The impact of flue gas cleaning technologies in coal fired power plants on CCN distribution and consequently clouds in Germany

M. Bangert¹, B. Vogel¹, W. Junkermann², L. Brachert³ and K. Schaber³ Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research – TRO¹ and IFU² Institute for Technical Thermodynamics and Refrigeration³

Motivation

Airborne measurements showed high number concentrations (≈ 50 000 cm-3) of ultra-fine particles (< 50 µm) a few km **downwind of** modern coal-fired power plants.

Because this high number concentrations occur almost **independent** of the daytime and are not found downwind of older coal-fired power plants in comparable measurements, Junkermann et al. 2011 [3] concluded that this is due to nucleation inside modern coal-



Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

max.bangert@kit.edu



Aerosol

Online coupled model system COSMO-ART [7]



fired power plants.

We present a combination of observation, process- and regional-scale simulations to investigate the impact on particle distribution, CCN and cloud properties.

Airborne Observations

Ultrafine particle plumes encountered during a research flight with D-MIFU in Germany. **Plumes originate** from Freiberg (distance ~30) km) and Schwarze Pumpe (distance ~15 km) power stations as well as from several Czech power stations south of the border with subsequent transport via the Elbe valley. Size indicates that Dresden is not the source.



- Explicit simulation of mass and number of 11 aerosol modes
- **Köhler theory** to calculate diagnostic CCN(0.1%)

Gases

Comprehensive photochemistry

Clouds Processes^[1]

- Activation [2] using updraft PDFs
- Comprehensive full **two-moment cloud microphysics** [4] Emissions
- Detailed anthropogenic emission data [5]
- Natural emissions parameterized online

Regional Simulations (16-19.11.2011)

Setup: 2.8 km grid mesh size, 50 vertical levels, nested in a simulation of Europe with 7km grid mesh size starting 2 days before

Direct H_2SO_4 particle emissions from power plants (1.5% of SO_x)

(A) 5.5E+15 s⁻¹ particles per plant (B) 2E+18 s⁻¹ particles per plant based on AerCoDe simulations derived from airborne observations

Aitken mode number concentration(after 12h)





Nucleation inside power plants

The simulation tool AerCoDe [8] is used to **simulate the formation of** sulphuric acid aerosol droplets inside the flue gas cleaning **devices** (wet flue gas desulfurization).

- One-dimensional mass and energy balances
- Gas-liquid heat and mass transfer
- Aerosol population balance including classical nucleation theory (with hydrate formation [6]) and growth by condensation
- Polydisperse modeling with multiple droplet classes
- Subsequent polydisperse coagulation calculations (residence time of 20s up to stack exit)

T inlet [°C]	120	120	160	160
H ₂ SO ₄ inlet [mg/m ³] (STP)	3	10	3	10
c _N outlet WFGD [cm ³]	3.81E+07	2.28E+09	2.62E+09	2.11E+09
c _N after 20 s [cm ³]	3.54E+07	4.36E+07	3.43E+07	4.1E+07
D _p [nm]	49.06	90.08	41.49	78.35
H ₂ SO ₄ outlet [mg/m ³] (STP)	0.9	3.6	0.59	2.54

→ Simulated particle number concentrations in (A) based on in-plant nucleation simulations differ by a factor of >10 to (B) and the observations. What is the source of the additional particles?

Difference in CCN(0.1%) to referenz (68h average) (Indiv. domain medians: A 1082 cm⁻³; REF 1010 cm⁻³; B 668 cm⁻³)



→ In case (A) CCN(0.1%) are increased up to 20% due to the additional particles. But, CCN(0.1%) are decreased up to 50% in case (B) due to the strong decrease in median particle diameters (< 50nm)

Difference in cloud droplet number to referenz (68h average) (Indiv. domain medians: A 103 cm⁻³; REF 101 cm⁻³; B 117 cm⁻³)

- \rightarrow H₂SO₄ droplet concentrations c_n at stack exit ~4E+07 cm⁻³
- \rightarrow Droplet sizes increase with higher inlet concentrations of H₂SO₄.

References

[1] Bangert M., Nenes A., Vogel B., Vogel H., Barahona D., Karydis V.A., Kumar P., Kottmeier C., and Blahak U. (2012) Saharan dust event impacts on cloud formation and radiation over Western Europe, Atmos. Chem. Phys. (12) 4045-4063

[2] Fountoukis, C. and Nenes A. (2005): Continued development of a cloud droplet formation parameterization for global climate models. J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., (110) D11

[3] Junkermann W., Vogel B., and Sutton M. A. (2011) The climate penalty for clean fossil fuel combustion, Atmos. Chem. Phys. (11) 12917–12924

[4] Seifert, A. and Beheng, K. D. (2006) A two-moment cloud microphysics parameterization for mixed-phase clouds. Part 1: Model description, Meteorol. Atmos. Phys. (92), 45–66

[5] Theloke J, Kugler U., Laufer S., Knecht M., Schieberle C., Thiruchittampalam B., Kampffmeyer T., and Friedrich R. (2013) Projekt Verkehrsentwicklung und Umwelt (VEU) Dokumentation der vom IER erarbeiteten Beiträge, technical report

[6] Vehkamäki, H., Kulmala, K. and Lehtinen, K.E.J. (2003) Modelling Binary Homogeneous Nucleation of Water-Sulfuric Acid Vapours: Parameterisation for High Temperature Emissions, Environmental Science & Technology (37) 3392-3398

[6] Vogel B., Vogel H., Bäumer D., Bangert M., Lundgren K., Rinke R., and Stanelle T. (2009) The comprehensive model system COSMO-ART – Radiative impact of aerosol on the state of the atmosphere on the regional scale, Atmos. Chem. Phys. (9) 8661–8680

[7] Wix, A., Brachert, L., Sinanis, S. and Schaber, K. (2010) A Simulation Tool for Aerosol Formation during Sulphuric Acid Absorption in a Gas Cleaning Process, Journal of Aerosol Science (41) 1066-1079





-> Cloud droplet numbers are increased in both cases. With a stronger increase up to 50% in case (B) caused by activation of **small particles** at the upper part of the updraft PDF (s>0.1%!).

