



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Real-world Emissions of Construction Mobile Machines and Comparison to a Non-road Emission Model*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/170657/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Tu, R, Li, T, Meng, C et al. (7 more authors) (2021) Real-world Emissions of Construction Mobile Machines and Comparison to a Non-road Emission Model. *Science of The Total Environment*. 145365. ISSN 0048-9697

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145365>

© 2021 Published by Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Real-world Emissions of Construction Machines and Comparison to**
2 **a Non-road Emission Model**

3 Ran Tu
4 turancoolgal@seu.edu.cn
5 School of Transportation, Southeast University, Nanjing, China
6

7 Tiezhu Li (corresponding author)
8 litiezhu@seu.edu.cn
9 School of Transportation, Southeast University, Nanjing, China
10

11 Chunsheng Meng
12 657487148@qq.com
13 School of Transportation, Southeast University, Nanjing, China
14

15 Yisong Xie
16 77451931@qq.com
17 Nanjing Institute of Ecological Environmental Protection, Nanjing, China
18

19 Fangjian Xie
20 strong886@126.com
21 Nanjing Institute of Ecological Environmental Protection, Nanjing, China
22

23 Feng Yang
24 510723286@qq.com
25 Nanjing Institute of Ecological Environmental Protection, Nanjing, China
26

27 Haibo Chen
28 H.Chen@its.leeds.ac.uk
29 Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
30

31 Ying Li
32 ylitransportation@gmail.com
33 Dynnoteq, 61 Bridge Street, Kington HR5 3DJ, UK
34

35 Jianbing Gao
36 J.Gao1@leeds.ac.uk
37 Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
38

39 Ye Liu
40 Y.Liu8@leeds.ac.uk
41 Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

1 **Real-world Emissions of Construction Machines and Comparison to** 2 **a Non-road Emission Model**

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 This study implemented real-world tests in Nanjing, China for measuring emission factors (EFs)
5 of air pollutants, including Carbon Monoxide (CO), Hydrocarbon (HC), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x),
6 and Particulate Matter (PM) from ten construction machines in three operational modes (idling,
7 moving, and working) with a Portable Emission Measurement System. The idling mode shows the
8 least variation of EFs, and its average CO EFs can be higher than the moving and working modes
9 by 43% and 34%, respectively. The working mode generates the highest emission for all other
10 pollutants with the highest variation. The EFs suggested by the Guide (an official guidebook for
11 developing emission inventory in China) are in general lower than the measured EFs, and the gap
12 becomes larger for older machines. The EFs of CO, NO_x, and PM of China Stage II machines are
13 24%, 120%, and 66% higher than the Guide, respectively. The differences go up as high as 126%,
14 1066%, and 559% for China Stage I machines, indicating the upgrade of engine technology from
15 Stage I to Stage II, as well as the effect of machine deterioration. The result of this study reveals
16 the effectiveness of stringent emission standards in controlling emissions from construction
17 machines. High emissions from older machines emphasize the importance of a more rigorous
18 machine replacement policy and a regulated maintenance strategy. The result also stresses the need
19 to update the Guide with differentiated activity modes, region variations, and machine
20 deterioration effects.

21 *Keywords:* Non-road mobile machinery (NRMM); construction machinery; air pollutant emissions;
22 Portable Emission Measurement System (PEMS); non-road emission model

1 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) is a great contributor to energy consumption as well as
3 air pollution. Most of this type of vehicles are diesel-fueled, which are proved to be a key source
4 for Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) and Particulate Matter (PM) emissions (Zhao et al., 2015). In 2017, the
5 total NO_x and PM emissions from construction machines reached 3.65 million tonnes in China,
6 which were comparable to the total emissions from on-road diesel vehicles (Huanxing et al., 2020).
7 Similarly, non-road diesel machinery in the US contributed over 35% and 44% to total mobile
8 source NO_x and PM emissions according to statistical data from the U.S. Environmental Protection
9 Agency in 2014. (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2014). In 2016, the construction sector
10 became the largest source to total PM₁₀ emissions (34%) and the 5th largest of the total NO_x
11 emissions (7%) in London (Desouza et al., 2020). A strongly positive relationship between total
12 emissions of non-road machines and the level of urbanization has been demonstrated in previous
13 studies (Fan et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2020). Among non-road machinery, construction machines
14 contribute to a large proportion (70%) to total emissions in Sichuan Province, China (Fan et al.,
15 2018). Construction machines also contributed 37% to total non-road emissions in Tianjin, another
16 metropolitan city in the northern China (Y. Zhang et al., 2020).

