Chapter 2

Methodology

This chapter details the model set-up in Sect. 2.1.1, initial and boundary conditions are described in Sect. 2.4 used to address the research questions of this work (Sect. ??).

2.1 Air Quality Modelling

AQ models are mathematical representations of the atmosphere designed to produce continuous output fields that aid in explaining sources of air pollution. All models numerically solve the system of differential equations describing the conservation of chemical species (Russell and Dennis, 2000).

Eulerian models are the most common type of AQ model (Russell and Dennis, 2000). These models use fixed grid-boxes where species are transported in and out of the boxes to describe the atmosphere (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2006). Box models are the simplest type of a model (zero-dimensional) having uniform atmospheric concentrations that are only a function of time. Whereas 3-D models describe atmospheric concentrations as a function of time, latitude, longitude and height thus requiring much more computing power than a box model (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2006). Box models lack realism but are useful for studying the detailed processes that influence air quality.

Solving the system of differential equations requires initial and boundary conditions for each chemical species. Initial conditions fix the starting concentrations of each species in each grid-box. Boundary conditions require knowledge of the concentration and transport of each species at the boundary edges of the model grid.

| Model Parameter | Setting |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Pressure | 1013 hPa |
| Relative Humidity | 81 % |
| Starting Date and Time | 27th March 06:00 |
| Model Time Step | 20 mins |

Table 2.1: General settings used for MECCA box model in this study.

2.1.1 Model Description and Setup

The MECCA (Module Efficiently Calculating the Chemistry of the Atmosphere) box model was used throughout this work. MECCA was developed by Sander et al. (2005) and adapted to include MCM v3.1 chemistry by Butler et al. (2011). The studies of Kubistin et al. (2010) and Lourens et al. (2016) used MECCA.

MECCA is written in Fortran and runs on UNIX/Linux platforms. The Kinetic Pre-Processor (KPP, Damian et al. (2002)) was used to process the chemical mechanism and generate Fortran code further compiled within MECCA. KPP has many choices of numerical solver for solving the differential equations, this work used a Rosenbrock solver (the ros3 option).

All fluxes of the chemical species into and out of the box are handled by KPP. The chemical mechanism file includes pseudo-unimolecular reactions specifying the emissions and dry deposition of chemical species with the relevant rate. The chemical species that are emitted into the model and the emission rates are read into the model using a namelist file. Namelist files were also used to specify the initial and boundary conditions of chemical species.

The physical parameters used in MECCA throughout this work are detailed in Table 2.1. In the first two studies, temperature was held constant at 293 K and the boundary layer height was fixed at 1000 m. In the final study, MECCA was updated to include a diurnal boundary layer height taken from the BAERLIN2014 campaign (Bonn et al., 2016). Also, in the final study temperature was systematically varied between 288 and 313 K (15–40 $^{\circ}$ C). These changes to the model setup for the final study are outlined in Chap. ??.

Photolysis rates in were paramaterised as a function of the solar zenith angle based on the approach of the MCM (Jenkin et al., 1997). This paramaterisation utilises the latitude and in the first two studies 34 °N, roughly the city of Los Angeles, was used. In the final study, the latitude was set to 51 °N simulating central European conditions.

| Chemical Mechanism | Lumping Type | Reference |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | Jenkin et al. (1997), Jenkin et al. (2003) |
| MCM $v3.1$ and $v3.2$ | No lumping | Saunders et al. (2003), Bloss et al. (2005) |
| | | Rickard et al. (2015) |
| CRIv2 | Lumped intermediate | Jenkin et al. (2008) |
| MOZART-4 | Lumped molecule | Emmons et al. (2010) |
| RADM2 | Lumped molecule | Stockwell et al. (1990) |
| RACM | Lumped molecule | Stockwell et al. (1997) |
| RACM2 | Lumped molecule | Goliff et al. (2013) |
| CBM-IV | Lumped structure | Gery et al. (1989) |
| CB05 | Lumped structure | Yarwood et al. (2005) |

Table 2.2: Chemical mechanisms used in the study.

2.2 Chemical Mechanisms

The first part of this study compared the influence of different chemical mechanisms on ozone produced. The chemical mechanisms used in this study are listed in Table 2.2 and descriptions of these chemical mechanisms are found in Paper I (Sect. ??).

The Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM, Jenkin et al. (1997, 2003); Saunders et al. (2003); Bloss et al. (2005); Rickard et al. (2015)) is a near-explicit chemical mechanism and this high level of detail made it ideal as the reference chemical mechanism in each study of this work. The Common Representative Intermediates (CRI) chemical mechanism (Jenkin et al., 2008) is an lumped intermediate mechanism where the degradation productions are aggregated (lumped) rather than primary VOC. Lumped molecule chemical mechanisms aggregate primary VOC into mechanism species and is the most simplification common technique. The lumped-molecule chemical mechanisms used in this work were Model for OZone and Related chemical Tracers (MOZART, Emmons et al. (2010)), Regional Acid Deposition Model (RADM2, Stockwell et al. (1990)), Regional Atmospheric Chemistry Mechanism (RACM, Stockwell et al. (1997)) and RACM2 Goliff et al. (2013). The Carbon Bond mechanisms CBM-IV (Gery et al., 1989) and CB05 (Yarwood et al., 2005) were the lumped-structure chemical mechanisms used in this work. These chemical mechanisms were chosen as they are commonly used by the AQ modelling community as outlined by the review of European modelling groups by Baklanov et al. (2014).

2.3 Implementing Chemical Mechanisms in MECCA

Each chemical mechanism listed in Table 2.2 was adapted to the KPP format for use in the MECCA box model. The WRF-Chem model (Grell et al., 2005) includes KPP versions of RADM2, RACM and CBM-IV and was the starting point for using these chemical mechanisms in MECCA. The full version of the CRI v2 was obtained from http://mcm.leeds.ac.uk/CRI while for all other chemical mechanisms the original reference was used.

In order to focus on the differences in the representation of VOC degradation between the chemical mechanisms, a number of harmonisations between the chemical mechanisms were implemented. For these harmonisations, the approaches used by the reference chemical mechanism (MCM v3.2) were implemented in the reduced chemical mechanisms, These changes are detailed in the supplementary material of the first paper of this thesis (Chap. ??). The main results from the chemical mechanism comparison study are presented in Sect. ??.

2.4 Initial and Boundary Conditions

In all simulations through this work, methane (CH₄) was fixed to 1.75 ppmv while carbon monoxide (CO) and O_3 are initialised at 200 ppbv and 40 ppbv and then allowed to evolve freely. The initial conditions for NMVOCs were held constant until noon of the first day of simulations to simulate a fresh plume of emissions.

The initial conditions for NMVOC species differed in each experiment, a brief summary is given below and details are found in the respective publications (Chap. ??, Chap. ?? and Chap. ??). The first study applied the tagging approach introduced in Butler et al. (2011) (discussed further in Sect. 2.5) to different chemical mechanisms. The initial conditions of the Los Angeles experiments in Butler et al. (2011) were used in the MECCA set-up with MCM v3.2 chemistry to determine the emissions needed for constant mixing ratios of the NMVOCs. These emissions were mapped to the appropriate chemical species of each chemical mechanism in Table 2.2 keeping amount of emitted NMVOC constant between model setups.

The second study compared the ozone production using the emission inventories for the solvent sector listed in Table 2.3. This study was designed to simulate a theoretical urban area of 1000 km² with total NMVOC emissions of

| Speciation | Comment | Reference |
|------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| TNO | European average | Builtjes et al. (2002) |
| IPCC | Model Specific | Ehhalt et al. (2001) |
| EMEP | Model Specific | Simpson et al. (2012) |
| DE94 | Country Specific | Friedrich et al. (2002) |
| GR95 | Country Specific | Sidiropoulos and Tsilingiridis (2007) |
| GR05 | Country Specific | Sidiropoulos and Tsilingiridis (2007) |
| UK98 | Country Specific | Goodwin (2000) |
| UK08 | Country Specific | Murrells et al. (2010) |

Table 2.3: The solvent sector emission inventories compared in this study.

1000 tons/day. The solvent sector contributes $\sim 43~\%$ by mass of total emissions (EEA, 2011), thus total NMVOC emissions of 430 tons/day were used.

The total NMVOC emissions of the solvent sector were mapped to MCM v3.2 species based on the speciations of each emission inventory. Model simulations were repeated using MOZART-4 and RADM2 to investigate whether changing the chemical mechanism affects the differences in ozone concentrations between the solvent sector emission inventories.

