

**Emission controls versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

# Emission controls versus meteorological conditions in determining aerosol concentrations in Beijing during the 2008 Olympic Games

Y. Gao<sup>1,2</sup>, X. Liu<sup>1</sup>, C. Zhao<sup>1</sup>, M. Zhang<sup>2</sup>, and Y. Wang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA

<sup>2</sup>State Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer Physics and Atmospheric Chemistry (LAPC), Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Received: 30 April 2011 – Accepted: 24 May 2011 – Published: 14 June 2011

Correspondence to: X. Liu (xiaohong.liu@pnl.gov)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## Abstract

A series of emission control measures were undertaken in Beijing and the adjacent provinces in China during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games on 8–24 August 2008. This provides a unique opportunity for investigating the effectiveness of emission controls on air pollution in Beijing. We conducted a series of numerical experiments over East Asia for the period of July to September 2008 using a coupled meteorology-chemistry model (WRF-Chem). Model can generally reproduce the observed variation of aerosol concentrations. Consistent with observations, modeled concentrations of aerosol species (sulfate, nitrate, ammonium, black carbon, organic carbon, total particulate matter) in Beijing were decreased by 30–50 % during the Olympic period compared to the other periods in July and August in 2008 and the same period in 2007. Model results indicate that emission controls were effective in reducing the aerosol concentrations by comparing simulations with and without emission controls. However, our analysis suggests that meteorological conditions (e.g., wind direction and precipitation) are at least as important as emission controls in producing the low aerosol concentrations appearing during the Olympic period. Transport from the regions surrounding Beijing determines the temporal variation of aerosol concentrations in Beijing. Based on the budget analysis, we suggest that to improve the air quality over Beijing, emission control strategy should focus on the regional scale instead of the local scale.

## 1 Introduction

During the past three decades, the rapid economic growth in China has caused a significant increase in the emission of aerosols and precursor gases. This leads to highly elevated aerosol concentrations, especially in some mega-cities (e.g., Beijing and Shanghai) and Pearl River Delta Region (e.g., Q. Zhang et al., 2009; Chan and Yao, 2008). In these regions, particulate aerosol is the major cause of severe air pollution. Aerosol species including sulfate ( $\text{SO}_4$ ), nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3$ ), ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4$ ), black

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



carbon (BC), organic carbon (OC), and dust could have significant impacts on environment and climate change in China (Tang et al., 2004; Han et al., 2008; Chan and Yao, 2008).

Beijing, China's capital city with a population of more than 16 millions, is one of the largest metropolises in the World. PM<sub>10</sub> (Particle Matter of 10 μm or less in the aerodynamic diameter) is reported to be the major cause of air pollution in Beijing on about 90 % of days from 1999 to 2005 (Beijing Environmental Bulletin, 1994–2005) and its concentration exceeds the China's Grade-2 Standard (daily averaged concentration of PM<sub>10</sub> of 150 μg m<sup>-3</sup>) on 30 % of the days each year. While the emission control inside Beijing is a direct way to reduce the concentrations of air pollutants in Beijing, emissions in the regions surrounding Beijing can also significantly affect the air quality in Beijing because of the transport of primary aerosols and the formation of secondary aerosols in the downwind. For example, An et al. (2007) suggested that emissions over the northwest and southwest to Beijing contribute 39 % and 15 %, respectively, to the particle matter concentrations over urban Beijing. Streets et al. (2007) showed that 34 % of PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Particle Matter of 2.5 μm or less in the aerodynamic diameter) and 35 ~ 60 % of ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) in Beijing were transported from the regions surrounding Beijing based on simulations using the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model.

