The critical role of fine-grained atmospheric data in determining the rates of transport, sources, and sinks of greenhouse gases across the globe.

Steven C. Wofsy Harvard University

Keck Institute for Space Studies

Pasadena, CA 03 March 2010

HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observations 2009 ("HIPPO")



Part I: Global Science Objectives:

Use observed distributions of major greenhouse gases to help determine the continental-scale sources and sinks of major greenhouse gases.

Motivation:

Computer models are the basic tool for this application. Models obtain the global distributions of surface fluxes for GHGs by optimizing *a priori* emission rates to match time series observations at surface stations.

Approach:

Challenge models with fine-grained data of global scale: HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observation program (HIPPO). "HIPPO" is designed to confront models with a new type of data.

We wish to uncover and eliminate sources of bias and error that limit the application of models to assessment of source trends and distributions: to distinguish to model-data differences that tell us about sources and sinks from those arising due to deficiencies of transport, model aggregation, etc

Fine-grained data for multiple species of different source/sink distributions, at he surface and in profile should provide critical tests of models.

Part II: Verification Science Objectives: Use observed time series of CO_2 and other greenhouse gases in major source locales to help track trends in emission sources.

Motivation:

The largest emissions sources reveal the largest signals of human-caused emissions. Compliance with treaty provisions will translate into measurable changes in emission rates from major emitting regions.

Approach:

Modeling of highly resolved concentration data from a highly resolved inventory and fine-resolution model. Use of multiple tracers (²²²Rn, ¹⁴CO₂, CO, ...).









- ~400 vertical profiles in 3 of 6 missions.
- 3 missions yet to go; nearly 1000 at HIPPO's conclusion.

Shadow of the Earth visualized by ice crystals over the Alaska range.

Pago Pago, Samoa

HIPPO Aircraft Instrumentation

Harvard/Aerodyne—HAIS QCLS	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , CO, N ₂ O (1 Hz)
NCAR AO2	O ₂ :N ₂ , CO ₂ (1 Hz)
Harvard OMS CO ₂	CO ₂ (1 Hz)
NOAA CSD O ₃	O ₃ (1 Hz)
NOAA GMD O ₃	O ₃ (1 Hz)
NCAR RAF CO	CO (1 Hz)
NOAA- UCATS, PANTHER GCs (1 per 70 – 200 s)	CO, CH₄ , N₂O , CFCs, HCFCs, SF₆ , CH ₃ Br, CH ₃ CI, H ₂ , H ₂ O
Whole air sampling: NWAS (NOAA), AWAS (Miami), MEDUSA (NCAR/Scripps)	O ₂ :N ₂ , CO₂ , CH₄ , CO , N₂O , other GHGs, COS , halocarbons, solvent gases, marine emission species, many more
Princeton/SWS VCSEL	H ₂ O (<i>1 Hz</i>)
NOAA SP2	Black Carbon (1 Hz)
MTP, wing stores, etc	T, P, winds, aerosols, cloud water

9









CO_QCLS

-40

-20

o

o

-60

-40

-20

a

Altitude

-60

Althude





-como Heald



HIPPO_1

Xsects along the Dateline Jan 2009







0

-60

-40

-20



CO_QCLS

Altitude

N2O_QCLS

20

0

40

324

325

40

60

80

80

Fits 2 3 4 5 6

60

326

Fits 2 3 4 5 6

1900

Fits 2 3 4 5



HIPPO_2

Xsects along the Dateline

Nov 2009

N₂O is upside down

Models with detailed simulations of HIPPO_1 or Pre-HIPPO Data

- •Earth Simulator ACTM ccsr/NIES/FRCGC AGCM
- •GEOS-CHEM (NASA DAO) Harvard •MACC-GEMS ECMWF Air Quality and Air Chemistry model

Detailed	Model	results	for HIPP	O_1:							
	CO2	SF6	C2H6	CO	N2O	CH4	O3	PAN	NOx	HCHO	BlkC
GEOS_C	C 1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	*
ACTM	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
MACC	0	0	1	1, Fcs t	t 0	1	1	1	1	1	
	0	0	0			0	4	4	4	4	
IUIALS	2	2	2	2, FCS	[1	3	1	1	1	1	16







sources and vertical and horizontal transport 19



Altitude

sources and vertical and horizontal transport









CO2.compositeOBS/HIPPO



Using multiple tracers to help solve the model-measurement conundrum

The stratosphere has a major influence on the concentrations of tracers distributed through the troposphere. How well is this feature captured by models ?

