# Supplement for: Molecular hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) combustion emissions and their isotope (D/H) signatures from domestic heaters, diesel vehicle engines, waste incinerator plants, and biomass burning

Martin K. Vollmer<sup>1</sup>, Sylvia Walter<sup>2</sup>, Joachim Mohn<sup>1</sup>, Martin Steinbacher<sup>1</sup>, Steven W. Bond<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Röckmann<sup>2</sup>, and Stefan Reimann<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Empa, Swiss Federal Laboratories for Material Science and Technology, Laboratory for Air Pollution and Environmental Technology, Überlandstrasse 129, 8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland <sup>2</sup>Institute for Marine and Atmospheric research Utrecht, Utrecht University, Princetonplein 5, 3508TA Utrecht, The Netherlands

*Correspondence to:* Martin K. Vollmer (martin.vollmer@empa.ch)

# **1** Methods Section for Supplements (Some text is overlapping with the content of the Methods Section in the main paper)

## 1.1 Residential fossil fuel and wood heaters

The samples were taken from a large variety of burner types, fuel systems, and burning capacities.

- 5 If not specified differently, two samples (A and B) were taken at the same location, typically ~5 min apart. The exhausts of two old (>20 yrs) oil-burner systems were sampled, both from single-family houses. In the first case (S-1), the samples were taken from a chimney access in the attic, about 4 m above the combustion chamber. The first sample (S-1A) was drawn shortly (~2 min) after starting the burner, such that the potential differences between this presumably non-optimal burning and the
- 10 more optimized burning (S-1B  $\sim$ 20 min after S-1A was collected) could be later investigated. The samples of the second oil-burner system (dating to 1992) were taken from the exhaust pipe at  $\sim$ 1 m from the burner where an exhaust temperature of 170 °C was measured (S-2).

A variety of natural gas burners were also sampled. The samples S-3 were taken from the roof-top chimney exhaust of a 4-party apartment house. The samples S-4 were also taken from the roof-top

15 chimney exhaust of a tall 25-party apartment block. The samples S-5 were taken at the roof-top chimney exhaust (S-5A was 55 °C and S-5B was 50 °C) from two different burner systems of a school complex, where S-5B was from a burner system with a H<sub>2</sub>O condensation-recovery system. The samples S-6 were both taken from a 3.7 MW gas burner system (1984) at Empa, which combusts  $\sim$ 330 Nm<sup>3</sup> hr<sup>-1</sup> of natural gas. These samples were taken  $\sim$ 5 m downstream of the burner where an

20 exhaust temperature of 220 °C was measured. The samples S-7 were taken from the exhaust system of a single-family house, a few meters downstream of the burner (built in 1999) at a temperature of 52 °C.

In addition to the fossil fuel-based heating systems, two wood-burning systems were also sampled. The samples S-8 were taken from a modern (2007) fully automated wood-pellet burning system of

- 25 a 2-family house. Both samples were drawn from the exhaust pipe ~2 m downstream of the burner. The first sample (S-8A, temperature at 108 °C) was collected only a few minutes after the start of the system. The second sample (S-8B, temperature at 114 °C) was collected after ~10 min when the system was in full burning mode. The samples S-9 were taken from an indoor open fire place of a single family house, in which pieces of local beech were burnt. The samples were drawn
- 30 through an opening in the chimney system ~4 m above the fire. The first sample (S-9A) was taken when the fireplace door was left open, which resulted in a reduced air draft and slower burning with a sample temperature of 155 °C. The second sample (S-9B) was taken with the fireplace door almost entirely closed. This created a stronger air draft with a more rigorous flaming and an exhaust temperature of 170 °C at the sample location. Finally, ambient air samples were also collected during
- 35 this campaign in order to determine approximate concentrations of the air drawn for combustion. They were collected in the vicinity of the sampled buildings, one air sample was collected at the end of the S-2 sampling, and two air samples were collected during the I-1 sampling.

Analysis on the RGA-3: Analysis was conducted on the Empa laboratory RGA (RGA-Frog). This instrument was characterized for nonlinear system response using a series of flasks containing vari-

