Comparison between in-situ surface measurements and global climate model outputs of particle light scattering coefficient as a function of relative humidity
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Aerosols and Climate

- **Direct and indirect effects on the Earth’s energy balance**
- Scattering ($\sigma_{sp}$) and absorption of solar radiation and the number of cloud condensation nuclei will be affected by aerosol concentration, size and chemical composition

**HYGROSCOPICITY:**

Since aerosol particles can take up water, they can change in size and chemical composition depending on the ambient relative humidity (RH)

$$\sigma_{sp}(RH, \lambda), \text{ strongly depends on RH}$$

The effect of water uptake is **relevant** for **climate forcing calculations** as well as for the comparison or validation of **remote sensing** with in-situ measurements and for the improvement of **Global Climate Models**

**SCATTERING ENHANCEMENT FACTOR**

$$f(RH, \lambda) = \frac{\sigma_{sp}(RH, \lambda)}{\sigma_{sp}(RH_{dry}, \lambda)}$$
Hygroscopicity in GCM’s

Fraction of aerosol optical depth (AOD) due to water in different models:

ECHAM5: global annual average 76%

GOCART: global annual average 40%

Figures from Mian Chin (NASA Goddard)
Hygroscopicity in GCM’s

OPAC: Optical Properties of Aerosol and Clouds (Hess et al., 1998)

**OPAC model** generally higher than measurements especially for low-medium RH

Reason: **OPAC** growth factors for sea salt and sulfate components are too high. Revised growth factors for sea salt published in Zieger et al., 2017.
Tandem Humidified Nephelometer

**PSI system:**

Aerosol → **Humidifier** → **Drier** → **WetNeph**

- RH~20 – 95%
- RH<40%

*(Fierz-Schmidehauser et al., 2010)*

**NOAA system:**

Aerosol → **DryNeph** → **Humidifier** → **WetNeph**

- RH<40%
- RH~20 – 95%
Tandem Humidified Nephelometer

Hygroscopic particles grow or shrink monotonically with ΔRH

Deliquescent aerosols undergo sudden phase transition (hysteresis)

- Humidograms can be parameterized with different equations:

  \[ f(RH) = \alpha (1 - RH)^{-\gamma} \]

  \[ \rightarrow \] Problem for sea salt aerosols (deliquescence)

  Zieger et al., 2010: Fit separately for RH>75% or RH<65%
  Titos et al., 2016: Several equations, some of them reproduce deliquescence
DoE funded project:
“Evaluation and improvement of the parameterization of aerosol hygroscopicity in global climate models using in-situ surface measurements” (2016-2019)

HARMONIZED DATA SET

- DoE/ARM sites, PSI sites and more
- Covering 18 years

compare with GCM’s
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Arctic > Marine > Rural > Desert
MERRA Aerosol Reanalysis (MERRAero):

- **Buchard et al. (2015):** “Using the OMI aerosol index and absorption aerosol optical depth to evaluate the NASA MERRA Aerosol Reanalysis”

- **MERRA Aerosol Reanalysis:** reanalysis for the satellite era based on a version of the GEOS-5 model, radiatively coupled to the Goddard Chemistry, Aerosol, Radiation, and Transport (GOCART) aerosol module (bulk (mass) scheme).
  - GEOS-5 -> run in replay mode using 6-hourly atmospheric analysis from MERRA
  - Aerosol species: dust, sea-salt, sulfates, organic and black carbon
  - Assimilation of bias corrected MODIS AOD observations at 550 nm every each 3 hours
  - Provides a aerosol gridded data set covering from 2002 to 2015

CAM5.3-Oslo

- **Kirkevåg et al. (2018):** “A production-tagged aerosol module for earth system models, OsloAero5.3 – extensions and updates for CAM5.3-Oslo”

- Aerosol module: **OsloAero5.3** implemented in the atmospheric component **CAM5.3-Oslo** of the Norwegian Earth System model (NorESM1.2)
  - **Improvements:** treatment of emissions, aerosol chemistry, particle lifecycle and aerosol-cloud interactions
  - **New features:** improved aerosol sources, aerosol particle nucleation, secondary organic aerosol production, emissions schemes for sea-salt, DMS and marine primary organics...
• Model data availability → Daily values
  → Period: January – December, 2010

• **Time coverage** of model data and measurements are **not coincident**. For consistency, short-term campaign sites with only a few months of measurements are compared to the same months of the model data.

