Fort Hays State University [FHSU Scholars Repository](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/)

[Chemistry Faculty Publications](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/chemistry_facpubs) **Chemistry** Chemistry

1-1-1997

The role of HO_x in super- And subsonic aircraft exhaust plumes

T. F. Hanisco Harvard University

P. O. Wennberg Harvard University

R. C. Cohen Harvard University

J. G. Anderson Harvard University

D. W. Fahey National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/chemistry_facpubs](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/chemistry_facpubs?utm_source=scholars.fhsu.edu%2Fchemistry_facpubs%2F10&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Part of the [Chemistry Commons](https://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/131?utm_source=scholars.fhsu.edu%2Fchemistry_facpubs%2F10&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Recommended Citation

Hanisco, T. F., Wennberg, P. O., Cohen, R. C., Anderson, J. G., Fahey, D. W., Keim, E. R., Gao, R. S., Wamsley, R. C., Donnelly, S. G., Negro, L. A. D., Salawitch, R. J., Kelly, K. K., & Proffitt, M. H. (1997). The role of HOx in super- and subsonic aircraft exhaust plumes. Geophysical Research Letters, 24(1), 65–68. https://doi.org/ 10.1029/96GL03724

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Chemistry at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chemistry Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

Authors

T. F. Hanisco, P. O. Wennberg, R. C. Cohen, J. G. Anderson, D. W. Fahey, E. R. Keim, R. S. Gao, R. C. Wamsley, Stephen G. Donnelly Ph.D., L. A. Del Negro, R. J. Salawitch, K. K. Kelly, and M. H. Proffitt

This article is available at FHSU Scholars Repository: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/chemistry_facpubs/10

The role of HO_x in super- and subsonic aircraft exhaust plumes

T. F. Hanisco, ¹ P. O. Wennberg, ¹ R. C. Cohen, ¹ J. G. Anderson, ¹ D. W. Fahey, ² E. R. Keim, 2 R. S. Gao, 2^3 R. C. Wamsley, 2^3 S. G. Donnelly, 2^3 L. A. Del Negro, 2^3 R. J. Salawitch, ⁴ K. K. Kelly² and M. H. Proffitt.^{2,3}

Abstract. The generation of sulfuric acid aerosols in aircraft exhaust has emerged as a critical issue in determining the impact of supersonic aircraft on stratospheric ozone. It has long been held that the first step in the mechanism of aerosol formation is the oxidation of SO₂ emitted from the engine by **OH in the exhaust plume. We report in situ measurements of** OH and HO₂ in the exhaust plumes of a supersonic (Air **France Concorde) and a subsonic (NASA ER-2) aircraft in the lower stratosphere. These measurements imply that reactions with OH are responsible for oxidizing only a small fraction of** SO₂ (2%), and thus cannot explain the large number of parti**cles observed in the exhaust wake of the Concorde.**

Introduction

Emissions from a proposed fleet of commercial high speed civil transports (HSCT's) flying in the lower stratosphere may alter stratospheric ozone concentrations. Concerns that reactive nitrogen emissions $(NO_r = NO + NO₂)$ could substantially **deplete ozone helped deter the development of HSCT's in the U.S. during the early 1970's and continue to influence HSCT engine design today [Stolarski et al., 1995]. In the mid- to** upper-stratosphere, direct removal of ozone by NO_r is thought **to account for most of the catalytic destruction of ozone; thus increased NO• could increase ozone loss rates. However, in** the lower stratosphere, NO_x suppresses the concentrations of **HO2 and C10 that together can dominate the ozone loss rate [Wennberg et al., 1994a]. Thus, in the lower stratosphere, increased NO• can lead to decreased ozone loss rates. The current assessment of the potential effects of HSCT emissions** reflects this picture: NO_x emissions are predicted to enhance **ozone loss rates in the middle stratosphere and decrease ozone loss rates in the lower stratosphere. This cancellation results in a small net change in the ozone column at most latitudes.**