The final study looked at the ozone-temperature relationship over central Europe and the emissions of NMVOC over Benelux (Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg) were used. The TNO_MACCIII emissions for the year 2011 were used as anthropogenic NMVOC emissions and mapped to MCM v3.2 species. Temperature indepedent emissions of biogenic species (isoprene and monoterpenes) were taken from the EMEP speciation (Simpson et al., 2012). Simulations using temperature-dependent emissions of isoprene used the MEGAN2.1 (Guenther et al., 2012) algorithm. All simulations were repeated using the CRI v2, MOZART-4, RADM2 and CB05 chemical mechanisms.

 ${
m NO_x}$ conditions generating VOC-and- ${
m NO_x}$ sensitive chemistry were used in the first two studies. This was achieved by emitting the amount of NO required to balance the source of radicals at each time step. While the final study assessed the relationship between ozone and temperature with different ${
m NO_x}$ conditions. For these simulations, a constant source of NO emissions was systematically varied between 5.0×10^9 and 1.5×10^{12} molecules (NO) cm⁻² s⁻¹.

No chemical boundary conditions were used in the first studies as the experiment was setup as a contained box. In the final study, MECCA included a diurnal profile of the PBL with vertical mixing into the free troposphere. The boundary conditions for the free troposphere mixing ratios for O_3 , CH_4 and CO were set to 50 ppbv, 1.8 ppmv and 116 ppbv respectively. These mixing ratios were taken

from the 700 hPa height using the MATCH-MPIC chemical weather forecast data (http://cwf.iass-potsdam.de/) from March 21st.

2.5 Tagging of Chemical Mechanisms

AQ models can be used to allocate the effects of different precursors or emission sources on ozone production. For example, source removal studies perform separate model simulations with and without emissions from a sector to quantify the effect of the sector on ozone production, such as the quantification of megacity emissions on ozone production n Butler and Lawrence (2009). Tagging is another approach where the chemical mechanism includes additional chemical species labelled (tagged) with source information. For example, Emmons et al. (2012) updated MOZART-4 chemistry to attribute ozone production to emission sources of NO_x emissions.

In Butler et al. (2011), tagged NMVOC chemistry allows allocation of ozone production to emitted NMVOC. This tagging approach considers O_x production as a proxy for O_3 production, this assumption is only valid for NO_x -limited and VOC-and- NO_x sensitive chemistry not in high NO_x conditions. The O_x family includes O_3 , NO_2 , $O(^1D)$, $O(^3P)$, NO_3 , N_2O_5 and other species involved in fast production and loss cycles with NO_2 .

All chemical mechanisms in Table 2.2 were tagged using the approach of Butler et al. (2011). In the first study, the tagging approach was the basis for comparing the respresentations of VOC degradation chemistry and their effects on ozone production. The second study used VOC-and-NOx-sensitive conditions and simulations using the tagged chemical mechanisms were a useful tool in determining the sources of differences in ozone production from the solvent sector emission inventories of Table 2.3. The variable NO_x conditions used in the third study meant that using the tagging approach was not possible. Thus all model simulations assessing the ozone-temperature relationship with different NO_x conditions were performed with non-tagged versions of the chemical mechanisms.

