7 EF_{NTOT} as vessel speed and S_F change, and should be investigated further.
8
9

10 11 12 ***Information Relevant to Climate Impacts*** 13

14
15 The indirect RF impacts of PM are difficult to assess and remain the least certain RF agent in global models.
16
17 For shipping, it is estimated that emitted PM leads to a significant negative RF (i.e. cooling) that substantially
18
19 exceeds the warming from the emitted CO₂ [2, 14, 16]. The impact of fuel quality (predominantly reducing
20
21 the S_F) would lead to a reduction in this cooling [2, 16]. *Eyring et al.* [14] estimate (for 2005) that the
22
23 globally averaged direct and indirect RF by shipping emissions of SO₄ and POM is -0.44 Wm⁻² (net cooling),
24
25 which is dominated by the indirect RF (-0.41 W m⁻²). CO₂, O₃ (from NO_x emissions), decreased CH₄ (from
26
27 NO_x) and BC from shipping together have a globally averaged positive RF of +0.03 Wm⁻² (net warming).
28
29 *Righi et al.* [2] estimate this indirect RF would decrease from -0.28 to -0.10 Wm⁻² if low S_F fuels are
30
31 introduced globally. For the data presented here, although absolute BC emissions decrease, the strong
32
33 concurrent decrease in CCN emission (from both composition and size changes) could completely offset the
34
35 cooling gained [43]. Given the observed, concurrent reductions in emissions of BC, POM and CCN (75%,
36
37 88% and 99%, respectively), we conclude that uncertainties in the magnitude of the RF balance from shipping
38
39 are critically dependent on the composition of emitted PM, size distributions and the ultimate fate of emitted
40
41 non-CCN active particles in the atmosphere.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The direct RF impact of shipping emissions of PM, although small relative to the indirect effect, will also
49
50 change due to fuel regulation. Over the past 15-20 years, fuel regulation in California for on-road vehicles and
51
52 non-road machines has focused on a variety of technological approaches, such as engine rebuilding or
53
54 addition of emissions control systems [44]. The goal (and likely net result) of this regulation was (has been) to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reduce primary emissions of BC [45] which, if it occurs in isolation, will lead to less warming. However,
4
5 absorbing BC is usually co-emitted with scattering (cooling) SO₄ and POM, which may also change upon
6
7 implementation of a control measure [46]. The single scattering albedo (SSA) represents the balance between
8
9 light scattered and absorbed by a particle and is one of the primary influences on whether a particle warms or
10
11 cools the atmosphere. The SSA for the *MM* encounter (for high and low *S_F*) was estimated from the measured
12
13 EF_{SO₄}, EF_{POM} and EF_{BC} values using 532nm mass extinction and mass absorption efficiencies (MEE and
14
15 MAE) for the different species;
16
17
18

$$19$$

$$20$$

$$21 \quad SSA_{532} \sim 1 - \left[\frac{MAE_{BC} EF_{BC}}{MEE_{SO_4} EF_{SO_4} + MEE_{POM} EF_{POM} + MEE_{BC} EF_{BC}} \right] \quad (\text{Eqn 3})$$

$$22$$

$$23$$

$$24$$

$$25$$

26 We use values for the MEE for SO₄ and POM from *Malm et al.* [47] (3 m²/g and 4 m²/g) and MEE/MAE
27
28 values for BC from Bond and Bergstrom [48] (9 m²/g and 7.5 m²/g). The SSA for directly emitted PM from
29
30 the *MM* decreased from 0.86 to 0.57 across the experiment. The estimated low-*S_F* SSA value compares
31
32 favorably with the directly measured dry value of 0.64 (0.2% *S_F*, 532nm). This is generally consistent with the
33
34 observations of *Lack et al.* [5], who found that the SSA decreased from 0.6 to 0.3, on average, as the *S_F*
35
36 changed from 2.5 to 0.2%. Thus, not only will the absolute PM emissions from ships operating on low sulfur
37
38 (instead of high sulfur) fuel be decreased, the particles that are emitted will be overall “darker” and can then
39
40 have a stronger relative warming influence. It seems clear that the implementation of global fuel sulfur
41
42 regulations will lead to a decrease in the cooling by ship PM emissions, both from changes in indirect and
43
44 direct RF. We emphasize that the emission reductions observed with the *MM* introduce previously
45
46 unaccounted emissions phenomena which may alter the specific RF balance from shipping described by
47
48 recent model studies [2, 16].
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 *Local, Regional And Global Policy Connections*

