

ADMS 4 Buildings Validation EOCR Study

Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants
June 2007

1 Introduction

The Experimental Organically Cooled Reactor (EOCR) study¹ (Start *et al.* [1]) involved the simultaneous release of three tracer gases (SF₆, F₁₂, and Freon-12B₂) at three levels around the EOCR test reactor building at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in southeast Idaho. The terrain was flat with low-lying shrubs. The main building was 25 m high with an effective width of 25 m. The tracer releases typically occurred simultaneously and were conducted during 22 separate time periods. Tracer sampler coverage was provided at eight concentric rings at distances of about 50, 100, 200, 400, 800, 1200, and 1600 m from the release points (see **Figure 1**). Most of the meteorological data were measured on site and conditions were mainly unstable.




Figure 1 – EOCR study area.

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 included the arcwise maximum observed concentrations that have been used for comparison with the ADMS modelled concentrations. There were data for only 19 time periods and no data for the concentric ring distance of 200 m.

¹ Note that the study description and **Figure 1** have been taken directly from the document [2].

This document compares the results of ADMS 4.0.2.0 (further referred to as ADMS 4.0) with those of ADMS 3.3.1.0 (further referred to as ADMS 3.3).

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

2 Input data

2.1 Study area

The latitude of the site is 43.5°N and the surface roughness was taken to be 0.1 m.

2.2 Source parameters

Source name	Pollutant	Location	Stack height (m)	Exit V (m/s)	Exit T (°C)	Diameter (m)	Emission rate (g/s)
Roof	SF ₆	(-8.22, 0.00)	25	0	ambient	0.5	1
Stack (S1)	SF ₆	(9.40, 1.00)	30	0	ambient	0.5	1
SW	SF ₆	(-22.00, -5.50)	1	0	ambient	0.5	1
NW	SF ₆	(-22.00, 5.50)	1	0	ambient	0.5	1
NE	SF ₆	(10.00, 17.00)	1	0	ambient	0.5	1

Table 1 – Source input parameters. T is the temperature, V the velocity.

The source parameters are summarised in **Table 1**. Note that the 1 g/s emission rate indicates that the observed concentrations supplied in [3] have been normalised by the emission rate.

2.3 Receptors

The receptor network consisted of radially spaced points at 10° intervals. The receptors were located at approximately 50, 100, 400, 800, 1200 and 1600 m from the sources (**Figure 2**).




Figure 2 – The receptor network for EOCR site.

2.4 Meteorological data

Apart from the cloud cover obtained from a meteorological station 80 km to the south-west of the facility, the meteorological data were measured on site. During the EOCR experiment there were 5 stable, 1 neutral and 13 convective conditions. The ambient temperature varied from -0.22 to 25.53°C and the wind speeds at 10 m from 0.8 to 8.1 m/s. The wind rose is shown in **Figure 3**. ADMS 4.0 also used the recorded wind and temperature at 4, 10 and 30 m high.




Figure 3 – Wind rose.

2.5 Buildings

The building dimensions are given in **Table 2**. The building locations relative to the modelled stacks are shown in **Figure 4**. The ‘Tall’ building was assigned as the main building for all sources, apart for the NE source where the ‘Short’ building was the main building.




Figure 4 – Building and stack locations.

Building name	Length (m)	Width (m)	Height (m)	Angle (°)
Tall	25.0	25.0	25.0	45
Short	36.6	36.6	7.0	45

Table 2 – Dimensions of the buildings.

3 Results

For this experiment, arc maximum modelled and observed concentration values are compared. Two sets of ‘observed’ data are supplied with the AERMOD data [3]: “fitted” and “actual”. The “actual” data are the values that were observed at the receptors. The “fitted” values are concentrations that have been adjusted using the data for the whole receptor arc; this adjustment is intended to account for the fact that models are calculating ensemble means and are not taking into account stochastic variation due to short term atmospheric turbulence. In general, the “fitted” values are lower than the “actual” values.

Scatter plots and quantile-quantile plots of model results against “fitted” observed data are presented in Section 3.1. The data were also processed using the BOOT statistical package against both “fitted” and “actual” observed data. These results are given in Section 3.2.

3.1 Scatter and quantile-quantile plots

Figure 5 shows the scatter plot of results.

Figure 6 shows the quantile-quantile plot 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.




Figure 5 – Scatter plots of ADMS results against observed data ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for actual observations, $\mu\text{s}/\text{m}^3$ for fitted observations).




Figure 6 – Quantile-quantile plots of ADMS results against observed data ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for actual observations, $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for fitted observations).

3.2 BOOT statistics

The BOOT package produces statistics of the data that are useful in assessing model performance. Statistics calculated include mean, standard deviation (sigma), bias, normalised mean square error (NMSE), correlation (cor), fraction of results where the modelled and observed concentrations agree to within a factor of two (fa2), fractional bias (fb) and fractional standard deviation (fs).

Tables 3 and **4** show the results from the BOOT package for all sources against “fitted” and “actual” observed data.

Data	Mean	Sigma	Bias	NMSE	Cor	Fa2	Fb	Fs
observed	174.40	481.81	0.00	0.00	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000
ADMS 3.3	336.40	988.68	-161.99	15.99	0.312	0.385	-0.634	-0.689
ADMS 4.0	237.76	588.09	-63.35	7.80	0.456	0.385	-0.307	-0.199

Table 3 – BOOT statistics against “actual” observed data.

Data	Mean	Sigma	Bias	NMSE	Cor	Fa2	Fb	Fs
observed	140.86	357.75	0.00	0.00	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000
ADMS 3.3	352.75	1026.27	-211.88	18.60	0.411	0.429	-0.859	-0.966
ADMS 4.0	248.46	607.87	-107.60	7.18	0.592	0.425	-0.553	-0.518

Table 4 – BOOT statistics against “fitted” observed data.

4 Discussion

Both ADMS 3.3 and ADMS 4.0 give generally good agreement between modelled and observed concentrations, although both versions of the model have a tendency to over-predict

the observed data (both “fitted” and “actual”). The scatter and quantile-quantile plots shown in **Figure 5** indicate that ADMS 4.0 has fewer over-predictions than ADMS 3.3.

The BOOT statistics presented in **Tables 3** and **4** also support the fact that ADMS 4.0 is performing better than ADMS 3.3. ADMS 4.0 agrees better with the “fitted” results for the non-dimensional statistics such as NMSE and correlation.

5 References

- [1] Start, G.E., N.F. Hukari, J.F. Sagendorf, J.H. Cate, and C.R. Dickson, 1981: *EOCR Building Wake Effects on Atmospheric Diffusion*. NUREG/CR-1395, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Idaho Falls, ID.
- [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