17 The estimation of construction machinery emissions in previous studies depends on three
18 major factors, the population, the activity data, and the emission factor (EF) of the machinery. The
19 EFs can be obtained from non-road vehicle emission models such as NONROAD developed by
20 the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (Marshall et al., 2012; Rasdorf et al., 2012;
21 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005), the OFFROAD model developed by the California
22 Air Resources Board (CARB) (Lewis et al., 2012; Rasdorf et al., 2010; Shao, 2016.). The modelled
23 EFs are usually derived from engine dynamometer tests through in-lab experiments, where various

1 test conditions with different engine parameters as well as after-treatment equipment can be
2 conveniently implemented (Pirjola et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2019). Rated power, machine types,
3 and the emission standard of the estimated machine, are commonly used as parameters in non-road
4 emission models. The Compilation Guide for Non-road Mobile Source Emission Inventory (the
5 Guide) developed by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China (Fan et al., 2018; Guo et
6 al., 2020; Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, 2014) is one of the most commonly used
7 guideline for developing emission inventories in China. The Guide provides three different
8 methods for estimating emissions based on different data availability, with suggested load factor
9 and EFs. The EFs in the Guide are distinguished by the level of rated power and emission standard
10 (Supplemental Information, or SI Table SI 5 to Table SI 7), and the EF values were determined by
11 a Portable Emission Measurement System (PEMS) on 50 typical construction machines (Guo et
12 al., 2020).

13 However, due to heavy workload, excessive year of usage, and lack of maintenance, EFs
14 provided by models cannot represent the actual emissions of the non-road machinery in real-world.
15 Moreover, the uncertainty of emission factors due to different machinery activity modes, varied
16 operations, machinery types, and engine deterioration, cannot be captured by the single value
17 provided by the model (Cao et al., 2018; Lewis et al., 2019, 2009; Sepasgozar and Blair, 2019). In
18 the study of Frey et al. (2010), a strong positive relationship between the time-based emission rate
19 and engine attributes, such as engine load, power and displacement, was revealed. Time-based
20 emission rates of construction machinery in the working mode and the moving mode are found to
21 be significantly higher than those from the idling mode (Abolhasani et al., 2008; Fu et al., 2012),
22 while in terms of the fuel-based emission factor, decreasing the idling mode ratio in the machine
23 operation can effectively reduce the additional fuel use and excess Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)

1 emissions (Hu et al., 2019; Lewis et al., 2012). Due to lower combustion efficiency, worse engine
2 wear, and less stringent emission limits, construction machines with older engines lead to higher
3 emission rates in the real-world operation (Desouza et al., 2020; Fu et al., 2012).

4 Despite the breadth of emissions modelling and measurements of construction machinery, the
5 variation of real-world machine operational EFs under different working conditions and engine
6 attributes needs to be further discussed to capture the uncertainty in the total emission estimation.
7 In this paper, real-world emissions, including Carbon Monoxide (CO), Hydrocarbon (HC), NO_x,
8 and PM, were measured from different types of construction machines using PEMS. The
9 uncertainty of the EFs is captured from the measured data by differentiating activity modes,
10 emission standards, and rated power of machines. The measured EFs were compared with the
11 values provided by The Compilation Guide for Non-road Mobile Source Emission Inventory (the
12 Guide, an official guidebook for developing non-road machinery emissions in China)(Ministry of
13 Environmental Protection of China, 2014) to illustrate the differences between the measured
14 results and the model. The novelty of this study is the identification of the gap between emission
15 factors from the commonly adopted model and those from the field measurement, with the
16 consideration of machine attributes and activity modes, which can be further used for identifying
17 possible underestimation/overestimation of total emissions when applying the Guide.

18 **2 DATA COLLECTION**

19 Emission measurements of non-road construction machines were conducted in the winter of
20 2018 in Nanjing, China. The type and the number of the in-use construction machines in the city,
21 as well as their annual operating hours (when the engine is on, including both idling and operating
22 states), were first collected through on-site interview and questionnaire. Second, machinery
23 emissions in three activity modes (idling, moving, and working) were measured by PEMS.