58
59
60

1
2
3 The efficacy of Californian shipping fuel quality regulation and vessel speed reduction (VSR) program in
4 reducing emission factors and absolute emissions (emissions per-km of travel with and without the regulation)
5 of SO₂, SO₄, and (somewhat unexpectedly) POM and BC is evident from the results presented here. EFs of
6 N_{Tot} (particle number) appear to increase due to the regulations, although it is likely that these are small
7 particles that will quickly condense or coagulate with existing particles. On an absolute scale (per kilometer of
8 travel), mass reductions of SO₂, SO₄ and PM are in excess of 96%; BC and POM reductions are 75% and 88%
9 respectively. The regulations will significantly alter the direct climate cooling impacts of the emitted PM by
10 reduction of the SO₄ formed just after emission and through secondary formation from SO₂ oxidation. In areas
11 where low sulfur fuel is used, significant CCN reductions and particle size reductions will reduce the indirect
12 cooling impacts from enhanced cloud formation, particularly in regions sensitive to inputs of CCN from
13 shipping, such as at ~30° N. This reduced cooling may be partially offset by a concurrent decrease in the
14 climate warming impact of BC. Our observations suggest that air quality benefits from the fuel quality
15 regulation and the VSR program are likely to be substantial, although these air-quality benefits are likely to
16 occur concurrent with a reduction in anthropogenic cooling that results from shipping PM. If it is determined
17 that air pollution (i.e. human health and welfare) goals can be met through near-coast regulation (i.e. ECAs),
18 then the implementation of a more nuanced location-dependent global fuel quality regulation may be worthy
19 of consideration. Lastly, possible reductions in BC emissions due to fuel quality changes might suggest a
20 consideration of more refined fuels for future Arctic shipping [40].
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 5. Acknowledgments

49
50 Thanks to the support of the Maersk Line (in particular Lee Kindberg and Wayne Tober) and the crew and
51 support staff of the *WP-3D* research aircraft and the *R/V Atlantis*. Thanks also to James Corbett for useful
52 discussions. This work was funded in part by NOAAs Climate Program (NA09OAR4310124,
53 NA09AR4310125), California Air Resources Board, US EPA (RD834558), Canadian Federal Government
54 (PERD Project C12.007) and NSERC.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supporting Information Available

Details on instruments uncertainties, literature and calibrations are available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org/>.

6. References

1. Corbett, J. J.; Winebrake, J. J., The Role of International Policy in Mitigating Global Shipping Emissions. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* **2010**, *XVI*, (II).
2. Righi, M.; Klinger, C.; Eyring, V.; Hendricks, J., et al., Climate Impact of Biofuels in Shipping: Global Model Studies of the Aerosol Indirect Effect. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2011**, *45*, (8), 3519-3525.
3. IMO *Amendments to MARPOL Annex VI, Amendments to the NO_x Technical Code*; International Maritime Organization: London, April, 2008, 2008; p 144.
4. Lyyranen, J.; Jokiniemi, J.; Kauppinen, E. I.; Joutsensaari, J., Aerosol Characterisation in Medium Speed Diesel Engines Operating with heavy Fuel Oils. *J. Aerosol. Sci.* **1999**, *30*, (6), 771-784.
5. Lack, D. A.; Corbett, J. J.; Onasch, T. B.; Lerner, B., et al., Particulate Emissions from Commercial Shipping. Chemical, Physical and Optical Properties. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2009**, *114*, (D00F04), doi:10.1029/2008/JD011300.
6. Dalsoren, S. B.; Eide, M. S.; Endresen, Ø.; Mjelde, A., et al., Update on emissions and environmental impacts from the international fleet of ships: the contribution from major ship types and ports. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *9*, (6), 2171-2194.
7. IMO *Air Pollution from Ships Cut, with Entry Into Force of MARPOL Amendments*; Online, 2010. http://www.imo.org/newsroom/mainframe.asp?topic_id=1859&doc_id=13309
8. IMO *New Rules to Reduce Emissions from Ships Enter Into Force*; IMO: Online, 2005.
9. IMO *North Sea SECA in effect from 22 November 2007*; IMO: Online, 2007. http://www.imo.org/inforesource/mainframe.asp?topic_id=1472&doc_id=8719
10. CARB *Final Regulation Order. Fuel Sulfur and Other Operational Requirements for Ocean-Going Vessels Within California Waters and 24 Nautical Miles of the California Baseline*; California Air Resources Board: 2009. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2008/fuelogv08/22992.pdf>
11. IMO *In Proposal to Designate an Emission Control Area for Nitrogen Oxides, Sulphur Oxides and Particulate Matter. Submitted by the United States and Canada.*, IMO MPEC 59, 2009; IMO: 2009.
12. Winebrake, J. J.; Corbett, J. J.; Green, E. H.; Lauer, A., et al., Mitigating the Health Impacts of Pollution from Oceangoing Shipping: An Assessment of Low-Sulfur Fuel Mandates. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43*, (13), 4776-4782.
13. US-EPA, EPA Proposal for Control of Emissions from New Marine Compression-Ignition Engines at or Above 30 Liters Per Cylinder. In United States Environmental Protection Agency Office of Transportation and Air Quality: 2009; Vol. EPA-420-F-09-029.
14. Eyring, V.; Isaksen, I. S. A.; Berntsen, T.; Collins, W. J., et al., Transport impacts on atmosphere and climate: Shipping. *Atmos. Environ.* **2010**, *44*, (37), 4735-4771.
15. Fuglestvedt, J. S.; Shine, K. P.; Berntsen, T.; Cook, J., et al., Transport impacts on atmosphere and climate: Metrics. *Atmospheric Environment* **2010**, *44*, (37), 4648-4677.
16. Lauer, A.; Eyring, V.; Corbett, J. J.; Wang, C., et al., Assessment of Near-Future Policy Instruments for Oceangoing Shipping: Impact on Atmospheric Aerosol Burdens and the Earth's Radiation Budget. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43*, (15), 5592-5598.