After being selected as the host of the 29th Olympic Games, the city government of Beijing has paid more attention to its air pollution problem. In order to achieve the goal that concentrations of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and O<sub>3</sub> meet the standards suggested by the World Health Organization and concentrations of particulate matters meet the standards for the major cities of developed countries during the Olympic Games, City Government of Beijing implemented a series of emission control measures in Beijing and its surrounding regions prior to and during the Olympics (Report "29th Beijing Olympic Games Air Quality Safeguards" drafted by the Environmental Protection Agency of China et al.; M. Wang et al., 2009). Before the full-scale control (pre-20 July 2008), heavy industrial polluters (e.g., the Capital Steel Company) were relocated, and 50 % of government cars were not allowed to drive in Beijing after

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

---

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

---

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

23 June 2008. During the full-scale control (from 20 July to 19 September 2008), first, the odd/even license plate number rule was applied on personal vehicles in Beijing; second, stricter control was applied on vehicles entering Beijing; third, the production of some factories that can cause air pollution was limited or even stopped. In addition, extra 20 % government cars were not allowed to drive in Beijing, some outdoor constructions were stopped, and usages of coal-burning facilities were restricted during 8–24 August (the period of the Olympic Games) and 7–19 September (the period of the Paralympics). These measures offer a unique opportunity to investigate the effect of emission controls on the air quality in a mega-city. Several universities and research institutes in China had set up observation networks in Beijing and its surrounding provinces during the emission control period. Previous studies indicated that emission controls were effective in improving the air quality in Beijing in terms of reducing gas and aerosol concentrations during the Olympics (e.g., T. Wang et al., 2009; Cermak et al., 2009; Y. Wang et al., 2009; X.-Y. Zhang et al., 2009). Based on observed emission factors, S. Wang et al. (2010) estimated that emissions of aerosol precursors (e.g., SO<sub>2</sub>, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs)) during the Olympic Games were reduced by about 40–50 % compared with those in June 2008. M. Wang et al. (2009) found that on-road concentrations of NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, carbon monoxide (CO), and BC were reduced by 41 %, 70 %, 54 %, and 12 %, respectively during the Olympics, compared to those of the pre-control period (before 20 July 2008) from measurements by a mobile laboratory. The mean daytime O<sub>3</sub> concentration was reduced by about 15 ppbv and daytime SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and reactive odd-nitrogen (NO<sub>y</sub>) concentrations were reduced by 61 %, 25 %, and 21 %, respectively, during the Olympic Games, compared to those of the same period in 2006 and 2007 from measurements at a rural site (Miyun site) of Beijing (Y. Wang et al., 2009).

As important as emissions, meteorological conditions can influence the air quality in mega-cities by affecting the chemical production of secondary pollutants in the atmosphere, wet/dry deposition of pollutants, and diffusion and exchange of pollutants with surrounding regions. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the role of meteorological

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

conditions in determining the aerosol pollution during the Olympic Games. Some studies indicated that during the Olympic period, there were still high levels of air pollutants on some days, and unfavorable weather conditions were suggested to be the reason (e.g., T. Wang et al., 2010; X.-Y. Zhang et al., 2009). T. Wang et al. (2010) measured trace gases and aerosol prior to and during the Olympics and suggested that improved air quality during the Olympics has a clear relationship with weather conditions. X.-Y. Zhang et al. (2009) found that aerosol concentrations were still increased on some days during the Olympics due to the stabilized weather conditions. Previous studies examined the improvement of air quality in Beijing during the Olympic period by comparing to the pre-control periods or to the same periods in previous years. However, meteorological conditions (e.g., wind and precipitation) can be significantly different between these periods. There are no studies yet to examine the relative importance of emission controls versus weather conditions in determining the air quality change during the Olympics.

In this study, we investigate the changes in aerosol concentrations and factors determining these changes in Beijing during the Olympic Games, by using a coupled meteorology-chemistry model (WRF-Chem). The contribution of emission controls versus weather condition changes is examined. We begin in Sect. 2 by introducing the WRF-Chem model and the numerical experiments conducted in this study. In Sect. 3, we give a description of observation data used in the model evaluation and result analysis. The variation of aerosol concentrations in Beijing during the Olympic Games and its relationship with emission controls and meteorology conditions are discussed in Sect. 4. Conclusions of this study are presented in Sect. 5.