Recent observations of the exhaust emitted from an Air France Concorde during supersonic flight in the lower stratosphere show that the measured NO_r emission index agrees **well with predictions based on ground-based tests performed in the early 70's [Fahey et al., 1995a]. However, the number of volatile particles measured, assumed to consist largely of sulfuric acid generated from fuel sulfur, is much higher than expected. Thus, HSCT emissions could significantly increase aerosol surface area in the lower stratosphere. This is a critical**

Paper number 96GL03724. 0094-8534/97/96GL-03724505.00 **issue because in the lower stratosphere reactions occurring on** these aerosols suppress the concentration of NO_x. Ironically, **HSCT particle emissions could increase ozone loss rates by** *reducing* the concentration of NO_r in the lower stratosphere.

Though the mechanism for aerosol formation in aircraft exhaust is not known in detail, the initial step in sulfate aerosol formation has long been assumed to be the oxidation of emitted SO2 by OH in the aircraft exhaust wake [Stolarski et al., 1995]. In the absence of oxidation within the engine, the production rate of nitric and sulfuric acid is controlled by the following reaction sequences occurring in the exhaust plume:

$$
HONO \xrightarrow[NO]{hV} OH \xrightarrow[NO]{NO_2} HNO_3 \tag{1}
$$

$$
\underbrace{OH + SO_2 \rightarrow HSO_3 \stackrel{O_2}{\rightarrow} HO_2 + SO_3 \stackrel{2 H_2O}{\rightarrow} H_2SO_4 + H_2O}_{NO} \tag{2}
$$

In this high NO_x environment, the reactions in (1) dominate **the photochemistry that controls the concentration of OH. As the exhaust leaves the engine, OH is sequestered into nitrous acid (HONO) which serves as a temporary reservoir for emitted OH [Arnold et al., 1992]. During daylight OH is produced from the photolysis of HONO and is either converted back to** HONO by NO or to HNO₃ by NO₂. The oxidation of SO₂ and the subsequent production of H_2SO_4 occurs while HONO is **photolyzed: in darkness no oxidation will occur and in the ab**sence of $NO₂$ the oxidation of $SO₂$ could occur indefinitely because it is catalytic with respect to HO_x (= $OH + HO_2$).

Measurements

The measurements presented here were obtained aboard the NASA ER-2 on October 8, 1994 during the Airborne Southern Hemisphere Ozone'Experiment/Measurements for Assessing the Effects of Stratospheric Aircraft (ASHOE/MAESA) campaign in Christchurch, New Zealand. The payload included instruments measuring most of the species necessary to empirically test the chemistry of HO_x in the plume: NO, NO₂, $NO_y (= NO_x + HONO + HNO₃ + ClONO₂ + 2N₂O₅ ...)$, $H₂O$, **03, OH and HO2. Measurements of CH4 and CO show these** species do not play a significant role in HO_x plume chemistry.

Figure 1 shows the OH and HO₂ mixing ratios measured **during three crossings of the Concorde exhaust plume (a-c) and an encounter with the ER-2 plume (d). As the plume ages, [OH] (the square brackets denote concentrations) falls markedly. In the early encounters [OH] is above ambient because the production of OH from the photolysis of HONO is** large. In the later encounters (e.g. Fig. 1c) [OH] decreases be**cause [HONO] is diminished, weakening the photochemical source of OH, while the loss rate of OH due to reaction with NO2 remains high. The small [HO2] in the plume results from a** change in the partitioning of HO_r: the high [NO] shifts the

[•]Department of Chemistry, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

²NOAA Aeronomy Laboratory, Boulder, CO

³Also at Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sci**ence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO**

⁴Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA

Copyright i 997 by the American Geophysical Union.