References

- A. Baklanov, K. Schlünzen, P. Suppan, J. Baldasano, D. Brunner, S. Aksoyoglu, G. Carmichael, J. Douros, J. Flemming, R. Forkel, S. Galmarini, M. Gauss, G. Grell, M. Hirtl, S. Joffre, O. Jorba, E. Kaas, M. Kaasik, G. Kallos, X. Kong, U. Korsholm, A. Kurganskiy, J. Kushta, U. Lohmann, A. Mahura, A. Manders-Groot, A. Maurizi, N. Moussiopoulos, S. T. Rao, N. Savage, C. Seigneur, R. S. Sokhi, E. Solazzo, S. Solomos, B. Sørensen, G. Tsegas, E. Vignati, B. Vogel, and Y. Zhang. Online coupled regional meteorology chemistry models in Europe: current status and prospects. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14(1):317–398, 2014.
- C. Bloss, V. Wagner, M. E. Jenkin, R. Vollamer, W. J. Bloss, J. D. Lee, D. E. Heard, K. Wirtz, M. Martin-Reviejo, G. Rea, J. C. Wenger, and M. J. Pilling. Development of a detailed chemical mechanism (MCMv3.1) for the atmospheric oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 5:641–664, 2005.
- B. Bonn, E. von Schneidemesser, D. Andrich, J. Quedenau, H. Gerwig, A. Lüdecke, J. Kura, A. Pietsch, C. Ehlers, D. Klemp, C. Kofahl, R. Nothard, A. Kerschbaumer, W. Junkermann, R. Grote, T. Pohl, K. Weber, B. Lode, P. Schönberger, G. Churkina, T. M. Butler, and M. G. Lawrence. BAERLIN2014 The influence of land surface types on and the horizontal heterogeneity of air pollutant levels in Berlin. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 2016:1–62, 2016.
- P. Builtjes, M. Loon, M. Schaap, S. Teeuwisse, A. Visschedijk, and J. Bloos. The development of an emission data base over Europe and further contributions of TNO-MEP. Technical report, TNO Environment, 2002.
- T. Butler, M. Lawrence, D. Taraborrelli, and J. Lelieveld. Multi-day ozone production potential of volatile organic compounds calculated with a tagging approach. *Atmospheric Environment*, 45(24):4082 4090, 2011.
- T. M. Butler and M. G. Lawrence. The influence of megacities on global atmospheric chemistry: a modelling study. *Environmental Chemistry*, 6:219–225, 2009.
- V. Damian, A. Sandu, M. Damian, F. Potra, and G. R. Carmichael. The kinetic

REFERENCES REFERENCES

preprocessor KPP-a software environment for solving chemical kinetics. Computers & Chemical Engineering, 26(11):1567-1579, 2002.

- EEA. Air quality in Europe 2011 report. Technical Report 12/2011, European Environmental Agency, 2011.
- Ehhalt, D., Prather, M., Dentener, F., Derwent, R., Dlugokencky, E., Holland, E., Isaksen, I., Katima, J., Kirchhoff, V., Matson, P., Midgley, P., Wang, and M. Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Technical report, IPCC, 2001.
- L. K. Emmons, S. Walters, P. G. Hess, J.-F. Lamarque, G. G. Pfister, D. Fillmore, C. Granier, A. Guenther, D. Kinnison, T. Laepple, J. Orlando, X. Tie, G. Tyndall, C. Wiedinmyer, S. L. Baughcum, and S. Kloster. Description and evaluation of the Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers, version 4 (MOZART-4). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 3(1):43–67, 2010.
- L. K. Emmons, P. G. Hess, J.-F. Lamarque, and G. G. Pfister. Tagged ozone mechanism for mozart-4, cam-chem and other chemical transport models. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5(6):1531–1542, 2012.
- R. Friedrich, B. Wickert, P. Blank, S. Emeis, W. Engewald, D. Hassel, H. Hoffmann, H. Michael, A. Obermeier, K. Schäfer, T. Schmitz, A. Sedlmaier, M. Stockhause, J. Theloke, and F.-J. Weber. Development of Emission Models and Improvement of Emission Data for Germany. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry*, 42(1):179–206, 2002.
- M. W. Gery, G. Z. Whitten, J. P. Killus, and M. C. Dodge. A photochemical kinetics mechanism for urban and regional scale computer modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 94(D10):12,925–12,956, 1989.
- W. S. Goliff, W. R. Stockwell, and C. V. Lawson. The regional atmospheric chemistry mechanism, version 2. *Atmospheric Environment*, 68:174 185, 2013.
- J. Goodwin. UK Emissions of Air Pollutants 1970 to 1998. Technical report, DEFRA, 2000.
- G. Grell, S. Peckham, R. Schmitz, S. McKeen, G. Frost, W. Skamarock, and B. Eder. Fully coupled "online" chemistry within the WRF model. *Atmospheric Environment*, 39(37):6957–6975, 2005.
- A. B. Guenther, X. Jiang, C. L. Heald, T. Sakulyanontvittaya, T. Duhl, L. K. Emmons, and X. Wang. The Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature

REFERENCES REFERENCES

version 2.1 (MEGAN2.1): an extended and updated framework for modeling biogenic emissions. Geoscientific Model Development, 5(6):1471–1492, 2012.