- 40 ous dilutions of a high-concentration mixture. For the dilutions, synthetic air was used from which traces of H<sub>2</sub> and CO were removed using a catalyst (Sofnocat 514, Molecular Products, Thaxted, UK). Based on the measurements of these flaks samples, the nonlinearities were characterized and correction functions derived. A function of the form  $y = a + b \times x + c \times x^{0.5} + d \times x^{0.333} + e \times x^{0.25}$  was applied (available within the GCWerks software used for all RGA measurements), where x is the
- 45 normalized peak height (with respect to the bracketing standard), and y is the normalized sensitivity, see e.g. Vollmer and Weiss (2002). The ranges, for which these functions were applicable, were approximately 50 ppb to 3.5 ppm for H<sub>2</sub> and 20 ppb to 1.2 ppm for CO. The dilutions were made using pressure measurements using a Keller (Switzerland, www.keller-druck.com) pressure gauge (-1 to 3 bar) with a stated accuracy of 0.1 % of the full scale.
- 50 Some of the heater samples were diluted using synthetic air, from which traces of H<sub>2</sub> and CO were removed using a catalyst (see above). The dilutions were made based with the above-mentioned pressure gauge. These samples, with their dilution factors in parentheses, were 7A (4.09), 8A (20.8), 9A (106), and 9B (26.7). These dilutions resulted in H<sub>2</sub> mole fractions, which were within the calibrated non-linearity range of the RGA. However, with regard to the CO mole fractions, some of

55 these diluted samples were still saturating the detector or they were exceeding the calibrated CO nonlinearity range. Subsequent measurements on a GC-FID/ECD and/or a FTIR yielded quantifyable CO results.

Analysis on the GC-FID/ECD: The samples were also analyzed (May 2009) on a GC (Agilent Technologies 6890N and controlled through GCWerks) located at the Jungfraujoch observatory and

- 60 equipped with a flame-ionisation detector (FID) for CO and CH<sub>4</sub>. The sample measurements were bracketed by those of a working standard at ambient concentrations of CO and CH<sub>4</sub>. This instrument has linear detector response in the ambient concentration range as found through earlier experiments (Steinbacher and Vollmer, unpubl. data), but needed to be calibrated for high-concentration CO samples at concentrations >2 ppm. Additional analysis of two high-concentration standards
- 65 (2.01 ppm and 8.25 ppm, NIST-2612a calibration scale) revealed a slight CO nonlinearity at higher concentrations, which was characterized and for which the sample measurements were corrected. The measurement precisions were 0.2% for CH<sub>4</sub> and 1.1% for CO. CO results are reported on the WMO-2000 calibration scale (with NIST and WMO-2000 in very close agreement, Zellweger et al. (2009)) and CH<sub>4</sub> results are reported on the NOAA-2004 calibration scale (Dlugokencky et al.,
- 70 2005). The overall accuracies, including calibration scale and nonlinearity uncertainties, are estimated at  $\sim 5\%$  for each compounds. This GC was also equipped with an electron-capture detector allowing for the measurements of nitrous oxide and sulfur hexafluoride, which, however, are not further discussed here.

#### 1.2 Waste incinerator exhaust

- 75 Exhaust gas was sampled at six waste incinerator facilities throughout Switzerland. These incinerators are typically designed for the combustion of household and industrial waste on a regional scale (equipped with one to four boilers and yearly waste throughput of 90'000 220'000 t) and are equipped with a sequence of catalysts and filters to remove most particles and toxic substances. The samples were collected on the occasion of extensive measurement and sampling campaigns serving
- 80 other purposes. The first incinerator (I-1) was sampled in 2008. CO was measured in-situ along with other parameters, and 6 stainless steel flask samples were taken for measurements of H<sub>2</sub> and CO on the RGA-3. The second incinerator was sampled in November 2008 using five 2-L glass flasks, which were measured on the RGA-3. In addition to the routine in-situ measurements, including CO, an on-line mass spectrometer (H-sense, V&F Analyse- und Messtechnik GmbH, Austria)
- 85 was used at this site for a full day of measurements (see Bond et al. (2010) for a description of the instrument). As this instrument is not suited for very accurate H<sub>2</sub> measurements in the ambient concentration range, these data are not further discussed here. However, these measurements support the independently performed flask sample measurement results and also revealed little H<sub>2</sub> variability in the incinerator exhaust over the course of the measurement day. During this second incinerator
- 90 sampling, ambient air samples were also drawn to characterize the composition of the intake air.