• **Uncertainty** in measurements between 20-30%, which has to be taken into account in the measurement-model comparison
Relative Frequency of Occurrence of $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$

**ARCTIC SITES**

- Measurements show higher variability while models present a narrower distribution.
- Measurements variability may be affected by the change of particle concentration along the year: Arctic haze in spring/new particle formation in summer/low concentration in winter (Tunved *et al.*, 2013).
MARINE SITES:

- Measured
- CAM5.3-Oslo
- MERRAero
MERRAero: $f(RH)$ systematically peaks at the same value, independent of the site characteristics.
**CAM5.3-Oslo** does better in reproducing the observed shape, though it tends to overestimate the measured values.
Urban-Mountain-Desert Sites

- **Urban Sites:** Models reproduce observed $f(RH)$ for Granada and Nainital, but overestimate in Shouxian and Manacapuro
Urban-Mountain-Desert Sites

- **Urban Sites:** Models reproduce observed $f(RH)$ for Granada and Nainital, but overestimate in Shouxian and Manacapuro

- **Mountain site (Jungfraujoch):** Model surface is not the same as measurement surface, so wouldn’t expect models to do well necessarily
Urban-Mountain-Desert Sites

• **Urban** Sites: Models reproduce observed $f$(RH) for Granada and Nainital, but overestimate in Shouxian and Manacapuro

• **Mountain** site (Jungfraujoch): Model surface is not the same as measurement surface, so wouldn’t expect models to do well necessarily

• **Desert** site (Niamey): models reproduce the measurements of $f$(RH) quite well
Rural Sites:

- Each model exhibits consistent peak values of $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$:
  - $\sim 2$ for MERRAero
  - $\sim 2.5$ for CAM5.3-Oslo
- Models systematically overestimate $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ except for Melpitz (MEL), where the measurements peak is shifted towards larger values relative to the other sites
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles
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- **Underestimates** $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ observations for Arctic sites
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles

**MERRAero**

- Underestimates $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ observations for Arctic sites
- Exhibits similar values for most Marine and Rural sites
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles

**MERRAero**

- Underestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ observations for Arctic sites
- Exhibits similar values for most Marine and Rural sites
- Inconsistent for Urban sites
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles

MERRAero

- **Arctic**
- **Marine**
- **Rural**
- **Urban**
- **Desert**

- **Underestimates** $f(RH=85\%)$ observations for **Arctic** sites
- Exhibits similar values for most **Marine** and **Rural** sites
- Inconsistent for **Urban** sites
- Does well for **Desert** site
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles

- Overestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations

**CAM5.3-Oslo**
• Overestimates $f$(RH=85%) relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations

• CAM5.3-Oslo \textbf{overestimates} $f$(RH=85%) for Arctic sites (opposite of MERRAero)
• Overestimates $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations

• CAM5.3-Oslo **overestimates** $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ for Arctic sites (opposite of MERRAero)

• Reproduces the **diversity** in Marine sites with a general overestimation
**Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles**

- Overestimates $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations.
- CAM5.3-Oslo **overestimates** $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ for Arctic sites (opposite of MERRAero).
- Reproduces the diversity in Marine sites with a general overestimation.
- Exhibits approximately constant $f(\text{RH}=85\%)$ at Rural sites – does NOT capture observed diversity.
Median Values and 25 and 75 Percentiles

- Overestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations
- CAM5.3-Oslo overestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ for Arctic sites (opposite of MERRAero)
- Reproduces the diversity in Marine sites with a general overestimation
- Exhibits approximately constant $f(RH=85\%)$ at Rural sites – does NOT capture observed diversity
- Inconsistent results for Urban sites, with a tendency to overestimate
Overestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ relative to observations, but better reproduces the diversity of observations.

CAM5.3-Oslo overestimates $f(RH=85\%)$ for Arctic sites (opposite of MERRAero).

Reproduces the diversity in Marine sites with a general overestimation.

Exhibits approximately constant $f(RH=85\%)$ at Rural sites – does NOT capture observed diversity.

Inconsistent results for Urban sites, with a tendency to overestimate.

Does well for the Desert site.
• GRW (Marine):
  • the value of $f(RH=85\%)=2$ simulated by MERRAero is constant throughout the year
  • CAM5.3-Oslo simulates a similar cycle to the observations with a bias towards larger values

• SGP (Rural):
  • both models overestimate $f(RH=85\%)$ throughout the year.
  • CAM5.3-Oslo tracks the observed annual cycle better than MERRAero

• BRW (Arctic):
  • Both models track observed annual cycle (higher in autumn, lower in spring)
• Differences suggests some seasonal chemistry that models are not reproducing
  → Possibility to compare model and measurement chemistry at some sites to further assess
  → Study how number, surface and volume size distributions affect scattering
• Re-analysis of data from 26 sites measuring different aerosol types to build a \textbf{benchmark, harmonized and reliable database}

• Comparison of \(f(\text{RH}=85\%)\) between \textbf{measurements} and \textbf{model} outputs (MERRAero and CAM5.3-Oslo) highlights that:
  • Constraint values of the model output for several aerosol types
  • Overall, CAM5.3-Oslo reproduces better the variability of measurements while MERRAero present less variability
  • The \(f(\text{RH}=85\%)\) values are coincident with measurements for some sites
  • Differences in seasonal chemistry may not be well represented in models

**Next Steps...**

• Optical closure studies can help to reduce uncertainties (not possible at all sites due to measurement restrictions)

• Study the covariance of aerosol hygroscopic growth with other intensive properties such as SAE or SSA

• Study what is considered a valid definition of “dry RH” and the changes in optical properties at low RH conditions and its implications (Poster Andrews, P02)
Questionaire to AeroCom modelling community to collect metadata and a description of growth parameterization

Variables requested:
• Aerosol extinction, 550 nm, 40%, 55%, 65%, 75%, 85% RH + ambient
• Aerosol absorption, 550 nm, 40%, 55%, 65%, 75%, 85% RH + ambient
• AOD speciated

Years of simulation/emission:
• 2010
• Optimal: 2000-2014

Please participate!
Description of data request can be found at:
https://wiki.met.no/_media/aerocom/INSITU_AeroComPIII_description.pdf

We encourage you to provide model data!!

