Comparison of alternative Storage Methods



Evaluation of emission for a 33,000 m³ storage tank with 44 meters in diameter, according to API method, chapter 19 Storage product: gasoline (RVP 600 mbar) / temperature: Ta = Ts = 10 °C; DTa = 8°C / wind speed: 3,0 m/s

Quantity of Emission for 12 filling cycles per year

Quantity of Emission for 0 filling cycles per year

		T !		Sources of emissions:					\ _	
		Tank dia. 44 meters		annual emissions [kg/y]	rim space	guide pole	roof legs	other installations	tank wall wetting	efficiency of tank [%]
case 1:	Fixed roof tank without floating roof P/V-valve only		comparison tank (base case)	294.583 26.917						0,0
case 2:	Floating roof tank		double seal, guide pole seal, roof leg seals	1.266 1.196	895	122	122	58	70 0	99,6 95,6
case 3:	Floating roof tank		threefold seal, guide pole seal + Helicoat*, roof leg seals	435 365	169	17	122	58	70 0	99,9 98,6
case 4:	Floating roof tank with alu dome		double seal, guide pole seal, without roof leg seals	388 318	116	17	150	35	70 0	99,9 98,8
case 5:	Fixed roof tank with steel floating roof free ventilated		double seal, guide pole seal, roof legs fix	238 168	116	17	0	35	70 0	99,9 99,4
case 6:	Fixed roof tank with steel floating roof P/V-valve		double seal, guide pole seal, roof legs fix	~ 238 ~ 168	ahove F => satety armature required. The ettect of					99,9 99,4
case 7:	Fixed roof tank + vapour balancing + vapour treatment		VRU	High investment and operating costs / high total emissions (CO2, NOx, methane) in consideration of direct emissions and emissions by use of electric power and other utilities. Risk of failure of vapour treatment plant.						
case 8:	Floating roof tank + vapour suck off from seal spaces + vapour treatment	threefold seal, guide pole seal + Helicoat*, roof leg seals		Small compact single-stage adsorption equipment sufficient. Low investment and low operating costs.						

^{*} Guide pole cover