

**EFFECTS OF GROWTH IN VMT AND NEW  
MOBILE SOURCE EMISSION STANDARDS ON NO<sub>x</sub>  
AND VOC EMISSIONS IN TENNESSEE  
1999-2030**

**(Based on MOBILE6-Final Version)**



by

**W.T. Davis, T.L. Miller, G.D. Reed  
A.M.Y. Tang, P. Doraiswamy, and P. Sanhueza**

**Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
The University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37996**

through

**University of Tennessee Center for Transportation Research**

for

**Tennessee Department of Transportation**

**March 14, 2002**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This report was funded by the Tennessee Department of Transportation's Planning Division in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration and the University of Tennessee Transportation Research Center. The results and information contained in this document are based on the final version of the U.S. EPA MOBILE6 mobile source emissions model that was released in January 2002.

## ABSTRACT

The relative importance of on-road emissions as a participant in ozone formation depends in large part on the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day in a given area. In the future, the relative importance of on-road emissions will be affected by the growth in VMT, which results in increased emissions, and the implementation of motor vehicle emissions controls, which will reduce the emissions associated with each mile of travel. This study evaluates the combined effects of VMT growth and the national LEV, HDDVNO<sub>x</sub>, Tier2/Sulfur and HDDV/Sulfur vehicle emission standards on NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC emissions for the State of Tennessee utilizing the final version of MOBILE6.

The new LEV, HDDVNO<sub>x</sub>, Tier2/Sulfur and HDDV/Sulfur standards, which will be fully in-place by 2001, 2004, 2006, and 2007, respectively, will significantly reduce the emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC from individual on-road vehicles. The implementation of the new regulations will have less effect on VOC emissions compared to NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. There is an 80% reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and a 61% reduction in VOC emissions without an I/M program compared to a reduction of 87% in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and 70% reduction in VOC emissions with an I/M program by year 2025. On the other hand, the year-to-year emission reduction with and without an I/M program is 2% to 42% for NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and 21 to 39% reduction for VOC emissions for 1999 and 2030, respectively.

With the potential of increasing NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC emissions in the future due to increasing growth of DVMT, there is a need to develop strategies which will decrease the current growth rate of DVMT, improve emission control technologies, and/or utilize alternative lesser polluting vehicles in order to maintain the lower emissions which will be achieved during the next 10 to 15 years.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 2 BACKGROUND .....	2
2.1. CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS .....	2
2.2. MOBILE MODEL .....	3
2.3. REGULATORY STATUS OF MOBILE SOURCE EMISSION CONTROLS .....	5
2.3.1. National Low Emission Vehicle (NLEV) Standards .....	5
2.3.2. 2004 NO <sub>x</sub> Standard for Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines.....	9
2.3.3. Tier 2 Vehicle Emission Standard and Gasoline Sulfur Requirements .....	10
2.3.4. Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards and Highway Diesel Fuel Requirements .....	11
2.4. GROWTH OF VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) IN TENNESSEE .....	12
2.4.1. Statewide VMT Equations and Growth.....	12
2.4.2. County Level DVMT Equations and Growth.....	17
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY .....	24
3.1. DEVELOPMENT OF REGISTRATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE FOR TENNESSEE .....	25
3.1.1. Introduction.....	25
3.1.2. Methodology.....	25
3.1.3. Use of Developed Registration Distribution Fraction in MOBILE6 Model .....	33

3.2 DEVELOPMENT OF VMT MIX FRACTIONS FROM THE TENNESSEE		
VEHICLE REGISTRATION DATA .....	33	
3.2.1. Introduction.....	33	
3.2.2. Methodology .....	34	
3.2.3. Use of Developed VMT Mix in MOBILE6 Model .....	41	
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCES EMISSION		
INVENTORY FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE.....	42	
3.3.1. Emissions Calculation Methodology .....	42	
3.3.2. MOBILE6 Input Parameters for Area Subgroups .....	45	
3.3.3. Specific Input Parameters for MOBILE6 Runs .....	47	
3.3.3.1. Shelby + Subgroup.....	47	
3.3.3.1a. Shelby County .....	50	
3.3.3.1b. Tipton and Fayette County.....	53	
3.3.3.2. Davidson + Subgroup .....	54	
3.3.3.3. Hamilton + Subgroup.....	55	
3.3.3.4. Knox + Subgroup.....	55	
3.3.3.5. Sullivan + Subgroup .....	56	
3.3.3.6. All Other Counties .....	56	
CHAPTER 4	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS .....	58
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	68
REFERENCES	.....	71
APPENDICES	.....	73
APPENDIX A. REGISTRATION AGE DISTRIBUTION BEST-FIT GRAPHS...		74

APPENDIX B.1 VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) FRACTIONS .....	81
APPENDIX B.2 DEVELOPMENT OF VEHICLE SPEEDS FOR EMISSIONS MODELING .....	102
APPENDIX C. CLASSIFICATION OF COUNTIES INTO EAST, MIDDLE AND WEST TENNESSEE .....	107
APPENDIX D. INPUT PARAMETERS FOR MOBILE6 RUNS .....	109
APPENDIX E. MOBILE SOURCE EMISSIONS FOR EAST, MIDDLE AND WEST TENNESSEE.....	129