- 1
2
3 17. Lack, D. A.; Lerner, B.; Granier, C.; Baynard, T., et al., Light Absorbing Carbon Emissions from
4 Commercial Shipping. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **2008**, *35*, (L13815), doi:10.1029/2008GL033906.
- 5 18. Winnes, H.; Fridell, E., Particle Emissions from Ships: Dependence on Fuel Type. *J. Air Waste*
6 *Manage.* **2009**, *59*, 1391-1398.
- 7 19. Brock, C. A.; Cozic, J.; Bahreini, R.; Froyd, K. D., et al., Characteristics, sources, and transport of
8 aerosols measured in spring 2008 during the aerosol, radiation, and cloud processes affecting Arctic
9 climate (ARCPAC) project. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* **2010**, *10*, (11), 27361-27434.
- 10 20. Maersk-Line, Personal Communication. In 2010.
- 11 21. Chen, G.; Huey, L. G.; Trainer, M.; Nicks, D., et al., An Investigation of the Chemistry of Ship
12 Emission Plumes During ITCT 2002. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2005**, *110*, (D10S90), doi:10.1029/2004JD005236.
- 13 22. Williams, E.; Lerner, B.; Murphy, P.; Herndon, S. C., et al., Emissions of NO_x, SO₂, CO, and C₂H₄
14 from commercial marine shipping during Texas Air Quality Study (TexAQS) 2006. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2009**,
15 *114*, (D21), D21306.
- 16 23. CARB *Vessel Speed Reduction for Ocean-going Vessels*; California Air Resources Board: 2009.
17 www.arb.ca.gov/ports/marinevess/vsr/vsr.htm
- 18 24. Seinfeld, J. H.; Pandis, S. N., *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate*
19 *Change*. John Wiley and Sons: 1998.
- 20 25. Harvald, S., *Prediction of power of ships*. Department of Ocean Engineering, Technical University
21 of Denmark: 1977.
- 22 26. Cooper, D. A., Exhaust Emissions From Ships at Berth. *Atmos. Environ.* **2003**, *37*, (27), 3817-
23 3830.
- 24 27. Kasper, A.; Aufdenblatten, S.; Forss, A.; Mohr, M., et al., Particulate Emissions from a Low-Speed
25 Marine Diesel Engine. *Aerosol Sci. Tech.* **2007**, *41*, 24-32.
- 26 28. Petzold, A.; Weingartner, E.; Hasselbach, J.; Lauer, A., et al., Physical Properties, Chemical
27 Composition, and Cloud Forming Potential of Particulate Emissions from a Marine Diesel Engine at
28 Various Load Conditions. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, *44*, 3800-3805.
- 29 29. Sinha, P.; Hobbs, P. V.; Yokelson, R. J.; Christian, T. J., et al., Emissions of Trace Gases and Particles
30 from Two Ships in the Southern Atlantic Ocean. *Atmos. Environ.* **2003**, *37*, (15), 2139-2148.
- 31 30. Miller, W., Personal Communication on Measured vs. Reported Fuel Sulfur Content of Ship Fuel.
32 In 2011.
- 33 31. Lovejoy, E. R.; Hanson, D. R.; Huey, L. G., Kinetics and Products of the Gas-Phase Reaction of SO₃
34 with Water. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1996**, *100*, (51), 19911-19916.
- 35 32. Petters, M. D.; Kreidenweis, S. M., A single parameter representation of hygroscopic growth and
36 cloud condensation nucleus activity. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2007**, *7*, (8), 1961-1971.
- 37 33. Pringle, K. J.; Tost, H.; Pozzer, A.; Pöschl, U., et al., Global distribution of the effective aerosol
38 hygroscopicity parameter for CCN activation. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *10*, (12), 5241-5255.