1 In this study, 20 representative construction sites were selected in the region of the city,
2 considering the spatial distribution and surrounding land use types, to collect information of most
3 common construction machines, such as the manufacturer, engine attributes, emission standard,
4 and annual working hours (see SI Figure SI 1). The results are presented in the SI 1.2. Given the
5 distribution of machine types, ten construction machines, including three cranes, two loaders, two
6 excavators, one forklift, one concrete pump truck, and one sprinkler, representing surveyed
7 machines at 20 construction sites, were selected for the operational emission measurement. The
8 specifications as well as the measurement equipment of these ten machines are listed in Table 1.
9 All the machines are equipped with selective catalytic reduction (SCR) for the emission after-
10 treatment and are powered by diesel under China Stage VI fuel standard with Sulfur content less
11 than 0.001%. The field test was conducted in the winter between November 2018 and January
12 2019. The meteorological information of the test, including the temperature and the weather, was
13 listed in the SI 1 Table SI 2. The measurement was implemented in three operational activity
14 modes (idling, moving, and working), each repeated for 5 to 15 minutes. The idling mode refers
15 to the state where machines were turned on without any workload or movement; the moving mode
16 was operated by driving machines back and forward for 15 meters without extra workload; and
17 the working mode simulated the real-world construction work of each specific machine type. The
18 moving cycle was excluded from cranes and the concrete pump truck due to their real-world
19 working conditions. Time-based Carbon Monoxide (CO), Hydrocarbon (HC), Nitrogen Oxides
20 (NO_x), and Particulate Matter (PM) emission factors (g/second) were measured by the PEMS. The
21 fuel use rate (kg/hour) was estimated based on the carbon balance of emissions, and the fuel-based
22 emission factors (g/kg) can be further generated. Two types of PEMS (HPC501 and SEMTECH-
23 DS developed by Sensors, Inc.) were utilized to measure emissions from the real-world operation,

1 and Dekati eFilter was added onto SEMTECH-DS for the PM measurement. The frequency of the
 2 data record was 1Hz, except for the PM measurement from HPC501, by which only the total value
 3 of PM emissions per test was given. In this study, the fuel-based EFs (in g/kg) were adopted due
 4 to their less variability compared to the time-based results (in g/second) (Frey et al., 2010). An
 5 overall EF of each measured machine can be calculated based on the proportion of three activity
 6 modes in the daily use: for idling-moving-working cycle, the time proportion is 0.1, 0.2, 0.7; for
 7 idling-working cycle, the time proportion is 0.1, 0.9.

8 Table 1: Specifications of machines for the emission measurement

ID	Machinery type	Model	Engine model	Registration	Emission standard	PEMS type	Rated power (kW)
1	Crane	Xugong	SC7H260Q5	2017.5	Stage III	HPC	192
2	Crane	XugongXCT50 L5	SC9DF300.2Q5	2018.5	Stage III	SEMTECH + Efilter	219
3	Crane	Liugong5301JQ Z25	ISD28550	2017.9	Stage III	SEMTECH + eFilter	204
4	Excavator	Xiagong822LG	6BG1TABFD0 8C2	2010.11	Stage II	HPC	120
5	Excavator	Doushan DX150W0-9C	DL06B-C3	2018.1	Stage III	SEMTECH + eFilter	103
6	Loader	Longgong	WD10G220E11	2010.4	Stage I	HPC	162
7	Loader	W156 Wheel Loader	WD10G220E21	2009	Stage I	SEMTECH + eFilter	162
8	Forklift	Longgong FD35	QC490GP	-	Stage I	SEMTECH + eFilter	36.8
9	Concrete pump truck	ACTROS5041	OM501LA.IV/3	2017.6	Stage III	SEMTECH + eFilter	300
10	Sprinkler	5106GSS	YC4E140-30	2011.05	Stage II	SEMTECH + eFilter	105

9
10

11 Comparisons of the EFs were implemented from two aspects. First, the measured EFs of this
 12 study were compared based on different emission standards and rated power levels. Second,
 13 suggested EFs of the same machinery type were extracted from the Guide, which is developed by
 14 the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China and is widely applied in the emission inventory

1 development (Fu et al., 2013; Guo et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2019; J. Zhang et al., 2020), to illustrate
2 the gap between the model and the real-world conditions.