## 2 Model description

### 2.1 WRF-Chem model

The model used in this study is the Weather Research and Forecasting model (WRF, version 3.2). WRF-Chem is a version of WRF that can simulate trace gases and aerosol simultaneously with the meteorological fields (Grell et al., 2005). There are two chemistry mechanisms in WRF-Chem: one is RADM2 (Regional Acid Deposition Model 2) photochemical mechanism (Stockwell et al., 1990) and MADE/SORGAM (Modal Aerosol Dynamics Model for Europe (MADE) and Secondary Organic Aerosol Model (SORGAM)) aerosol model (Ackermann et al., 1998; Schell et al., 2001) and the other one is CBMZ (Carbon Bond Mechanism) photochemical mechanism (Zaveri and Peter, 1999) and MOSAIC (Model for Simulating Aerosol Interactions and Chemistry) aerosol model (Zaveri et al., 2008) which was implemented by Fast et al. (2006). The RADM2 chemistry mechanism with the MADE/SORGAM aerosol model is used in this study. For the treatment of aerosol size distribution, MADE/SORGAM uses the modal approach with three lognormal modes (Aikten, accumulation and coarse mode). All major components of aerosol are treated in the model including SO<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub>, BC, OC, sea salt, mineral dust, and aerosol water. Aerosol processes in the MADE/SORGAM include nucleation, condensation of both inorganic and organic aerosol, coagulation, dry/wet deposition, gas phase and aqueous phase chemistry, and water uptake of aerosols. Aerosol nucleation is the most important process for the formation of secondary aerosol particles in the sulfuric acid-water system and is calculated following Kulmala et al. (1998). Aerosol growth by condensation occurs in two steps: the production of condensable material (vapor) by reactions of chemical precursors, and the condensation and evaporation of ambient volatile species on aerosols using the modal approach of Binkowski and Shankar (1995). The formulation for the coagulation process follows Whitby et al. (1991) and Binkowski and Shankar (1995). Dry deposition in MADE/SORGAM is calculated through the deposition velocity which is proportional to the sum of aerodynamic, sublayer, and surface resistances from the

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



parameterization by Wesley (1989). Wet deposition includes the in-cloud aerosol removal based on the conversion rate of cloud water to rain water, and below-cloud aerosol removal by impaction and interception, following the formulation by Easter et al. (2004) for both large-scale and convective precipitation. Aerosol-cloud interactions were included in the model by Gustufson et al. (2007) for calculating the activation and resuspension between dry aerosols and cloud droplets, which is similar to the method used in the MIRAGE general circulation model (Ghan et al., 2001).

## 2.2 Numerical experiments

In this study, WRF-Chem is configured to cover East Asia (70° E–150° E, 10° N–55° N) with 160 (W–E) × 110 (S–N) grid points, a 36 km horizontal resolution centering at central China (110° E, 30° N), and 35 vertical layers up to 10 hPa. Figure 1a shows the experiment domain (the outer-most box), and the shaded area in Fig. 1b (enlarged from the blue box in Fig. 1a) shows Beijing (115.42° E–117.50° E, 39.43° N–41.05° N). Here, the scope of Beijing includes urban area and rural areas according to administrative divisions. The Runge-Kutta 3rd order time-integration scheme, Noah land surface model, Mellor-Yamada-Janjic Planetary Boundary Layer scheme, and Grell-Devenyi Ensemble Cumulus clouds scheme are used in this study. The Lin cloud microphysics scheme is used to include the aerosol indirect effect and RRTMG longwave/shortwave scheme is used to include aerosol direct effect (Zhao et al., 2010). For chemistry, RADM2 photochemical mechanism, MADE/SORGAM aerosol model and Fast-J Photolysis scheme are used. The initial meteorological fields and boundary conditions are from NCEP Final reanalysis data with 1° × 1° spatial resolution and 6-h temporal resolution. Chemical lateral boundary conditions are from the default profiles in WRF-Chem. The simulation is conducted for the period of May to September 2008 by reinitializing meteorological conditions every 5 days with NCEP Final reanalysis data and including an overlap period of one day for each simulation block for meteorological spin up. The modeled  $u$ -component and  $v$ -component of wind, temperature and water vapor mixing ratio are also nudged towards the NCEP reanalysis data with a nudging

