


US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

BAYESIAN AND ADJOINT INVERSE MODEL ANALYSES OF PM SOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES USING OBSERVATIONS FROM SURFACE, AIRCRAFT, AND SATELLITE PLATFORMS


Daniel J. Jacob, Harvard (P.I.) and John H. Seinfeld, Caltech (Co-I.)



- Park, R.J., D.J. Jacob, and J.A. Logan, **Fire and biofuel contributions to annual mean aerosol concentrations in the United States**, *AE (in press)*
- Fairlie, T.D., D.J. Jacob, and R.J. Park, **The impact of transpacific transport on mineral dust in the United States**, *AE*, 41, 1251-1266, 2007.
- Heald, C.L., D.J. Jacob, et al., **Concentrations and sources of organic carbon aerosol in the free troposphere over North America**, *JGR* 111, D23S47, 2006.
- Drury, E.E, D.J. Jacob, et al., **Improved algorithm for MODIS satellite retrievals of aerosol optical depths over land**, to be submitted, 2007
- **CALTECH PUBLICATIONS TO BE ADDED!**

Supported by EPA-STAR

USING OBSERVED ATMOSPHERIC CONCENTRATIONS TO IMPROVE SOURCE INVENTORIES



A priori “bottom-up”
source vector \mathbf{x}_a ,

error covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_a

Chemical transport model

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_m$$

Observation vector \mathbf{y} ,
error covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_y ;

diagnose $\mathbf{S}_y^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_a))$
(forward model analysis)

FORMAL INVERSE ANALYSIS: seek true source \mathbf{x} by minimizing $J(\mathbf{x})$:

$$J(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}))^T \mathbf{S}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) + (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_a)^T \mathbf{S}_a^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_a)$$

- Analytical (“Bayesian”) method: for linear(ized) model $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}$, solve analytically


$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} J(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \Rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_a + (\mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{S}_y^{-1} \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{S}_a^{-1})^{-1} \mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{S}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}_a)$$

- Adjoint method: solve numerically by steepest-descent algorithm based on successive calculations of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} J(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} J(\mathbf{x}) = - \underbrace{(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}))^T}_{\text{adjoint of forward model}} \mathbf{S}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{S}_a^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_a)$$

adjoint of
forward model

QUANTIFYING THE BIOMASS BURNING SOURCE OF PM_{2.5} FROM CORRELATION OF TOTAL CARBON (TC) WITH NON-SOIL K⁺ AT IMPROVE SITES





Non-soil K⁺:
West: summer max,
low background

East: winter and
summer maxes,
high background



Background ns-K⁺
(traces industrial biofuel)

Attribute TC from open fires from RMA slope
of TC vs. ns-K⁺ linear regression



SEASONAL VARIATION OF TC IS DRIVEN BY SUMMER WILDFIRES


JJA fire emission inventory from MODIS data [van der Werf et al., 2006]
and contiguous U.S. dry mass burned totals (1997-2004 mean 16 Tg C)



TC seasonal variation averaged
over all U.S. IMPROVE sites

FIRE AND BIOFUEL CONTRIBUTIONS TO TC PM2.5

Annual mean C concentrations, 2001-2004 –also mean values in W and E



IMPLICATIONS FOR AQ STANDARDS AND EMISSION INVENTORIES

Source attribution at IMPROVE sites
(annual means)

PM2.5, $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ (x1.8 for TC)	West	East
Summer wildfires	0.47	0.25
Other fires	0.49	0.56
Residential biofuel	0.13	0.52
Industrial biofuel	0.13	0.32
Total fire+biofuel TC (this work)	1.2	1.6
Observed TC	2.2	3.4
Observed total PM2.5	3.8	8.2


Emissions for contiguous U.S.
(climatological fires)

	Tg C y ⁻¹
Top-down	
This work	
Open fires	0.90
Biofuel	0.51 (40% ind.)
Park et al. [2003]	
Open fires	0.68
Biofuel	0.96 (80% ind.)
Bottom-up	
Bond et al. [2004]	
Open fires	0.89
Biofuel	0.42 (<10% ind.)
NEI99	
Biofuel	0.23 (<10% ind.)