- M. Jenkin, L. Watson, S. Utembe, and D. Shallcross. A Common Representative Intermediates (CRI) mechanism for VOC degradation. Part 1: Gas phase mechanism development. *Atmospheric Environment*, 42(31):7185 7195, 2008.
- M. E. Jenkin, S. M. Saunders, and M. J. Pilling. The tropospheric degradation of volatile organic compounds: a protocol for mechanism development. *Atmospheric Environment*, 31(1):81 104, 1997.
- M. E. Jenkin, S. M. Saunders, V. Wagner, and M. J. Pilling. Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part B): tropospheric degradation of aromatic volatile organic compounds. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 3(1):181–193, 2003.
- D. Kubistin, H. Harder, M. Martinez, M. Rudolf, R. Sander, H. Bozem, G. Eerdekens, H. Fischer, C. Gurk, T. Klüpfel, R. Königstedt, U. Parchatka, C. L. Schiller, A. Stickler, D. Taraborrelli, J. Williams, and J. Lelieveld. Hydroxyl radicals in the tropical troposphere over the Suriname rainforest: comparison of measurements with the box model MECCA. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10(19):9705–9728, 2010.
- A. S. M. Lourens, T. M. Butler, J. P. Beukes, P. G. van Zyl, G. D. Fourie, and M. G. Lawrence. Investigating atmospheric photochemistry in the Johennesburg-Pretoria megacity using a box model. *South African Journal of Science*, 112(1/2), 2016.
- T. P. Murrells, N.R.P., G. Thistlethwaite, A. Wagner, Y. Li, T.B., J. Norris, C. Walker, R. A. Stewart, I. Tsagatakis, R. Whiting, C.C., S. Okamura, M. Peirce, S. Sneddon, J. Webb, J.T., J. MacCarthy, S. Choudrie, and N. Brophy. UK Emissions of Air Pollutants 1970 to 2008. Technical report, DEFRA, Didcot, UK, 2010.
- A. Rickard, J. Young, M. J. Pilling, M. E. Jenkin, S. Pascoe, and S. M. Saunders. The Master Chemical Mechanism Version MCM v3.2. http://mcm.leeds.ac.uk/MCMv3.2/, 2015. [Online; accessed 25-March-2015].
- A. Russell and R. Dennis. NARSTO critical review of photochemical models and modeling. *Atmospheric Environment*, 34(12-14):2283 2324, 2000.
- R. Sander, A. Kerkweg, P. Jöckel, and J. Lelieveld. Technical note: The new comprehensive atmospheric chemistry module mecca. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 5(2):445–450, 2005.

REFERENCES REFERENCES

S. M. Saunders, M. E. Jenkin, R. G. Derwent, and M. J. Pilling. Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part A): tropospheric degradation of non-aromatic volatile organic compounds. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 3(1):161–180, 2003.

- J. H. Seinfeld and S. N. Pandis. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate Change. John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York, second edition, 2006.
- C. Sidiropoulos and G. Tsilingiridis. Composition changes of NMVOC emissions from solvent use in Greece for the period 1990-2005. *Fresenius Environmental Bulletin*, 16(9):1108–1112, 2007.
- D. Simpson, A. Benedictow, H. Berge, R. Bergström, L. D. Emberson, H. Fagerli,
 C. R. Flechard, G. D. Hayman, M. Gauss, J. E. Jonson, M. E. Jenkin, A. Nyíri,
 C. Richter, V. S. Semeena, S. Tsyro, J.-P. Tuovinen, Á. Valdebenito, and P. Wind.
 The EMEP MSC-W chemical transport model technical description. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 12(16):7825–7865, 2012.
- W. R. Stockwell, P. Middleton, J. S. Chang, and X. Tang. The second generation regional acid deposition model chemical mechanism for regional air quality modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 95(D10):16343–16367, 1990.
- W. R. Stockwell, F. Kirchner, M. Kuhn, and S. Seefeld. A new mechanism for regional atmospheric chemistry modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 102(D22):25847–25879, 1997.
- G. Yarwood, S. Rao, M. Yocke, and G. Z. Whitten. Updates to the Carbon Bond Chemical Mechanism: CB05. Technical report, U. S Environmental Protection Agency, 2005.