- 39 34. American-Bureau-of-Shipping *Notes on Heavy Fuel Oil*; American Bureau of Shipping: Houston,
40 2001; pp 1-68.
41 [http://www.eagle.org/eagleExternalPortalWEB/ShowProperty/BEA%20Repository/Rules&Guides/Cu](http://www.eagle.org/eagleExternalPortalWEB/ShowProperty/BEA%20Repository/Rules&Guides/CURRENT/31%20HeavyFuelOil/Pub31%20HeavyFuelOil)
42 [rrent/31 HeavyFuelOil/Pub31 HeavyFuelOil](http://www.eagle.org/eagleExternalPortalWEB/ShowProperty/BEA%20Repository/Rules&Guides/CURRENT/31%20HeavyFuelOil/Pub31%20HeavyFuelOil)
- 43 35. MAN *Operation on Low-Sulphur Fuels. MAN B&W Two-Stroke Engines*; Copenhagen, 2010; pp 1-
44 24.
- 45 36. Corporan, E.; DeWitt, M. J.; Belovich, V.; Pawlik, R., et al., Emissions Characteristics of a Turbine
46 Engine and Research Combustor Burning a Fischer,àTropsch Jet Fuel. *Energy & Fuels* **2007**, *21*, (5),
47 2615-2626.
- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 37. Agrawal, H.; Welch, W. A.; Henningsen, S.; Miller, J. W., et al., Emissions from main propulsion
5 engine on container ship at sea. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2010**, *115*, (D23), D23205.
- 6 38. Cappa, C. D.; Williams, E.; Buffaloe, G.; Coffman, D. J., et al., The influence of operating speed on
7 gas and particle-phase emissions from the R/V Miller Freeman. *In Preparation* **2011**.
- 8 39. Jayaram, V.; Agrawal, H.; Welch, W. A.; Miller, J. W., et al., Real-Time Gaseous, PM and Ultrafine
9 Particle Emissions from a Modern Marine Engine Operating on Biodiesel. *Environmental Science &*
10 *Technology* **2011**, *45*, (6), 2286-2292.
- 11 40. Corbett, J. J.; Lack, D. A.; Winebrake, J. J.; Harder, S., et al., Arctic shipping emissions inventories
12 and future scenarios. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *10*, (19), 9689-9704.
- 13 41. Entec Quantification of Ship Emissions.
14 http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pdf/chapter2_ship_emissions.pdf
- 15 42. US-EPA *Analysis of Commercial Marine Vessels Emissions and Fuel Consumption Data*; United
16 States Environmental Protection Agency: 2000.
- 17 43. Chen, W. T.; Lee, Y. H.; Adams, P. J.; Nenes, A., et al., Will black carbon mitigation dampen aerosol
18 indirect forcing? *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **2010**, *37*, (9), L09801.
- 19 44. CARB *The California Diesel Fuel Regulations*; California Air Resources Board: 2004.
20 <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regs/regs.htm>
- 21 45. Murphy, D. M.; Capps, S. L.; Daniel, J. S.; Frost, G. J., et al., Weekly patterns of aerosol in the United
22 States. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *8*, (10), 2729-2739.
- 23 46. Bond, T. C.; Sun, H., Can Reducing Black Carbon Emissions Counteract Global Warming? *Environ.*
24 *Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39*, (16), 5921-5926.
- 25 47. Malm, W. C.; Day, D. E.; Carrico, C.; Kreidenweis, S. M., et al., Intercomparison and closure
26 calculations using measurements of aerosol species and optical properties during the Yosemite Aerosol
27 Characterization Study. *J. Geophys. Res.* **2005**, *110*, (D14), D14302.
- 28 48. Bond, T. C.; Bergstrom, R. W., Light Absorption by Carbonaceous Particles: An Investigative
29 Review. *Aerosol Sci. Tech.* **2006**, *40*, 27-67.
- 30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