Figure 1. OH (solid line) and HO₂ (broken line) mixing ra**tios measured during three crossings of the Concorde exhaust plume (a-c) and the single encounter with the ER-2 plume (d). The gaps in the data occur during background calibration of the OH fluorescence signal and (in panel c) during a calibra**tion of the chemical titration of HO_2 [[]Wennberg et al., 1994b]. **The plume ages are a) 16, b) 60, and c) 66 minutes for the Concorde exhaust and d) 10 minutes for the ER-2 exhaust. Meteorological conditions are: altitude 16.2 km, temperature 222 K, and pressure 100 mb. The Concorde plumes corre**spond to encounters 3, 9, and 11 observed by the NO_v instru**ment [Fahey et al., 1995a].**

partitioning of HO_x towards OH because the species that convert OH to HO_2 (O_3 and CO) do not increase above back**ground levels inside the plume.**

The Hydrogen Radical Emission Index

We can infer the [HONO] in the plume by comparing the effective production and loss rates of OH calculated with a steady state photochemical model. The model uses measurements obtained on the ER-2, rate constants from DeMore et al., 1994, and photolysis rates calculated with a radiative transfer model [Salawitch et al., 1994]. Since the lifetime of OH is short (< 1 minute), the steady state solution is representative of conditions in sampled air parcels inside and outside of the plume. The results for encounter #3 (Fig. la) are listed in Table 1. Outside the plume the agreement between production and loss rates is excellent. Inside the plume, loss rates increase by two orders of magnitude due to the large increases in [NO] and [NO₂], but the increase in production rates due to background species (H₂O, HNO₄, H₂CO) is small. In the ab**sence of added HONO in the plume, the calculated [OH] is a factor of 40 lower than measured.**

Since the production rate of OH from HONO photolysis is the only significant undetermined source of OH in the plume, this rate must be equal to the difference between production and loss rates within the plume $(1.48 \times 10^6 \text{ molecules/cm}^3 s)$. **The [HONO] inferred from this rate and the photolysis rate of HONO** (2.73×10⁻³ s⁻¹) is 5.4×10⁸ molecules/cm³, or 165 \pm 65 ppt (1σ) . Since the loss rate of OH in the plume is dominated **by reactions in (1), the uncertainty of this estimate of HONO** is determined by uncertainties in the OH, NO, and NO₂ meas**urements, rate constants, and the photolysis rate of HONO. The contribution of other sources of OH formed in the exhaust are neglected in this estimate, but will be addressed below.**

The [HONO] in the plume 981 s prior to this measurement can be estimated using the lifetime of HONO in the plume. Because of the high [NO] and [NO₂] in the plume, the lifetime **of HONO is determined by the time constant for removal of OH. The net loss rate for HONO in the plume is the fraction** of photolyzed HONO that forms HNO₃ multiplied by the **photolysis rate. The lifetime of HONO in the plume is:**

$$
\tau = \left[\frac{k_2\text{[OH][NO}_2]}{k_1\text{[OH][NO]} + k_2\text{[OH][NO}_2]} \times J_{\text{HONO}}\right]^{-1} \tag{3}
$$

For the rates in the plume listed in Table 1, $\tau = 586$ s. Eq. 3 is **independent of dilution, so we reference to a conserved tracer, NOy, to account for the effects of dilution and integrate the loss of HONO over the age of the plume. [HONO] referenced** to $[NO_v]$ at the time of emission $(t = 0)$ is:

$$
\frac{\text{[HONO]}_0}{\text{[NO}_y]_0} = \frac{\text{[HONO]}_t e^{\frac{\tau}{\tau}}}{\text{[NO}_y]_t},\tag{4}
$$

where the concentrations refer to values above ambient levels. For encounter #3, Eq. 4 yields $[HONO]₀/[NO_v]$ ₀ = 0.045, $([NO_y]_t = 19$ ppb). This $[HONO]_0$ corresponds to the sum of emitted HO_x that forms HONO after emission and any HONO **that might be directly emitted from the engine. In the absence** of other loss processes for HO_x and HONO the total $[HO_x]_0$ **emitted from the engine is given by Eq. 4.**

An important uncertainty in $[HO_x]_0$ calculated from Eq. 4 is **the fraction of emitted OH that forms HONO. The small**

Table 1. Calculated production and loss rates of OH for encounter #3 (Fig. la). Only the most important rates are shown. Rates are in 10³ molecules/cm³s. Values in **parentheses are the percent contribution to the total rate.**

