

# ADMS 4 Complex Terrain Validation Lovett Power Plant

Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants  
December 2010

## 1 Introduction


The Mirant Lovett<sup>1</sup> power plant is located in Tompkins Cove, on the Hudson river in the state of New York, about 30 miles upstream of New York city. Terrain elevations vary significantly over the study area, with altitudes in the river valley close to zero and maximum altitudes close to the receptors of approximately 270 m – see **Figures 1 and 2**.

On-site meteorological data included wind speeds, temperatures and turbulence data at heights of 10, 50 and 100 m.

A long term SO<sub>2</sub> sampling experiment was undertaken during the whole year 1988. The buoyant, continuous SO<sub>2</sub> source was released from a 145-m stack.

Data were collected from 12 monitoring sites located 2 to 3 km from the plant. Hourly, 3-hour, 24-hour and annual average concentrations are available from 9 of them only.

The input data for the ADMS runs were taken from the AERMOD files downloaded from the United States Environmental Protection Agency website [3]. These data includes the observed concentrations that are used for comparison with the ADMS modelled concentrations.



**Figure 1** – (a) Monitoring network used in the Lovett study. (b) Receptors, stack and on-site met. station shown with the terrain elevation.



**Figure 2** – Top: 360° panorama from Dunderberg Mountain (receptors DD).  
Bottom: 270° panoramic view from the Timp (location of receptor TIMP3).

<sup>1</sup> Note that the study description and **Figure 1** have been taken from the documents [1] and [2].

This document compares the results of ADMS 4.1.0.0 (hereafter referred to as ADMS 4.1) with those of ADMS 4.2.2.0 (hereafter referred to as ADMS 4.2).

Section 2 describes the input data used for the model. The results are presented in Section 3 and discussed in Section 4.

## 2 Input data


### 2.1 Study area

The study area is located around 41.3°N and 74.0°W. The roughness length used in the study depends on wind direction and month as shown in **Table 1**.

Time of the year	Wind sector					
	0-35°	35-60°	60-130°	130-175°	175-225°	225-360°
January to March	0.750	0.001	0.300	0.001	0.750	1.500
April to May	0.850	0.001	0.500	0.001	1.000	1.500
June to August	1.000	0.001	0.700	0.001	1.500	1.500
September to November	0.900	0.001	0.500	0.001	1.250	1.500
December	0.750	0.001	0.300	0.001	0.750	1.500

**Table 1** – Surface roughness length (m).

Terrain data included in the modelling covered a 17 km × 20 km area (**Figure 3**); terrain data points were located every 260 m within this area. **Figure 2** shows panoramic views from two of the receptors, illustrating the significant changes in elevation over the study area.



**Figure 3** – Modelled Lovett plant site.

### 2.2 Source parameters

The source parameters are summarised in **Table 2**. The gas exit velocity and temperature


range between 4 and 39 m/s and between 69 and 163°C respectively. The SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate ranges between 1 and 396 g/s. Note that for over 13% of year, the emission rate from the source was zero.

Source name	Pollutant	Location	h (m)	V (m/s)	T (°C)	D (m)	Q (g/s)
STK4N5	SO <sub>2</sub>	6500, 67900	145	varied	varied	4.5	varied

**Table 2** – Source input parameters. h is the stack height, V the exit velocity, T the exit temperature, D the diameter and Q the emission rate.

## 2.3 Receptors

The receptor network consists of 9 monitors, ranging from 2 to 3 km from the sources. All receptors are modelled as ground level receptors. During the experiment, background measurements were apparently taken from a further 3 sites, but these data are unavailable and therefore no account of background concentrations has been taken in the results presented in Section 3. **Figure 4** shows the receptor network and **Table 3** gives their spatial coordinates.



**Figure 4** – Enlarged view of the modelled area, showing the receptor locations on Dunderberg Mountain and the Timp.

Output point			X (m)	Y (m)
3	TIMP3	The Timp	4500	69910
4	DD4	Dunderberg Mtn	5220	69940
5	DD5	Dunderberg Mtn	6400	70590
6	DD6	Dunderberg Mtn	5650	70760
7	DD7	Dunderberg Mtn	5920	70910
8	DD8	Dunderberg Mtn	6600	70900
9	DD9	Dunderberg Mtn	6660	71400
10	DD10	Dunderberg Mtn	6990	71100
11	DD11	Dunderberg Mtn	7600	71100

**Table 3** – Receptor point locations.

## 2.4 Meteorological data

One year of hourly sequential data from 1 January 1988 to 31 December 1988 was used. On-site wind speed, temperature, and vertical and horizontal turbulence data were available at heights of 10, 50 and 100 m above ground level. Cloud cover information was available from a meteorological station in Albany, NY.