3 **3 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

4 **3.1 Comparison of emission factors among different machine specifications**

5 Figure 1 present average EFs of ten measured machines under three activity modes, error
6 bars indicating the standard deviation. Values of the Coefficient of Variation (CV), which equals
7 the standard deviation divided by the mean, are illustrated in the SI 2 Figure SI 3. EFs are presented
8 by the descending order of the emission standard and the rated power of the measured machines.
9 On average, CO EFs of idling mode are higher than the moving and working mode by 43% and
10 34%, respectively. It is possibly due to the incomplete combustion of the fuel during idling. While
11 the variance of idling EFs is lower than that of the other two activity modes for all the pollutants
12 due to stable engine speed (or rotation per minute, RPM). The working mode EFs are slightly
13 higher than the moving mode with average relative difference 4%, 9%, 14% and 40% for CO, HC,
14 NO_x and PM, respectively. Due to varied workload during the working mode, the CV of the
15 working mode EFs is also higher than the moving mode by 58% and 122% on average for CO and
16 NO_x EFs, respectively. PM EFs from working and moving modes are significantly higher than
17 those from the idling mode by as much as 576%, which is different to the trend of CO EFs. In
18 addition, PM emissions reach the highest variation during all three activity modes for every
19 measured machine.


20 Comparing among different machines, EFs of each activity mode present an increasing
21 trend with less stringent emission standard (or longer in-use time). Machines under Stage III have
22 relatively lower EFs for all the air pollutants. In contrast, machines under lower emission standard
23 emit more emissions in all activity modes, and their EFs are constantly high as the variations are

1 lower than those with Stage III standard. Among four machines under Stage III, the concrete pump
 2 truck generates the lowest EFs, possibly due to higher rated power and higher energy efficiency.
 3 The trend is consistent with the Guide, which suggests lower EFs for higher rated power or more
 4 stringent emission standards. However, this does not apply to all pollutants. For example, Crane
 5 #3 (with Stage III and 204kW rated power) shows higher NO_x EFs than Excavator #5 (with Stage
 6 III and 103kW rated power). Similarly, Loader #7 (Stage I, 162kW) also generates higher NO_x
 7 EFs than Forklift #8 (Stage I, 36.8kW). In addition, CO EFs of Crane #1 (Stage III, 192kW) are
 8 significantly higher than other machines under the same emission standard, which possibly results
 9 from the manufacturer and poor maintenance of this machine.





10

1



2





1
2 Figure 1: Mean and standard deviation of CO, NO_x, HC, and PM EFs (g/kg) for ten measured
3 machines under three activity modes (numbers on the bottom of the x-label are the rated power
4 of the corresponding machine)
5


6 3.2 Comparison between measured EFs and the Guide EFs

7 A weighted average EF is calculated for each tested machine based on the activity mode
8 proportion. The comparison between the PEMS-based weighted average EFs and the Guide-based
9 EFs is illustrated in Figure 2. Note that PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, that are distinguished in the Guide, cannot
10 be differentiated by the measurement. Therefore, PM EFs from the Guide refer to the sum of PM₁₀
11 and PM_{2.5}.


12 The result shows that measured EFs are higher than the suggested values in general, and
13 the relative difference between the Guide and the measured result increases for machines under
14 lower emission standards. For older machines under Stage I, the relative difference between the
15 measurement and the Guide for CO, HC, NO_x, and PM is 126%, 33%, 1066%, and 559% on
16 average, respectively; while for Stage II machines, the average relative difference is 24%, 58%,
17 120%, and 66% respectively.

1 For CO and PM emissions, the relative difference of machines with Stage III standard lead
 2 to similar or lower EFs than the suggested values, except Crane #1, of which the average CO EF
 3 is higher than the suggested EF by 400%. Machines with Stage I standard generate higher EFs for
 4 almost all the pollutants. Especially for Loader #6 (Stage I, 162kW rated power), from which the
 5 EFs of CO, HC, and PM exceed the value provided by the Guide by 171%, 2543%, and 1417%,
 6 respectively. The comparison of NO_x emissions between measured and the Guide shows
 7 inconsistent trend to other pollutants. Crane #2 and Crane #3 under Stage III lead to the highest
 8 difference on the NO_x EFs, exceeding the Guide by 275% and 261%, respectively. The CO, HC,
 9 and PM EFs for forklift #8 (Stage I) exceed the Guide by 183%, 523%, and 196%, respectively,
 10 while it has lower NO_x EFs than the suggested value.