Flue gas samples were taken from a large set of incinerators from September to December 2010 (sample groups I-3 to I-9) by collection of integrated (1 week) dried (MD-070-24S-4, Perma Pure, USA) exhaust gas samples in Cali-5-Bond<sup>TM</sup> sampling bags (GSB-P/44, Ritter Apparatebau, Germany), employing a peristaltic pump (ECOLINE VC-MS/CA8-6, Ismatec, Switzerland) at a flow

- 95 rate of  $3 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ . Some of these Tedlar bag samples were cryogenically transferred into preevacuated stainless steel flasks, which were immersed in liquid nitrogen. The transfer flow rates through the connecting 1/4" OD stainless steel tube were >0.6 L min<sup>-1</sup>. We assume that back diffusion of H<sub>2</sub> becomes negligible under these conditions. These samples were measured on the RGA-3 a few days after transfer. Some samples with large CO concentrations were transferred directly from
- 100 the Tedlar bags into a small (50 ml) pre-evacuated stainless steel container, immediately diluted with purified (H<sub>2</sub> and CO free) synthetic air, and subsequently measured on the RGA-3. CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and other trace gases were also measured from the Tedlar bag samples using FTIR instrumentation. However, no H<sub>2</sub> isotope analysis was conducted on these samples.

Exhaust gas samples were stored in the Tedlar bags for less than two weeks before transfer and/or
analysis. In order to assess potential diffusive exchange/loss of H<sub>2</sub> through the Tedlar bags during storage, a stability experiment was conducted. A reference gas sample of ~3 ppm H<sub>2</sub> (also including ~2 ppm CO and other compounds) was collected in a Tedlar bag stored in an ambient laboratory air H<sub>2</sub> and CO environment, similar (in temperature and light exposure) to that used for storage of the

waste incinerators. The sample was repeatedly (4 times, nearly monthly) analyzed on the RGA-

- 110 3 along with the original reference gas (stored in a cylinder). Over the course of 3.5 months, an increase of  $\sim 7\%$  ( $\sim 210$  ppb) in H<sub>2</sub> and  $\sim 12\%$  ( $\sim 240$  ppb) in CO was detected. At the same time, a similar experiment was conducted with synthetic air samples that contained small concentrations of H<sub>2</sub> ( $\sim 20$  ppb) and virtually no CO. Here, an increase of  $\sim 130$  ppb H<sub>2</sub> and 65 ppb CO was detected over that same time span. The cause for these increases has not been further investigated but could
- 115 possibly be related to potential  $H_2$  and CO production from plastic under the influence of light. We originally suspected that diffusive exchange could potentially alter the  $H_2$  concentration in the Tedlar bags. However, the fact that we observe an increase in  $H_2$  over time in the bag with the  $\sim$ 3 ppm  $H_2$ (and the ambient air having lower concentrations) indicates that this would not be the only process that might alter the  $H_2$  composition/concentration. If we scale the results to the storage time of our
- 120 incinerator samples, then the potential  $H_2$  and CO concentration increases are relatively small and do not change our scientific interpretation. However, for longer storage, Tedlar bags may not be suitable for  $H_2$  and CO experiments. Also, potential alterations of the D/H during storage in Tedlar bags may be expected.

### 1.3 Diesel powered vehicles

125 Exhaust gas analysis of diesel-powered vehicles was conducted at Empa in 2008 as part of an extensive dynamometer test stand emission study that included H<sub>2</sub> emissions, and that were part of a larger fleet study also including gasoline vehicles (Bond et al., 2010). This included the measurements of 5 light-duty diesel delivery vehicles and 1 passenger car, most of which were tested under 6 different driving cycles. All diesel vehicles were classified by the Euro-4 emission standard. They

- 130 were equipped with oxidation catalysts and three had diesel particle filters. On-line direct exhaust measurements were conducted for a suite of compounds. H<sub>2</sub> was measured using the H-sense MS described in 1.2. For most of the diesel exhaust measurements with low H<sub>2</sub> concentrations (<1 ppm), this instrument was not suitable for accurate quantification because of its blank concentrations of similar size. The CO instruments used (Mexa 7100 AIA-721A and AIA-722, Horiba, Japan) exhibit</p>
- 135 similar limitations. However, large H<sub>2</sub> and CO concentrations (up to several hundred ppm) occurred during all cold starts and during some of the acceleration phases making these two measurement techniques suitable for these periods. We have extracted these periods for further investigation of H<sub>2</sub>/CO and have selected the duration based on the criteria of blank-corrected H<sub>2</sub>>1 ppm. Mean H<sub>2</sub> and CO concentrations were calculated over the typically 1 min–2 min phases of the cold starts and
- 140 the 15–30 sec periods during some of the accelerations. The two driving cycles Ra and Rb (see Bond (2010) for details) had H<sub>2</sub> mole fraction exceeding 1 ppm in very rare cases only, these did not qualify for inclusion in our analysis. For our H<sub>2</sub>/CO ratio calculations, we have also chosen to use the cumulative H<sub>2</sub> and CO mole fractions for each period (rather than the mean of the ratio of all 1-sec measurment pairs) to avoid potential mismatches of response time characteristics of the H<sub>2</sub> and CO
- 145 instruments. The results are shown in Table 1. This results in a mean H<sub>2</sub>/CO ratio of  $0.080 \pm 0.082$ (1  $\sigma$ ) and a median of 0.031 (interquartile range is 0.12) suggesting that the distribution is not normal. For the final H<sub>2</sub>/CO ratio, we have further weighed the individual ratio of each selected period by duration of the period. This reduces the above ratio to  $0.058 \pm 0.075$  (1  $\sigma$ ), with a median of 0.026, an interpercentile range of 0.12, and a median absolute deviation (MAD) of 0.0550. Using
- 150 these weights, and the fact that we base the initial calculation on the ratio of the cumulative  $H_2$  and CO of each period, we better represent the ratio of the cumulative amounts of  $H_2$  and CO emitted to the atmosphere (during the experiments). These results suggest that the molar  $H_2$ /CO for diesel is more then ten times smaller compared to gasoline combustion (Vollmer et al., 2007).

