

AQMEII-4 Activity 3 Participant Call – March 22, 2022

Attendees: Roberto San Jose, Paul Makar, Jesse Bash, Holly Nowell, Olivia Clifton, Laurens Ganzeveld, Kiran Alapaty, Jon Pleim, Chris Holmes, Johannes Fleming, Lisa Emberson, Limei Ran

- Model runs
 - Inputs are supposed to be identical for all models - this helps clarify process level differences
 - Do we need to unify the environmental conditions better or stay true to the regional models?
 - Leaf wetness
 - M3DRY is using a different parameterization for missing values and is setting limits
 - Post mtg note - Harvard only has 24 h precipitation in reality but has been divided evenly across all hours of the day
 - 85% rule - observationalists proposed alternatives for their sites where missing
 - Specify just soil type or specify soil moisture parameters (field capacity, etc)?
 - Roughness length - need to specify for modelers
 - Temperature parameters for Jarvis stomatal resistance? Do we specify these?
 - CO2 data - make sure all are using the same
 - Soil moisture depths - need to specify root zone and surface for each site
 - LAI
 - Modelers should use observed values or tabulated as used in the models; use time series
 - WRF-Chem doesn't use LAI as an input; only used to get roughness length
 - Standardize what we can standardize in terms of inputs as the paper Olivia is working on needs models run with the same inputs to analyze process level differences
 - Olivia needs model descriptions so she can see
 - Questions also on observational data - some have issues/uncertainties
- Deadline for special issue will be extended
- Papers
 - Olivia - overview of process level differences; model inputs as consistent as possible
 - Jesse - STAGE
 - Jon & Limei- M3DRY and PSN model
 - Paul - effective flux vs effective conductance

- Laurens? - Stomatal differences across models
- Roberto - WRF-Chem performance
- ??? - comparison of models as implemented in regional models (use of more tabulated values, etc)