Figure 5 – Wind rose.

Conditions		ADMS 4.2	ADMS 4.1
Hours modelled	Stable conditions	5117 (63%)	5117 (63%)
	Neutral conditions	486 (6%)	486 (6%)
	Unstable conditions	2571 (31%)	2571 (31%)
	<i>Total</i>	<i>8174 (100%)</i>	<i>8174 (100%)</i>
Hours not modelled	Calm conditions	0	0
	Wind speed at 10 m < 0.50 m/s	495	495
	Inadequate data	115	115
	<i>Total</i>	<i>610</i>	<i>610</i>

Table 4 – Meteorological conditions. Percentage values are computed with respect to the total number of modelled hours.

The prevailing wind at 100 m was from north-west, which disperses the tracer from the stack away from the receptor points. As the mean wind speed at 10 m is 1.2 m/s, with a maximum of 6.6 m/s, the power plant appears well sheltered from the prevailing wind by the hills to the north and west. The wind rose is shown in **Figure 5** for the wind at 100 m in height.

There is a wide annual variation in temperature with a minimum of -18.5°C and a maximum of 35.6°C.

The model also used a profile of the wind speed and temperature at 10, 50 and 100 m.

**Table 4** gives the detail of the modelled meteorological conditions.


### 3 Results

Scatter plots and quantile-quantile plots of model results against observed data are presented in Section 3.1. Other statistical analysis is presented in Section 3.2.

#### 3.1 Scatter and quantile-quantile plots

The modelled  $\text{SO}_2$  concentrations are compared to observed hourly concentrations ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). **Figure 6** shows the scatter plots and the quantile-quantile plots of results.

Note that these quantile-quantile plots are *linear*; care should be exercised when comparing these plots with similar ones presented with *logarithmic* axes.



### 3.2 Statistics

**Table 5** compares the modelled and observed maximum 1 hour, 3 hour and 24 hour average concentrations at the receptor points. **Table 6** compares the corresponding robust highest concentrations, where this statistic is defined by:

$$\text{robust highest concentration} = \chi(n) + (\chi - \chi(n)) \ln\left(\frac{3n-1}{2}\right),$$

where  $n$  is the number of values used to characterise the upper end of the concentration distribution,  $\chi$  is the average of the  $n - 1$  largest values, and  $\chi(n)$  is the  $n^{\text{th}}$  largest value;  $n$  is taken to be 26, as in Perry *et al.* [4].

Statistics	Data	Concentrations ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )									Mean M/O ratio
		P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	
1-hour maximum	observed	231	257	151	448	372	157	230	193	155	-
	ADMS 4.1	238	100	119	193	292	151	235	281	222	0.92
	ADMS 4.2	225	103	117	189	279	159	279	336	221	0.97
3-hour maximum	Observed	146	137	58	151	136	109	102	103	83	-
	ADMS 4.1	119	74	53	94	108	81	98	94	74	0.80
	ADMS 4.2	113	72	58	92	104	83	103	112	74	0.82
24-hour maximum	observed	76	22	19	40	46	20	23	29	20	-
	ADMS 4.1	25	19	12	15	16	17	22	17	14	0.64
	ADMS 4.2	26	20	13	14	16	17	23	18	16	0.66

**Table 5** – Observed (O) and modelled (M) maximum concentrations ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) per receptor point, and the mean ratio of modelled/observed values for each statistic.