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>Page</b>
2-1 Brief History of the MOBILE Model .....	6
2-2 Relative Phase-in of Various Mobile Source Emission Standards .....	8
2-3 State Wide Annual VMT (million mi).....	13
2-4 Summary of Linear Equations for Growth Rates for TN Counties, Based on 1990-1999 DVMT Data.....	19
3-1 Body Type and Registration Class Code for Different Vehicle Classifications.....	28
3-2 Gaussian Equation Parameters.....	30
3-3 Age Distributions for LDV .....	31
3-4 Age Distributions for LDT (LDT1, 2, 3 and 4) .....	32
3-5 Conversion from MOBILE5b Based VMT Mix to MOBILE6 Based VMT Mix .....	40
3-6 Seasonal Adjustment Factors.....	44
3-7 Highest 8-hr Maximum Ozone Levels. a. East Tennessee: 1998-2000, b. Middle Tennessee: 1998-2000 and c. West Tennessee: 1998-2000.....	48
3-8 Summary of Tennessee Highway Speeds vs. Mobile6 Defaults .....	51
B.1-1 “Shelby +” VMT Mix .....	82
B.1-2 “Knox +” VMT Mix .....	84
B.1-3 “Hamilton +” VMT Mix .....	86
B.1-4 Davidson County VMT Mix.....	88
B.1-5 Rutherford County VMT Mix.....	90

B.1-6	Sumner County VMT Mix.....	92
B.1-7	Williamson County VMT Mix.....	94
B.1-8	Wilson County VMT Mix.....	96
B.1-9	“Sullivan +” VMT Mix.....	98
B.1-10	“All Other Counties” VMT Mix.....	100
B.2-1	Vehicle Speeds for Emissions Modeling by Source.....	106
C1	Classification of Counties into East, Middle and West .....	108
D1	Header Section (same for ALL subgroups) .....	110
D2	Shelby + Subgroup.	
	a. Shelby County: Run Section.....	111
	b. Shelby County: I/M Program “1” Parameters .....	113
	c. Shelby County: I/M Program “2” Parameters.....	114
	d. Shelby County: I/M Program “3” Parameters .....	115
	e. Shelby County: I/M Program “4” Parameters.....	116
	f. Shelby County: I/M Program “5” Parameters .....	117
D3	Shelby + Subgroup – Tipton & Fayette Counties: Run Section.....	118
D4	Davidson + Subgroup.	
	a. Run Section.....	119
	b. I/M Program “1” Parameters .....	121
	c. I/M Program “2” Parameters.....	122
	d. I/M Program “3” Parameters .....	123
D5	Hamilton + Subgroup: Run Section .....	124
D6	Knox + Subgroup: Run Section.....	125



D7	Sullivan + Subgroup: Run Section.....	126
D8	All Other Counties Subgroup: Run Section.....	127
D9	Scenario Section (same for ALL subgroups).....	128
E1	East Tennessee.	
	a. VOC Emissions (tons/day).....	130
	b. NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions (tons/day).....	131
E2	Middle Tennessee.	
	a. VOC Emissions (tons/day).....	132
	b. NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions (tons/day).....	133
E3	West Tennessee.	
	a. VOC Emissions (tons/day).....	134
	b. NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions (tons/day).....	135
E4	Statewide Emissions: a. VOC Emissions and b. NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions .....	136

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
2-1 Transportation Conformity Process .....	4
2-2 State Wide Annual VMT vs. Year (1967-1999) .....	14
2-3(a) State Wide Annual VMT vs. Year (1990-1999) (Compound Fit) .....	15
2-3(b) State Wide Annual VMT vs. Year (1990-1999) (Linear Fit).....	16
2-4 Davidson DVMT vs. Year (1990-1999) .....	20
2-5 Hamilton DVMT vs. Year (1990-1999) .....	20
2-6 Knox DVMT vs. Year (1990-1999).....	21
2-7 Shelby DVMT vs. Year (1990-1999) .....	21
2-8 Sullivan DVMT vs. Year (1990-1999) .....	22
2-9 Increase in DVMT per year in Thousands of DVMT Based on 1990-1999 DVMT Data .....	23
3-1 Map of the Area Subgroups and the Counties Classified as East, Middle and West Tennessee.....	49
4-1 Davidson County – Mobile Source Emissions (MOBILE6) .....	59
4-2 Shelby County – Mobile Source Emissions (MOBILE6).....	59
4-3 Knox County – Mobile Source Emissions (MOBILE6).....	60
4-4 Hamilton County – Mobile Source Emissions (MOBILE6).....	60
4-5 Sullivan County – Mobile Source Emissions (MOBILE6) .....	61
4-6 Total Projected Emissions in Tennessee (MOBILE6).....	61
4-7 Davidson County – NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions with and without I/M Program .....	64

4-8	Davidson County – VOC Emissions with and without I/M Program.....	64
4-9	Davidson County (with I/M Program) – NO <sub>x</sub> Emission Factors vs. Year .....	66
4-10	Davidson County (with I/M Program) – VOC Emission Factors vs. Year .....	66
A1	Registration Distribution for Shelby +. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	75
A2	Registration Distribution for Davidson +. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	76
A3	Registration Distribution for Hamilton +. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	77
A4	Registration Distribution for Knox +. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	78
A5	Registration Distribution for Sullivan +. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	79
A6	Registration Distribution for All Other Counties. (a). LDV Vehicle Classification, (b). LDT Vehicle Classification.....	80