What do we learn about sources, versus transport, from latitude and altitude profiles ?



















HIPPO_2: High-altitude pollution phenomena in the Arctic



78N latitude, 160W (north of Barrow) 04 Nov 2009 moonrise, haze, black carbon





H2 Profile 19

How do anomalies arise? How is a profile composed?

Arctic, very dense highaltitude pollution juxtaposed with "a pure CH₄ play"

388 CO2 389

N2C

324.5

CH4

1880

325.0

1890

325.5

324.0

1870

323.5

CO200

250

150

100

8000

6009

4000

2000

 \circ

323.0

1860

Att (m)

NOAA HYSPLIT MODEL Backward trajectories ending at 2100 UTC 02 Nov 09 GDAS Meteorological Data



NOAA HYSPLIT MODEL Backward trajectory ending at 2200 UTC 12 Jan 09 GDAS Meteorological Data

H1 Profile 24



NOAA HYSPLIT MODEL Backward trajectories ending at 2300 UTC 16 Jan 09 GDAS Meteorological Data

H1 Profile 51

386.2

8000

6000

4000

2000

0

323.0

1800

A#(⊒)

How do anomalies arise? How is a profile composed?



Summary/ conclusions: Part 1 – Global fine-grained data

•HIPPO provides a new type of data for CO_2 and GHG studies: global, extremely fine grained, many tracers. Data of this type should be part of a global observing strategy for GHG treaties.

•Major transport processes are elucidated: Stratosphere [sets the stage; Pre-HIPPO connection]; *warm conveyor belt* (intense, persistent, ensemble of small scale processes)—mixes the whole atmosphere [CO₂, CH₄, CO: QCLS, RAF; *all models*]; *Arctic Cold Dome*—brings strong pollution to high altitudes in pivotal season [BC, CH₄, N₂O: QCLS, SP2; *GEMS, ACTM and GEOS*] and *Antarctic marine PBL* –distortion of surface observations used in models [CO₂, CH₄, O₂, SF₆ : QCLS, UCATS; *all models*].

•Source/sink regions are revealed and impacts quantified: N₂O in the tropics and Antarctic—a major finding [N₂O: QCLS; <u>ACTM</u>]; marine reactive species—obvious implications for source regions [COS, CS2, DMS; ALLWAS]; O₂ and CO₂ Antarctic and S. Ocean.—source strength, relate to PBL [CO₂, O₂: QCLS, AO2; GEOS-CHEM].

* HIPPO and Pre-HIPPO Teams *

<u>Harvard</u>: *PI*: S. Wofsy; *Measurement, data team*: R. Jimenez, S. Park, B. Daube, E. Gottlieb, E. Kort, J. Pittman, R. Commane, Bin Xiang, G. Santoni; *GEOS-CHEM team*: D. Jacob, J. Fisher, C. Pickett-Heaps, H. Wang, J. V. Pittman, K. Wecht, Q.-Q. Wang

<u>NCAR and NCAR-RAF</u>: B. Stephens, P. Romanshkin, T. Campos, Laura Pan, J. Haggerty, S. Schertz, GV Crew (*Henry Boynton, Ed Ringleman, pilots*)

<u>NOAA ESRL and CIRES</u>: J. W. Elkins, D. Fahey, R. Gao, F. Moore, S. A. Montzka, J. P. Schwartz, D. Hurst, B. Miller, J. B. Miller, S. Oltmans, D. Nance, E. Hintsa, G. Dutton, L. A. Watts, R. Spackman, K. Rosenlof, E. Ray; CCG (*E. Dlugokencky, T. Conway, P. Novelli, A. Andrews, C. Sweeney…*)

Princeton: M. Zondlo JPL: M. J. Mahoney

UCSD/Scripps: R. Keeling, J. Bent

U. Miami: E. A. Atlas, R. Lueb

<u>Cooperating modeling groups</u>: ACTM (Prabir Patra, Kentaro Ishijima), GEMS-MACC (Richard Engelen), ...others soon.