11




12



1



2



1
2 Figure 2: The comparison of the Guide EFs and measured EFs. The error bar represents the
3 standard deviation of measured EFs. The line with dots shows the EF relative difference, which
4 equals the difference between measured and the Guide (values at the bottom of the x-label
5 represent the rated power of the corresponding machine)
6

7 4 DISCUSSION

8 The result in this study illustrates the effectiveness of stringent emission standard for
9 remarkably reducing non-road machine emissions in general, particularly for CO, PM, and HC
10 emissions. However, this trend cannot apply to all machines, and the variation of the emissions is
11 also not neglectable. From the activity mode perspective, EFs generated from the idling mode are
12 relatively less varied, due to stable engine RPM. Moving EFs are slightly lower than working EFs,
13 while EFs have higher variation during the working mode, which may result from varied load
14 during the working mode. To estimate total emissions from non-road machinery more accurately,
15 it is essential to differentiate EFs from different activity modes, and that requires investigations on
16 the proportion of activity modes in the operational hours during on-site surveys. Comparing across
17 three stages of emission standards, EFs of machines with Stage I show higher variations,

1 introducing more uncertainties to EFs. These machines have usually been used for over ten years.
2 Given their high EFs with large uncertainties, management should be taken into effect for replacing
3 these machines with newer ones.

4 Comparing the measurement of this study with the Guide, the result shows a large gap of
5 EFs between the real-world measurement and the suggested values. Overall, the measured EFs are
6 higher than those suggested in the Guide, and the relative differences between the measured EFs
7 and the suggested values increase with older machines for CO, HC, and PM emissions. This is
8 expected since the Guide was released six years ago, while Stage I machines are still in use till
9 now. Therefore, engines of these older machines have deteriorated significantly, leading to higher
10 emissions than the Guide values. The comparison stresses the need to update the Guide for the
11 non-road machinery emission estimation, due to a highly possible underestimation of total
12 emissions using the EFs suggested by the current version. For NO_x emissions, however, the trend
13 is completely different to the other three emissions: the NO_x EF of newer machines can be up to
14 275% higher than those of the Guide EFs, indicating much worse NO_x after-treatment of the
15 measured machines than those tested in the Guide. More stringent controls from local authorities
16 should be implemented for non-road machines in terms of their NO_x emissions.

17 In addition to the EFs, the annual working hours of each machine type is also recommended
18 by the Guide for the calculation of total emissions. Table 2 shows the comparison between
19 suggested working hours from the Guide and those of the surveyed construction sites in this study.
20 The average working hours of the construction sites in Nanjing are higher than the national average
21 level (which is suggested in the Guide) by 192% to 319%. The overloaded work fastens the engine
22 deterioration, lowering the efficiency of after-treatment equipment, which explains the higher EFs
23 measured in this study compared to the Guide. The comparison also demonstrates the importance

1 of on-site surveys. Local working conditions of construction machines should be considered when
 2 developing regional emission inventories, instead of using the value recommended by the Guide.

3 Table 2: Average annual working hours of the surveyed sites and the Guide

	Average annual working hours at 20 construction sites	Average annual working hours suggested by the Guide	Differences $(\frac{surveyed-Guide}{Guide})$
Loader	3225	770	319%
Concrete pump truck	2535.7	-	-
Excavator	2578.1	770	235%
Crane	2317.3	770	201%
Forklift	2250	770	192%
Sprinkler	2416.7	-	-

4
 5 Table 3 compares the measured EFs of this study with the result of existing research on the
 6 real-world non-road machinery emission measurement. Similar to this study, working and moving
 7 PM EFs are also found to be higher than those of the idling mode in Yu et al. (2020), with similar
 8 PM EFs for machines under China Stage III. Compared to Yu et al. (2020) and Fu et al. (2013) for
 9 Stage I and Stage II machines, the EFs of this study are much higher, which could result from the
 10 overloaded work of measured machines. The annual working hours in this study are over 2000,
 11 while in Hou et al. (2019), the working hours of these two types of machines are 500 and 150,
 12 respectively. Due to the lack of data, US Tier 1 and Tier 2, which correspond to China Pre-Stage I,
 13 cannot be compared with this study. The comparison emphasizes a strong deterioration effect on
 14 non-road machinery, demonstrating an urgent need for a more stringent control on the machine
 15 replacement and a more efficient working organization of construction machines.