		Background Rate		Plume Rate	
			OH Production		
$HNO3 + hV$	3.5	(26)	4.6	(0)	
$H2CO + hv$	3.5	(26)	9.9	$\rm(2)$	
$O(^1D) + H_2O$	2.9	(22)	3.3	$\rm (1)$	
$HONO + hv$	1.3	(10)	J_{HONO} [HONO]	(95)	
$HNO4 + hV$	1.1	(8)	9.6	(2)	
total	14.0		1500		
			OH Loss		
$OH + HO2$	3.2	(21)	5	(0)	
$OH + NO2$	2.9	(19)	852	(57)	
$OH + HNO3$	2.8	(19)	14	(1)	
$HO2 + NO2$	$2.2\,$	(14)	39	(3)	
$OH + NO$	1.3	(9)	512	(34)	
OH + HNO4	1.2	(8)	32	(2)	
total	15.0		1500		

[H₂O], [OH], and [NO] are measured. [NO₂] is the mean of the measured and calculated steady-state concentrations. [HNO₃] is inferred from the NO_y measurement. $[H_2CO]$, $[HNO_4]$, $[O(^1D)]$, and **background [HONO] are calculated from steady-state relations. [HONO] in the plume is calculated as described in the text.**

[HO_{rlo} [NO_{rlo} results in little loss of HO_r through self reactions, but the reaction of OH with NO₂ converts some of the emitted OH into HNO₃ before HO_r is sequestered into HONO. **Ground based tests of the Concorde Olympus engine indicate** that $NO₂$ is 4% of emitted NO_x at the engine exit plane **[Williams, 1973]. Based on the relative rates of OH + NO and** $OH + NO₂$, Eq. 4 underestimates $[HO_x]₀$ by ~10%. On the **other hand, Eq. 4 overestimates [HO•]o (-6%) by assuming** steady state values for NO₂/NO for the duration of the plume. **These uncertainties, combined with that of the steady-state** model result in a net uncertainty of $±50\%$ (1σ) for known **processes. If other loss processes for emitted OH occur, the estimate from Eq. 4 will be a lower limit.**

The removal of HONO via non-photolytic processes would also result in an underestimation of OH at the exit plane. HONO is known to react in H₂SO₄/H₂O solutions [*Zhang et*] **al., 1996; Fenter and Rossi, 1996]. Model calculations estimate that up to 25% of HONO could be removed by uptake** onto H₂SO₄/H₂O aerosols that might be generated early in the plume (*B. Kärcher, personal communication, 1996*). How**ever, there is substantial uncertainty in this estimate because the surface area and composition of aerosols at the exit plane are not known. It is also not known whether the aerosol reac-**

Figure 2. (a) Time evolution of OH produced from HONO photolysis in the Concorde plume. The five measurements (circles) are scaled to [NOy] in each encounter. The error bars are the 2-0 uncertainties of the measurements. The open circle represents encounter #3. The solid line is the result of the integrating model and the dashed line is the result of Eq. 4, each using $[HONO]_0 / [NO_y]_0 = 0.045$. The dotted line corresponds to the 0.3 ppt background level of OH. Oxidation of (b) NO₂ \rightarrow HNO₃ and (c) SO₂ \rightarrow SO₃ in the plume is shown versus plume age. The oxidation ratio is the ratio of emitted NO_x or SO_2 that is oxidized by emitted OH to the total NO_x or SO_2 **emitted from the engine. The shaded region includes the 1-o uncertainty of the calculation. The dashed line in (c) repre**sents the oxidation ratio of SO₂ assuming all HO_r is emitted as **OH, the solid line represents the ratio if OH is converted to HONO prior to emission.**

Table 2. Relative HO_r emission indices:

Encounter	$[\mathrm{HO}_{x}]_{0}$ $[NO_v]_0$	$EIMOv$ [†] $(gNO2/kg$ fuel)	EI HO. $(gOH/kg$ fuel)
Concorde #3	0.045	23	0.35 ± 0.17
Concorde #4-5	0.051	12	0.2 ± 0.1
ER-2	0.035	4	0.06 ± 0.02

t NOy emission indices are from Fahey, et al., 1995a; 1995b.