Statistics	Data	Robust Highest Concentrations ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )									Mean M/O ratio
		P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	
1-hour RHC	observed	287	235	119	408	255	171	237	181	108	-
	ADMS 4.1	145	114	110	214	269	163	256	173	117	0.84
	ADMS 4.2	141	111	112	208	257	166	262	191	126	0.86
3-hour RHC	Observed	169	127	64	178	130	97	107	96	56	-
	ADMS 4.1	94	85	60	87	102	69	108	74	50	0.74
	ADMS 4.2	92	82	63	92	100	77	114	84	67	0.82
24-hour RHC	observed	47	27	21	45	45	20	24	26	22	-
	ADMS 4.1	19	22	14	19	19	15	23	17	12	0.62
	ADMS 4.2	18	21	14	18	19	17	25	19	13	0.65

**Table 6** – Observed (O) and modelled (M) robust highest concentrations (RHC) per receptor point, and the mean ratio of modelled/observed RHC for each statistic (number of points = 26).

## 4 Discussion

The scatter and quantile-quantile plots (**Figure 6**) show relatively good agreement between modelled and observed concentrations for both ADMS 4.2 and ADMS 4.1. The scatter plots compare predicted and measured concentrations at a particular location at a particular time, i.e. an (x,t) pairing. The quantile-quantile plots compare the distribution of predicted and measured concentrations during the period having abandoned the (x,t) pairing. Predicting the

distribution of concentrations accurately is relevant to calculations for permitting purposes, where the comparison with air quality limits is more important than accurately predicting a time series of concentrations at each location. The latter is a harder task.

The pollutant monitored for this study is SO<sub>2</sub>. There are a number of issues with using SO<sub>2</sub> as a tracer, which include:

- The detection limits of monitors are usually of the order of 16µg/m<sup>3</sup>, and concentrations below these are set to one-half of the limit. This leads to considerable inaccuracy when modelled concentrations are low.
- SO<sub>2</sub> is released from other sources. If estimates of these background concentrations are not available, then the model will underestimate concentrations, particularly long-term averages.

The issue with missing background pollutant data can be investigated by inspecting monitored concentration values when all sources are downwind of the receptors. When this is done, it is clear that there are significant levels of background SO<sub>2</sub> present during this study. Comparisons between modelled and observed annual average concentrations are not presented in this report due to the issues with monitor detection limits and background data.

The predictions of maximum concentrations and robust highest concentrations presented in **Tables 5** and **6** show good model performance considering the complexity of the domain modelled. The model has a tendency to predict slightly lower maximum concentrations than those observed. However, this apparent underestimate of observed maximum concentrations is a usual feature of a model that has been developed to represent the ensemble mean i.e. a model that neglects turbulent fluctuations. The ADMS 4.2 fluctuations module may be used to estimate the likelihood of concentrations greater than or less than the ensemble mean, although currently it is not possible to run the fluctuations module in conjunction with the buildings module in ADMS.

The graphs and tables presented in Section 3 show generally good prediction of the observed concentrations by ADMS. In particular, the high concentrations are well-predicted – see for example the 1-, 3- and 24-hour maximum values presented in **Table 5**, and the RHC values presented in **Table 6**.

Inspection of the data also shows that the receptors for which there is best agreement between modelled and observed concentrations are those on the near side hill relative to the stack, and not around the sides or behind the hill i.e. in regions where the flow is not separated. Once the flow has separated, it is very complex and difficult to model.

Consideration of the scatter and quantile-quantile plots show that concentrations predicted by ADMS 4.2 differ slightly from than those predicted by ADMS 4.1; this behaviour is also seen in the statistics presented in **Table 5** and **6**.

## 5 References

- [1] Paine, R.J, Lee, R.F, Brode, R, Wilson, R.B, Cimorelli, A.J., Perry, S.G., Weil, J.C., Venkatram, A, and Peters, W., 1998: *Model Evaluation Results for AERMOD (draft)*. United States Environmental Protection Agency.
- [2] United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2003: *AERMOD, Latest Features and Evaluation Results*. EPA-454/R-03-003.
- [3] United States Environmental Protection Agency website, *Model Evaluation Databases*.

[http://www.epa.gov/scram001/dispersion\\_prefrec.htm](http://www.epa.gov/scram001/dispersion_prefrec.htm)

- [4] Perry, S. G., Cimorelli, A. J., Paine, R.J., Brode, R.W., Weil, J.C., Venkatram, A., Wilson, R.B., Lee, R.F, & Peters, W.D. 2005 AERMOD: A Dispersion Model for Industrial Source Applications. Part II: Model Performance against 17 Field Study Databases. *J. Appl. Met.* **44**, pp 694-708.