#### References

- 155 Bond, S. W.: Atmospheric Abundance and Anthropogenic Sources of Molecular Hydrogen: Status and Outlook Towards a H<sub>2</sub>-intensive Economy, Ph.D. Thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, No. 19346, 2010.
  - Bond, S. W., Alvarez, R., Vollmer, M. K., Steinbacher, M., Weilenmann, M., and Reimann, S.: Molecular hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) emissions from gasoline and diesel vehicles, Sci. Tot. Environ., 408, 3596–3606, 2010.
- 160 Dlugokencky, E. J., Myers, R. C., Lang, P. M., Masarie, K. A., Crotwell, A. M., Thoning, K. W., Hall, B. D., Elkins, J. W., and Steele, L. P.: Conversion of NOAA atmospheric dry air CH<sub>4</sub> mole fractions to a gravimetrically prepared standard scale, J. Geophys. Res., 110, D18306, doi:10.1029/2005JD006035, 2005.
  - Vollmer, M. K. and Weiss, R. F.: Simultaneous determination of sulfur hexafluoride and three chlorofluorocarbons in water and air, Mar. Chem., 78, 137–148, 2002.
- 165 Vollmer, M. K., Juergens, N., Steinbacher, M., Reimann, S., Weilenmann, M., and Buchmann, B.: Road vehicle emissions of molecular hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) from a tunnel study, Atm. Environ., 41, 8355–8369, doi:10.1016/j. atmosenv.2007.06.037, 2007.
  - Zellweger, C., Hüglin, C., Klausen, J., Steinbacher, M., Vollmer, M. K., and Buchmann, B.: Inter-comparison of four different carbon monoxide measurement techniques and evaluation of the long-term carbon monoxide
- time series of Jungfraujoch, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 3491–3503, doi:10.5194/acp-9-3491-2009, 2009.

**Table 1.** Diesel vehicle dynamometer exhaust results for  $H_2$  and CO during events of elevated emissions for a variety of standardized driving cycles. Periods were selected where the  $H_2$  mole fraction exceeded 1 ppm. Entries on the same lines do not indicate occurence of the events at the same time within a cycle. Some vehicles have more events than others, hence dashes indicate no more events in a particular cycle.  $H_2$ -m is the mean  $H_2$  mole fraction over the selected range, n is the number of measurement points (1 sec measurements),  $H_2$ /CO is the molar ratio of  $H_2$  to CO for the selected periode, and the classification 'Phase' is either emission during cold start (CS) or during acceleration phases (Acc). The Audi A4 is a passenger vehicle, all others are light-duty delivery vehicles. For details on the experiments see Bond et al. (2010) and Bond (2010)

Make Model	Fiat Ducato	Renault Trafic T29	Citroen Jumper	Volkswagen T5	Ford Transit	Audi A4
Empty Mass [kg]	2000	1930	2650	2089	1735	1620
Displacement [cm <sup>3</sup> ]	2287	2464	2198	2461	2198	1968
Power [kW]	88	107	88	96	63	103
Gearbox	m5	m6	m6	m6	m5	m6
Diesel Particle Filter	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Mileage [km]	24'867	38'158	13'482	32'203	23'485	25'806
Driving Cycle	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase	H <sub>2</sub> -m n H <sub>2</sub> /CO Phase
IUFC15 IUFC15 IUFC15 IUFC15 IUFC15 L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 LA LA	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
LA	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	7.2 [9] 0.161 Acc	- [-]	- [-]
CADC CADC	- [-] - [-]	198.8 [25] 0.143 Acc 62.5 [19] 0.092 Acc	- [-] - [-]	- [-] - [-]	- [-] - [-]	- [-] - [-]