tivity would saturate due to uptake of HONO (there are at least three HONO molecules for every sulfur atom in the fuel). Finally, the measured NO_v/NO_v (0.9) is inconsistent with the **conversion of large amounts of HO• into HNO3.**

Given the estimate of HONO at the time of emission, the time evolution of OH in the plume can be calculated using an integrating photochemical model. The model solves the coupled differential equations that control OH concentrations (see Table 1) using measured concentrations and temperatures, calculated photolysis rates, and [HONO]o calculated from Eq. 4. The results using the conditions for encounter #3 as model inputs are compared to the measurements of OH in Figure 2.

The agreement of this model with the measured OH for encounter #3 shows that the assumptions in the calculation of HONO discussed above are justified. In fact, the more extensive photochemical model and Eq. 4 give nearly identical results until the plume is more than 15 min. old. This agreement occurs because HONO is the primary source of OH in the early encounters and the lifetime of HONO is completely described by Eq. 3. The curvature after 30 minutes occurs because other processes, mostly the photolysis of HNO4, contribute to the production of OH. However, the rates of these processes are small compared to the loss rates due to NO_x and [OH] drops below background levels (see Fig. 1c).

Estimates of the oxidation of NO_r and SO₂ by OH in the **plume via reactions in (1) and (2) are shown in Figure 2. Ap**proximately 5% of NO_x and 1-2% of $SO₂$ are oxidized, mostly within the first 15 minutes. The amount of NO_x oxidized by OH is largely determined by the fraction of $[OH]_0/[NO_x]_0$ in the exhaust. The fraction of SO₂ that is oxidized depends on **the relative rates of sequences 1 and 2. For lower strato**spheric daytime conditions in general, 5% of NO_r and \sim 2% of **SO2 will be oxidized by OH before the plume disperses. Similar fractions are reported in modeling studies when the** same [HO_r]_o [NO_r]₀ value as determined here is used [e.g., **Danilin et al., 1994; Karcher et al., 1996; Brown et al., 1996].**

Summary and Conclusions

Based on the ratio of [HONO]₀/[NO_y]₀, we estimate the emission index (EI) of HO_x to be 0.35 \pm 0.17 gOH/kg fuel for **encounter #3. Table 2 summarizes the measurements of the Concorde and ER-2 exhaust plume encounters for which accurate estimates can be made. The Concorde encounters include measurements of exhaust emitted at Mach 2 (#3) and Mach 1.7 (#4 and #5). The ER-2 emission indices represent an aver**age of 7 plume encounters. Both the EI's of HO_x and NO_y are **substantially smaller for the ER-2 and Mach 1.7 cases than for the Mach 2 case. This trend is consistent with the strong temperature dependence of OH and NO emission indices [Neely and Davidson, 1972; McGregor et al., 1972].**

Measurements of the number of volatile particles, thought to be composed largely of sulfufic acid, imply that at least 12- **45% of fuel sulfur is oxidized to H2SO4 [Fahey et al., 1995a].** However, measurements of HO_x suggest that only \sim 2% of $SO₂$ **is oxidized by OH via gas-phase reactions in the plume. The** discrepancy could be resolved if the particles are not primarily H_2SO_4 or if the sulfur is oxidized to SO_3 in the engine or in the **plume by some unknown mechanism. Whether sulfur is** emitted as SO₃, which quickly forms H₂SO₄, or as SO₂ deter**mines whether sulfate aerosols form in the plume or long after the plume disperses. This formation rate directly affects the size distribution of sulfate aerosols, and will determine the impact of future HSCT emissions on aerosol surface areas throughout the stratosphere [Weisenstein etal., 1996].**

Acknowledgments. The authors thank the pilots of the NASA ER-2 and of the Air France Concorde for their achievements. We also acknowledge support from NASA's Upper Atmospheric Research and High Speed Research Programs.