Modelling CO₂ in Salt Lake City

March 3, 2010 Steve Wofsy, Kathryn McKain, Harvard University Atmospheric and Environmental Research, Inc (AER)



Objective

 \cdot Develop and test a method for using ground-based CO $_2$ concentration measurements for estimating the emissions of a city

 \cdot Quantify the relationship between CO_2 measurements and emissions via a modeling framework

 $CO_{2emissions} = a * \Delta CO_{2observation}$

• Determine the statistical requirement for detecting a change in emissions from an observed change in CO_2 concentration

 $δ(CO_{2emissions}) = εa * δ(ΔCO_{2observation})$

Methods

• Emissions

· Vulcan Inventory (by Gurney @ Purdue)

- Hourly
- 0.1 ° x 0.1° (~8.5 x 11 km)
- 8 categories
- 2002

Observations

- . Salt Lake City (by Ehleringer & Pataki @ U of Utah)
 - 5 sites
 - .2001-present
 - 5-minute collection interval
- -Model (LPDM)

-Stochastic Time Inverterted Lagrangian Transport (STILT)

-Driven by Weather Research and Forecasting (**WRF/ 3 km**) -Generates a footprint (ppm/(μmol/m²/s)) for each

measurement point, which represents the sensitivity of the observed concentration to surface emissions



2006 - entire year - Cum PDFs variations by day of the week, 1000 - 1700h local.



2006 – Time of Day variations: Summer (June – Aug) Winter (Dec – Feb)



2006, 1000—1700, Cum PDFs: Summer (June – Aug) Winter (Dec – Feb)



October, Hourly means

Downtown 2006



October, Daily means by hour

Downtown 2006



Downtown 2006



49

Model – Data Fits – one month (Oct. 2006 or 2009)

site	year	fit	%	<u>slope</u>	S.E. slope
HJH	2006	0	100	0.67	0.02
HJH	2006	1	60	0.74	0.03
HJH	2009	0	100	0.93	0.03
HJH	2009	1	55	1.07	0.05
ASB	2006	0	100	0.99	0.04
ASB	2006	1	65	1.03	0.06
ASB	2009	0	100	0.71	0.03
ASB	2009	1	57	0.78	0.04
AH	2006	0	100	0.79	0.03
AH	2006	1	67	0.87	0.04
AH	2009	0	100	0.95	0.04
AH	2009	1	50	1.09	0.06
SC	2006	0	100	0.68	0.02
SC	2006	1	65	0.74	0.03
SC	2006	2	52	0.71	0.02

Summary and conclusions for Part 2:

High-resolution data at even a single point contain clear signatures of emissions that respond to emission rates.

High resolution modeling appears potentially able of providing the metric for determining changes in emission rates for major emitting regions.

Goal of quantifying 5% change over 5 years appears feasible. Shorter times, small changes may not be feasible.

Long time series with unchanging tracers (222 Rn) and addition of key covariates ($^{14}CO_2$, CO, ...) provide strong validation and high accuracy for change detection (Levine).

Reactive species in the atmosphere:

A movie... (not in 3-D)



Whole-Air Sampling NWAS / AWAS (E. Atlas, S. Montzka)

Mid-Pacific Sample coverage



Ethyne



Benzene



Methyl chloroform



Dichloromethane



Dimethyl Sulfide



DMS_md

Carbonyl Sulfide



OCS_md

Carbon Disulfide



cs2_md