Simulating Deposition with a Regional Air Quality Model for the Rocky Mountain Atmospheric Nitrogen and Sulfur Study (RoMANS)

Mike Barna¹, Marco Rodriguez², Kristi Gebhart¹, Bret Schichtel¹, Bill Malm¹

¹National Park Service, Fort Collins, CO ²CIRA, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

NADP Technical Meeting and Scientific Symposium Boulder, CO 10-12 September 2007





introduction

- CAMx is being used to simulate the spring and summer 2006 RoMANS field campaigns
- RoMANS CAMx runs:
 - 'base case' simulation
 - tracer simulations
 - N and S source apportionment simulations
- Modeling system consists of:
 - emission inventory
 - MM5 mesoscale met model
 - CAMx chemical transport model



deposition in complex terrain



deposition flux = (concentration) * (v_d or Λ) v_d = dry dep velocity Λ = wet dep scavenging



deposition in complex terrain

- ~2/3 of N deposition at RMNP is wet (ROM406 monitor)
- Difficult to get clouds and precip correct:
 - sub-grid orographic and convective clouds
 - difficult to simulate weak synoptic regimes
- Does grid scale resolve important transport paths?





emission inventory

- Update the WRAP 2002 inventory for RoMANS 2006
- Primarily interested in nitrogen sources:



NOx







emission inventory

N emissions in Colorado:





meteorology from MM5

- Nested grids at 36/12/4 km
- IC/BC's from NARR (3hr, 32 km)
- Analysis nudging at 36 km, obs nudging at 4 km
- Physics options: Reisner 2 microphysics, Kain-Fritsch cumulus parameterization (36 and 12 km), MRF PBL, NOAH LSM



meteorology from MM5





MM5 36-Km Terrain



concentrations and depositions from CAMx

- N species simulated: NOx, NH3, RNO3, PAN, NH4, NO3
- Options: PPM advection, CB-4v3 chemistry, 2-way nesting (36/12/4 km)
- dry deposition limitations:
 - no transient wetted surfaces
 - enhanced turbulence from terrain gradients – assume 'flat earth'
 - filtering by leading edges of forest canopies



concentrations and depositions from CAMx

- wet deposition limitations:
 - only cloud water and precipitation are effective scavengers
 - rain drops and cloud drops are only one size
 - assume equilibrium between ambient concentration and cloud droplet
 - acidity of cloud water doesn't change (pH~5)



particulate ammonium at core site





particulate nitrate at core site





example concentrations (4 km Colorado)





simulated wet deposition

wet dep ammonium:



- Simulate the maximum potential impact of a source region using conserved tracers
- Tracers for NOx and NH3 emissions
- Tracers characteristics:
 - conserved
 - scaled to match 'real' emissions
 - same plume rise behavior



Colorado vs. outside of Colorado:





12 NOx: All Sources NOx: All Sources - CO NOx: CO only NOx tracer concentration (ppbV) 10 8 6 4 2 0 4/14 4/17 4/19 4/22 4/15 4/16 4/18 4/20 4/21 4/23 4/24 4/25 4/27 4/29 4/26 4/28 2006 (MST)

NOx Tracer at RMNP





NH3 Tracer at RMNP



NOx tracer

| | All Sources | All Sources - CO | CO only |
|---------------|-------------|------------------|---------|
| average (ppb) |): 2.17 | 1.11 | 1.06 |
| average (%) |): | 51.1% | 48.9% |
| NH3 tracer | | | |
| | All Sources | All Sources - CO | CO only |
| average (ppb) |): 1.12 | 0.73 | 0.38 |
| average (%) |): | 65.6% | 34.4% |



~90 ammonia tracers:



<u>summary</u>

- CAMx simulates major episodes that occur during last week of April, but ammonium and nitrate concentrations too low.
- MM5 captures major precipitation event on April 23-25; timing is generally ok, but magnitude overpredicted.
- Strong concentration gradients evident at Continental Divide, near core monitoring site.
- Need to evaluate other species (NOx, NH3, HNO3, SO2, SO4) and other sites.



<u>summary</u>

- Conserved tracer simulation indicates that ~1/2 of the NOx and ~1/3 of NH3 that impact RMNP are from Colorado sources.
- Refine tracer simulations:
 - more source regions ~90
 - estimate deposition losses