References

- **Arnold, F., et al., Measurements of Jet Aircraft Emissions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 12, 2421-2424, 1992.**
- **Brown, R. C. et al., Aerosol dynamics in near-field aircraft plumes, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 22939-22953, 1996.**
- **Danilin, M. Y., et al., Evolution of the concentrations of trace species in an aircraft plume: Trajectory study, J. Geophys. Res., 99, 18951-18972.**
- **DeMore, W. B., et al., Chemical Kinetics and photochemical data for use in stratospheric modeling, evaluation number 11, JPL Publ. 94-26, 1994.**
- **Fahey, D. W., et al., Emission measurements of the Concorde supersonic aircraft in the lower stratosphere, Science, 270, 70-74, 1995a.**
- **Fahey, D. W., et al., In situ observations in aircraft exhaust plumes in the lower stratosphere at midlatitudes, J. Geophys. Res., 100, 3065- 3074, 1995b.**
- **Fenter, F. F. and M. J. Rossi, Heterogeneous kinetics of HONO on H2SO4 solutions and on ice: activation of HC1, J. Phys. Chem., 100, 13765-13775, 1996.**
- Kärcher, B., M. M. Hirschberg, and P. Fabian, Small-scale chemical **evolution of aircraft exhaust species at cruising altitudes, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 15169-15190, 1996.**
- **McGregor, W. K., B. L. Seiber, and J. D. Few, Concentration of OH and NO in YJ93-GE-3 engine exhausts measured in-situ by narrow-line UV absorption, in Proceedings of the Second Conference on CIAP, November 1972, Cambridge, MA (A. J. Broderick, Ed.), DOT-TSC-OST-73-4, p. 214-229, (NTIS, Springfield, VA, 1973).**
- **Neely, J. and D. L. Davidson, Emission level of the YJ93-GE-3 engine, an SST-like engine, ibid., pp. 180-193.**
- **Salawitch, R. J., et al., The distribution of hydrogen, nitrogen, and chlorine radicals in the lower stratosphere: Implications for changes in 03 due to emission of NOy from supersonic aircraft, Geophys. Res. Lett., 21, 2547-2550, 1994.**
- **Stolarski, R. S., et al., 1995 Scientific Assessment of the Atmospheric Effects of Stratospheric Aircraft, NASA Ref. Publ. 1381, 1995.**
- Weisenstein, et al., Potential impact of SO₂ emissions from strato**spheric aircraft on ozone, Geophys. Res. Lett., 23, 161-164, 1996.**
- Wennberg, P. O., et al., Removal of stratospheric O₃ by radicals: in **situ measurements of OH, HO2, NO, NO2, C10, and BrO, Science, 266, 398-404, 1994a.**
- **Wennberg, P. O., et. al., Aircraft-borne, laser induced fluorescence instrument for the in situ detection of hydroxyl and hydroperoxyl radicals, Rev. Sci. Instr., 65, 1858-1876, 1994b.**
- **Williams, M. R., Emission levels of the Olympus 593 engine at the supersonic cruise conditions of the Concorde aircraft, in Proceedings of the Second Conference on CIAP, November 1972, Cambridge, MA (A. J. Broderick, Ed.), DOT-TSC-OST-73-4, pp. 173- 179, (NTIS, Springfield, VA, 1973).**
- **Zhang, R., M.-T. Leu, and L. F. Keyser, Heterogeneous chemistry of HONO on liquid sulfuric acid: a new mechanism of chlorine activation on stratospheric sulfate aerosols, J. Phys. Chem., 100, 339- 345, 1995.**

J. G. Anderson, R. C. Cohen, T. F. Hanisco, P.O. Wennberg, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

L. A. Del Negro, S. G. Donnelly, D. W. Fahey, R. S. Gao, E. R. Keim, K. K. Kelly, M. H. Proffitt, and R. C. Wamsley, NOAA Aeronomy Laboratory, Boulder, CO 80303.

R. J. Salawitch, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109.

(Received September 26, 1996; revised November 21, 1996 accepted November 25, 1996)