Table 3: Comparison with previous research on real-world non-road machinery emission factors (g/kg)

Previous research							This study				
	Activity mode	Machine type or emission standard	CO	HC	NO _x	PM	Machine type and emission standard	CO	HC	NO _x	PM
Yu et al. (2020) ¹	Idling	China Stage I	-	-	-	3.27	China Stage I	-	-	-	6.15
	Working		-	-	-	7.78		-	-	-	19.96
	Idling	China Stage II	-	-	-	1.87	China Stage II	-	-	-	2.40
	Working		-	-	-	2.50		-	-	-	5.53
	Idling	China Stage III	-	-	-	1.29	China Stage III	-	-	-	1.02
	Working		-	-	-	2.94		-	-	-	2.76
Hou et al. (2019) ²	Idling	China Stage II, 37-75 kW	1.62	0.22	2.21	0.13	Stage II, 105kW	10.77	2.82	73.26	0.99
	Moving		2.51	0.41	2.76	0.16		7.56	2.54	88.18	1.31
	Working		5.56	1.29	8.06	0.49		7.88	2.62	84.95	1.21
	Idling	China Stage II, 75-135 kW	1.88	0.25	2.06	0.04	Stage II, 120kW	37.13	16.53	3.74	3.81
	Moving		2.96	0.47	4.86	0.21		59.42	23.09	5.57	3.77
	Working		5.80	1.12	6.36	0.35		50.17	17.28	6.58	9.85
Frey et al. (2008) ³	Working	US Tier 1	67.59	76.60	482.14	3.79	Pre-stage I	-	-	-	-
	Working	US Tier 2	54.07	54.07	432.57	3.79		-	-	-	-
	Working	US Tier 3	39.65	27.94	292.89	2.57	China Stage I	48.00	41.87	53.89	6.15
Muresan et al. (2015) ⁴	Working	EURO Stage III	3.15	0.49	12.80	-	China Stage I	48.00	41.87	53.89	

2 Note: 1, 3, 4: Emission factors of the study presented in this paper are the average value under each corresponding emission standard; 2: Measured
3 machines with the same rated power category and the emission standard are selected for the comparison; 3: the unit is converted from g/gal to g/kg;
4 4: the unit is converted from g/L to g/kg.

1 **5 CONCLUSION**

2 In this study, emission factors of air pollutants, including CO, HC, NO_x, and PM, of non-road
3 construction machinery were measured in the real-world working condition. Fuel-based emission
4 factors (EFs, in g/kg) of ten typical construction machines with six machinery types and three
5 activity modes (idling, moving, working) were summarized. EFs from the idling activity mode
6 generally have smaller variations, while the working mode leads to the highest variation with
7 relatively higher EFs. From the comparison of EFs among ten machines, EFs become higher with
8 lower rated power or less stringent emission standard, which is consistent with the trend of the EFs
9 suggested by the Guide. Given similar engine attributes, EFs are varied among different machine
10 types, which possibly results from different working operations, varied maintenance condition,
11 and different engine technologies adopted by manufacturers. Comparing the measured EFs to the
12 Guide ones, it is found that in general, the measured EFs are higher than those from the Guide, and
13 the relative difference between the measured EFs and the Guide increases for machines under
14 lower emission standard. For older machines under Stage I, average relative difference can be as
15 high as 1066% (HC EFs); while for Stage II machines, the average relative difference is at most
16 120% (HC EFs). The comparison of NO_x EFs shows different trend to other emissions, and
17 machines under Stage III exhibit the highest relative difference to the Guide. The high EFs from
18 the measurement is possibly due to the engine deterioration of tested machines. This may result
19 from overloaded annual working hours, which can be more than 300% higher than the suggested
20 working hours in the Guide.

21 The measurement of this study covers representative construction machines utilized in the
22 real-world construction sites, which include all the emission standards in effect. The deterioration
23 of old machines shows strong impacts on emissions, suggesting a more stringent machine

1 replacement strategy that should be applied by the local authority. An efficient working
2 organization of non-road machines and regulated maintenance should also be implemented to keep
3 an appropriate working condition of construction machines, especially for urban regions, where
4 the construction demand is high. In addition, in order to develop emission inventories more
5 accurately, an urgent need for an updated Guide is revealed, in which the demographical and
6 geographical variation of estimated areas, emission factor differences among various activity
7 modes, and the engine deterioration effect should be considered.

8

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

2 The research in this paper was jointly supported by Nanjing Institute of Ecological
3 Environmental Protection (Nanjing, China), the National Natural Science Foundation of China
4 (No. 1877395), the EU-funded project MODALES (grant agreement No 815189), and
5 DYNNOTEQ.