Park et al. [2007]

TESTING DUST EMISSION SCHEMES WITH IMPROVE DATA

GOCART [Ginoux et al., 2004] , DEAD [Zender et al.,2003] and combined schemes Implemented in GEOS-Chem global simulation




GOCART has two low wind threshold
DEAD has insufficient areal restriction } combination of two gives significant improvement


Fairlie et al. [2007]

ASIAN CONTRIBUTION TO U.S. DUST (2001)


Spring is max dust season in most of U.S., and source is mainly from Asia



Annual time series; Asian dust is combination of events + seasonal background




Model simulation of spring 2001 Asian outflow (TRACE-P aircraft data)




TESTING OC SOURCES WITH ITCT-2K4 AIRCRAFT DATA

Jul-Aug 2004 out of Portsmouth, NH;
water-soluble OC (WSOC) measurements by R. Weber (Georgia Tech)




- IMPROVE and ITCT-2K4 consistent; high aircraft values in N. New England due to Canadian fires
- Model low by 30%, weak correlation w/aircraft data ($R^2 = 0.10$)
- 0-2 km source attribution in model: 49% anthropogenic, 27% fires, 8% biogenic (isoprene), 16% biogenic (other)

WSOC AEROSOL OVER EASTERN U.S. IN ITCT-2K4



- Observed free tropospheric concentrations are lower than in ACE-Asia; model is only 25% too low in the mean...
- ...but is incapable of reproducing observed variability in boundary layer ($r^2 = 0.11$) or free troposphere ($R^2 = 0.05$)
- Observed free tropospheric WSOC has significant correlation ($R^2 \sim 0.3$) with methanol combined with sulfate, nitrate, or toluene; suggests cloud production mechanism and combined bio-anthro source

IMPROVING MODIS SATELLITE RETRIEVALS OF AEROSOL OPTICAL DEPTHS OVER LAND




MODIS measures top-of-atmosphere (TOA) reflectance in several wavelength channels


- Interpretation of TOA reflectance in terms of AOD requires assumptions on surface reflectance, aerosol optical properties
- Use TOA reflectance at 2.13 μm (transparent atmosphere) to derive surface reflectance
- MODIS operational algorithm relies on general assumptions for 0.47/2.13 surface reflectance ratios and aerosol optical properties; we improve by deriving those locally using GEOS-Chem model information
- The resulting retrieval (or model reflectance) is suited for quantitative interpretation including inverse analyses

COMPARISON vs. AERONET 0.47 μm AODs (Jul-Aug 2004)


AERONET





MODIS (collection 5)



MODIS (this work)





MODIS (collection 4)





ADJOINT MODEL APPROACH TO IMPROVE PM NITRATE SIMULATION

IMPROVE
(Jan 2002)



< 0.00 2.33 4.67 7.00 [$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$]

Sulfate




< 0.00 2.33 4.67 7.00 [$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$]


Use LSQ cost function J to fit $[\text{NO}_3^-]$ and $[\text{SO}_4^{2-}]$ as function of model parameters

SENSITIVITY OF COST FUNCTION TO MODEL PARAMETERS


NO_x
emissions




Anthro.
 NH_3
emissions



γ_{N2O5}



Initial
conditions



OPTIMIZATION OF NH₃ EMISSIONS USING NO₃⁻ AND SO₄²⁻ DATA



Jan 2002

Anthropogenic NH₃

Natural NH₃



Prior
GEIA

0.20 Tg N mo⁻¹



Posterior

0.10 Tg N mo⁻¹







[molec x 10⁻¹⁰ / cm²]

Other recent estimates are in range 0.08-0.12 Tg N mo⁻¹ [Gilliland et al., 2003, 2006; Pinder et al., 2003, 2006; Park et al., 2004]

NH₄⁺, observed

NH₄⁺, model (*prior*)

NH₄⁺, model (*posterior*)



Henze et al. [2007]