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



time interval of 6 h. We conducted five numerical experiments starting from 1 May to 2 September 2008 as listed in Table 1: (1) the control experiment (CTL) was driven by the meteorological conditions of 2008 and the emissions of 2008 with emission controls from 20 July to 2 September; (2) experiment (CTL-BJ0) was driven by the meteorological conditions of 2008 and the emissions of 2008 but with emissions in Beijing (Fig. 1b) set to be zero and with emission controls over the rest of model domain from 20 July to 2 September; (3) experiment (CTL-RD0) was driven by the meteorological conditions of 2008 and the emissions of 2008 with emission controls in Beijing and with emissions over the rest of model domain (i.e., domain outside the inner blue box in Fig. 1a) set to be zero from 20 July to 2 September; (4) experiment (NO-CTL) was driven by the meteorological conditions of 2008 and the business-as-usual emissions of 2008 (i.e., no emission controls); (5) experiment (NO-CTL07) was driven by the meteorological conditions of 2007 and the emissions of 2007.

### 2.3 Emissions

Anthropogenic emissions of CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), BC, OC, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> used in the simulations over the model domain are obtained from David Streets' 2006 emission inventory ([http://www.cgrer.uiowa.edu/EMISSION\\_DATA\\_new/index\\_16.html](http://www.cgrer.uiowa.edu/EMISSION_DATA_new/index_16.html)), which consists of four sectors (power, industry, residential and transportation). According to the increase of anthropogenic emissions in Asia from 2001 to 2006 (Q. Zhang et al., 2009), we calculate the increasing rate for each species of anthropogenic emissions per year to be 3.36 % for CO, 9.16 % for NO<sub>x</sub>, 6.34 % for SO<sub>2</sub>, 5.22 % for VOC, 2.66 % for BC, OC and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and 2.47 % for PM<sub>10</sub>, and project the emissions for 2007 and 2008. As there is no NH<sub>3</sub> emission in the David Streets' 2006 emission inventory, we use the 2008 NH<sub>3</sub> emission from Regional Emission inventory for Asia domain (REAS, <http://www.jamstec.go.jp/frsgc/research/d4/emission.htm>). Biomass burning emission is obtained from the Global Fire Emissions Database, Version 2 (GFEDv2.1), which has one-month temporal resolution (Randerson et al., 2005). Biogenic emission is from the Model of Emission of Gases and Aerosol from

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Nature (MEGAN) (Guenther et al., 2006). Dust emission is calculated online following Zhao et al. (2011). According to the study by S. Wang et al. (2010) and personal communication with Kebin He of Tsinghua University (2011), we estimate that from 20 July to 7 August prior to the Olympics Games and from 25 August to 6 September after the Olympics Games, anthropogenic emissions decreased by 35 % for Beijing, 20 % for Hebei province (the province immediately surrounding Beijing) and 10 % for other places in China; during the Olympic Games (8 to 24 August) and Paralympics (7 to 19 September), anthropogenic emissions decreased by 50 % for Beijing, 35 % for Hebei province and 10 % for other places in China. The restrictions on coal burning pollution in the provinces (Hebei, Shanxi, Inner Mongolia, Shandong, etc.) surrounding Beijing were conducted based on the air quality status in Beijing, which worked together to protect Beijing's air quality. Thus, we estimate that the emission control in Hebei province (the province immediately surrounding Beijing) was weaker than that in Beijing, but stronger than the emission control in other provinces. These estimated emissions are used in our numerical experiments as listed in Table 1. We note that these are uncertainties with the actual starting date of emission controls and exact emission reduction percentages in Beijing and surrounding provinces. We will discuss their impact on our conclusions in session 5.