6

7

1 REFERENCES

- 2 Abolhasani, S., Frey, H.C., Kim, K., Rasdorf, W., Lewis, P., Pang, S.H., 2008. Real-world in-use
3 activity, fuel use, and emissions for nonroad construction vehicles: A case study for
4 excavators. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 58, 1033–1046. [https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-](https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.58.8.1033)
5 [3289.58.8.1033](https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.58.8.1033)
- 6 Cao, T., Russell, R.L., Durbin, T.D., Cocker, D.R., Burnette, A., Calavita, J., Maldonado, H.,
7 Johnson, K.C., 2018. Characterization of the emissions impacts of hybrid excavators with a
8 portable emissions measurement system (PEMS)-based methodology. *Sci. Total Environ.*
9 635, 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.011>
- 10 Desouza, C.D., Marsh, D.J., Beevers, S.D., Molden, N., Green, D.C., 2020. Real-world
11 emissions from non-road mobile machinery in London. *Atmos. Environ.* 223, 117301.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2020.117301>
- 13 Fan, W., Chen, J., Li, Y., Jiang, T., Sun, S., Wang, G., Liao, H., Jiang, T., Wu, K., Qian, J., Ye,
14 H., 2018. Study on the non-road mobile source emission inventory for sichuan province.
15 *China Environ. Sci.* 38, 4460–4468.
- 16 Frey, H.C., Kim, K., Pang, S.H., Rasdorf, W.J., Lewis, P., 2008. Characterization of real-world
17 activity, fuel use, and emissions for selected motor graders fueled with petroleum diesel and
18 B20 biodiesel. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 58, 1274–1287. [https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-](https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.58.10.1274)
19 [3289.58.10.1274](https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.58.10.1274)
- 20 Frey, H.C., Rasdorf, W., Lewis, P., 2010. Comprehensive field study of fuel use and emissions
21 of nonroad diesel construction equipment. *Transp. Res. Rec.* 69–76.
22 <https://doi.org/10.3141/2158-09>
- 23 Fu, M., Ge, Y., Tan, J., Zeng, T., Liang, B., 2012. Characteristics of typical non-road machinery

- 1 emissions in China by using portable emission measurement system. *Sci. Total Environ.*
2 437, 255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.07.095>
- 3 Fu, X., Wang, S., Zhao, B., Xing, J., Cheng, Z., Liu, H., Hao, J., 2013. Emission inventory of
4 primary pollutants and chemical speciation in 2010 for the Yangtze River Delta region,
5 China. *Atmos. Environ.* 70, 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.12.034>
- 6 Guo, X., Wu, H., Chen, D., Ye, Z., Shen, Y., Liu, J., Cheng, S., 2020. Estimation and prediction
7 of pollutant emissions from agricultural and construction diesel machinery in the Beijing-
8 Tianjin-Hebei (BTH) region, China☆. *Environ. Pollut.* 260, 113973.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.113973>
- 10 Hou, X., Tian, J., Song, C., Wang, J., Zhao, J., Zhang, X., 2019. Emission inventory research of
11 typical agricultural machinery in Beijing, China. *Atmos. Environ.* 216, 116903.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116903>
- 13 Hu, Q., Huang, C., Qiao, L., Ma, Y., Yang, Q., Tang, W., Zhou, M., Zhu, S., Lou, S., Tao, S.,
14 Chen, Y., Li, L., 2019. Speciated PM composition and gas and particle emission factors for
15 diesel construction machinery in China. *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 19, 1820–1833.
16 <https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.2018.07.0272>
- 17 Huanxing, C., Gang, L., Ying, Y., Liang, J., Shunli, L., 2020. Review and outlook of China non-
18 road diesel mobile machinery emission standards stricter emissions standards for better air
19 quality in China. *Johnson Matthey Technol. Rev.* 64, 76–83.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1595/205651320x15730367457486>
- 21 Lewis, P., Frey, H.C., Rasdorf, W., 2009. Development and use of emissions inventories for
22 construction vehicles. *Transp. Res. Rec.* 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2123-06>
- 23 Lewis, P., Karimi, B., Shan, Y., Rasdorf, W., 2019. Comparing the economic, energy, and

1 environmental impacts of biodiesel versus petroleum diesel fuel use in construction
2 equipment. *Int. J. Constr. Educ. Res.* 15, 276–290.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15578771.2018.1483982>