REFERENCES:
THANK YOU for your ATTENTION!

Related poster: Andrews, P02
BackUp slides

María Ángeles Burgos

(Maria.Burgos@aces.su.se)
MERRA Aerosol Reanalysis (MERRAero):

Implementation of hygroscopic growth (Randles, C. A. et al., 2013):

- Carbonaceous species and sulfate: parameterized based on OPAC (Hess et al., 1998) as in Chin et al. (2002)
- Sea salt: parameterized based on observations of mixed-salt aerosol growth from Tang et al., (1997)

CAM5.3-Oslo

- **Hygroscopic growth factors** for aerosol components at some typical dry radii and for relative humidities up to RHmax = 99.5%
Checking the time series of BRW for the measurements

Wet/dry
N.data(2009)=[0,0,0,0,0,0,0,5,13,33,11]
N.data(2010)=[51,78,39,17,0,1,36,28,32,19,52]
N.data(2011)=[24,23,34,24,3,0,0,19,0,3,73]
N.data(2012)=[34,63,63,0,11,11,5,15,26,19,60]
N.data(2013)=[92,33,75,54,9,6,8,5,14,2,0,0]

85%/40%
N.data(2009)=[0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,2,5,16,9]
N.data(2010)=[19,43,58,15,10,0,0,20,19,19,49]
N.data(2011)=[21,20,25,24,2,0,0,5,0,3,25]
N.data(2012)=[19,34,41,0,2,4,2,3,4,5,12,40]
N.data(2013)=[36,12,50,40,6,1,2,0,3,0,0,0]
Median Values and Percentiles 25 and 75

**MERRAero**

- Arctic
- Marine
- Rural
- Urban
- Desert

**CAM5.3-Oslo**

Linear fit and 95% prediction interval (y±2Δ)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>CAM5.3-Oslo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>1.7±0.4</td>
<td>2.3±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>2.4±0.6</td>
<td>2.5±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabauw</td>
<td>2.2±0.6</td>
<td>2.5±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finokalia</td>
<td>2.5±0.6</td>
<td>2.3±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Forest</td>
<td>1.5±0.4</td>
<td>2.3±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciosa</td>
<td>2.3±0.6</td>
<td>3.0±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosan</td>
<td>2.1±0.4</td>
<td>2.3±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouxian</td>
<td>1.6±0.3</td>
<td>1.9±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyttiala</td>
<td>1.2±0.3</td>
<td>2.3±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungfraujoch</td>
<td>2.3±0.8</td>
<td>2.3±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manacapuro</td>
<td>1.2±0.1</td>
<td>1.8±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace Head</td>
<td>2.5±1.0</td>
<td>2.9±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melpitz</td>
<td>2.3±0.5</td>
<td>2.3±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niamey</td>
<td>1.3±0.5</td>
<td>1.3±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nainital</td>
<td>1.5±0.4</td>
<td>1.7±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cod</td>
<td>1.9±0.5</td>
<td>2.5±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Reyes</td>
<td>2.6±0.7</td>
<td>2.5±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Great Plains</td>
<td>1.7±0.6</td>
<td>2.3±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad Head</td>
<td>2.0±0.7</td>
<td>2.6±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>1.8±0.4</td>
<td>2.4±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeppelin</td>
<td>2.5±1.3</td>
<td>2.8±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>Measurements</td>
<td>MERRAero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>1.7±0.4</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>2.4±0.6</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cabauw</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2±0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finokalia</td>
<td>2.5±0.6</td>
<td>1.9±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Forest</td>
<td>1.5±0.4</td>
<td>1.9±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graciosa</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3±0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gosan</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1±0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouxian</td>
<td>1.6±0.3</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyytiäälä</td>
<td>1.2±0.3</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungfraujoch</td>
<td>2.3±0.8</td>
<td>1.9±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manacapuro</td>
<td>1.2±0.1</td>
<td>1.9±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace Head</td>
<td>2.5±1.0</td>
<td>2.1±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melpitz</td>
<td>2.3±0.5</td>
<td>1.9±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niamey</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3±0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nainital</td>
<td>1.5±0.4</td>
<td>1.7±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Cod</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9±0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Reyes</td>
<td>2.6±0.7</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Great Plains</td>
<td>1.7±0.6</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinidad Head</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0±0.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1±0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Granada</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8±0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7±0.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeppelin</td>
<td>2.5±1.3</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>