4 Lewis, P., Leming, M., Rasdorf, W., 2012. Impact of engine idling on fuel use and CO2
5 emissions of nonroad diesel construction equipment. *J. Manag. Eng.* 28, 31–38.
6 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000068](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000068)

7 Lu, Q., Zheng, J., Ye, S., Shen, X., Yuan, Z., Yin, S., 2013. Emission trends and source
8 characteristics of SO2, NOx, PM10 and VOCs in the Pearl River Delta region from 2000 to
9 2009. *Atmos. Environ.* 76, 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.10.062>

10 Marshall, S.K., Rasdorf, W., Lewis, P., Frey, H.C., 2012. Methodology for estimating emissions
11 inventories for commercial building projects. *J. Archit. Eng.* 18, 251–260.
12 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)AE.1943-5568.0000073](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)AE.1943-5568.0000073)

13 Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, 2014. *The Compilation Guide for Non-road
14 Mobile Source Emission Inventory (trial edition)*.

15 Muresan, B., Capony, A., Goriaux, M., Pillot, D., Higelin, P., Proust, C., Jullien, A., 2015. Key
16 factors controlling the real exhaust emissions from earthwork machines. *Transp. Res. Part D
17 Transp. Environ.* 41, 271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2015.10.002>

18 Pirjola, L., Rönkkö, T., Saukko, E., Parviainen, H., Malinen, A., Alanen, J., Saveljeff, H., 2017.
19 Exhaust emissions of non-road mobile machine: Real-world and laboratory studies with
20 diesel and HVO fuels. *Fuel* 202, 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.04.029>

21 Rasdorf, W., Frey, C., Lewis, P., Kim, K., Pang, S.H., Abolhassani, S., 2010. Field procedures
22 for real-world measurements of emissions from diesel construction vehicles. *J. Infrastruct.
23 Syst.* 16, 216–225. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000027](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000027)

- 1 Rasdorf, W., Lewis, P., Marshall, S.K., Arocho, I., Frey, H.C., 2012. Evaluation of On-Site Fuel
2 Use and Emissions over the Duration of a Commercial Building Project. *J. Infrastruct. Syst.*
3 18, 119–129. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000071](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000071)
- 4 Sepasgozar, S.M.E., Blair, J., 2019. Measuring non-road diesel emissions in the construction
5 industry: a synopsis of the literature. *Int. J. Constr. Manag.* 0, 1–16.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2019.1573479>
- 7 Shao, Z., 2016. Non-road emission inventory model methodology. *Int. Counc. Clean Transp.*
8 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2014. 2014 National Emissions Inventory Report
9 (Retrieved in May 2020).
- 10 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005. NONROAD2005 Model.
- 11 Yu, F., Li, C., Liu, J., Liao, S., Zhu, M., Xie, Y., Sha, Q., Huang, Z., Zheng, J., 2020.
12 Characterization of particulate smoke and the potential chemical fingerprint of non-road
13 construction equipment exhaust emission in China. *Sci. Total Environ.* 723, 137967.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137967>
- 15 Zhang, J., Liu, L., Zhao, Y., Li, H., Lian, Y., Zhang, Z., Huang, C., Du, X., 2020. Development
16 of a high-resolution emission inventory of agricultural machinery with a novel
17 methodology: A case study for Yangtze River Delta region. *Environ. Pollut.* 266, 115075.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115075>
- 19 Zhang, Y., Lou, D., Tan, P., Hu, Z., 2019. Experimental study on the emission characteristics of
20 a non-road diesel engine equipped with different after-treatment devices. *Environ. Sci.*
21 *Pollut. Res.* 26, 26617–26627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05839-y>
- 22 Zhang, Y., Zhou, R., Peng, S., Zhang, X., Mao, H., Zhu, L., Li, X., Zheng, L., Wang, Y., 2020.
23 Study on emission characteristics of non-road mobile source pollutants in Tianjin. *IOP*

1 Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci. 467. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/467/1/012163>
2 Zhao, Y., Qiu, L.P., Xu, R.Y., Xie, F.J., Zhang, Q., Yu, Y.Y., Nielsen, C.P., Qin, H.X., Wang,
3 H.K., Wu, X.C., Li, W.Q., Zhang, J., 2015. Advantages of a city-scale emission inventory
4 for urban air quality research and policy: The case of Nanjing, a typical industrial city in the
5 Yangtze River Delta, China. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 15, 12623–12644.
6 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-12623-2015>
7