### 3 Observational data

#### 3.1 Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network

Observations of  $PM_{2.5}$  (Xin et al., 2010) from July to September 2008 were obtained from the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network that was supported by the Beijing Olympic Technological Project of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Beijing Municipal Environmental Protection Bureau and operated by the Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences. The instruments of the network include a Model 42C&42I NONO<sub>2</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub> Analyzer, a Model 43C&43I SO<sub>2</sub>

Analyzer, a Model 49C&49I O<sub>3</sub> Analyzer, and a Model RP 1400-PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The four sites in the network are Aoyuncun (116.38° E, 40.00° N), Yangfang (116.13° E, 40.13° N), Xinglong (117.48° E, 40.42° N), and Langfang (116.75° E, 39.60° N), which are shown in Fig. 1b as blue triangles. Aoyuncun is an urban site located between the North Third Ring road and the Ring road. Yangfang, Xinglong and Langfang are suburban sites, which are more than 35 km away from Beijing urban area and distributed in different directions of Beijing.

### 3.2 Olympic Monitoring Campaign by China Meteorological Administration (CMA)

The 2008 Olympic Monitoring Campaign was operated by CMA from June to September 2008 (X.-Y. Zhang et al., 2010). Various atmospheric components including SO<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub>, and BC were measured at three urban stations and four rural stations in Beijing and its vicinity. The observations at CMA (116.33° E, 39.95° N) site, which is located in the urban area of Beijing, are available to us and used in this study.

### 3.3 PERSIANN

We use the PERSIANN hourly precipitation data (Hsu et al., 1999; Sorooshian et al., 2000) during July and August of 2008 on a 0.25° grid (60° S–60° N). In the PERSIANN system, a neural network trained by precipitation from the TRMM Microwave Imager (TMI) and other microwave measurements (Hsu et al., 1997, 1999) was used to estimate 30-min precipitation rates from infrared (IR) and visible imagery from geostationary satellites.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Reduction of aerosol concentrations during the Olympic Games

Time series of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration at the surface layer during July and August of 2008 are shown in Fig. 2 to illustrate the change of air quality during the Olympics. This figure compares the observed and simulated  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration in the CTL and NO-CTL cases at four sites (Aoyuncun, Yangfang, Xinglong, and Langfang) of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network. These four sites are chosen as they can represent different areas of Beijing (Fig. 1b). In general, model simulation in the CTL case captures the temporal variations of observed  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration at the four sites in July and August. For all the sites, there are four  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration peaks on 9 to 11 July, 24 to 26 July, 4 to 9 August, and 28 August. Observed  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations at Aoyuncun site are  $120\text{--}180\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  at these peaks. During other periods,  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations are much lower, especially for the Olympic period with values of  $40\sim 70\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ . Both simulations and observations show that  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations at Yangfang site have almost the same fluctuations as those at Aoyuncun site and also have the similar values of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations, although Yangfang is a suburban site. Both observed and simulated  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations at Xinglong site are the lowest during the Olympic period compared to other sites as it is located in the northeast direction of Beijing, which is a mountain area with relatively clean background. Observed and simulated  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations at Langfang site are similar to or often higher than those at the urban site (Aoyuncun) because Langfang site is surrounded by several other industrial cities such as Tianjin and Tangshan. At all the four sites,  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations are significantly underestimated by the model during 24–28 July while overestimated during 24–30 August. The underestimation might be due to the incorrect emissions. The overestimation is associated with the bias in simulated grid-scale precipitation, which will be discussed in Sect. 4.2.2. Modeled  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations from the CTL case agree with observations reasonably well during the Olympic period, although the model results slightly overestimate the observations. In

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



comparison modeled  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations from the NO-CTL case significantly overestimate the observations. The comparison between the CTL and NO-CTL case will be discussed in Sect. 4.2.1 to illustrate the impact of emission controls.

Table 2 summarizes the statistical analysis between observed and simulated daily  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations in both CTL and NO-CTL cases at the four sites (in Fig. 2) from July to August 2008.  $N$  is the number of daily samples between observations and simulations at each site in July and August. The correlation coefficients ( $R$ ) between observations and model simulations in both cases range from 0.5 to 0.7. The similar  $R$  value for both cases indicates that emission controls have a limited impact on the co-variation of modeled and observed  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations. There is positive mean bias (MB) of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration from the CTL case compared to observations with values of 9.8, 3.3, 5.0 and  $7.2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  for the four sites, respectively, which are, however, substantially lower than the values of 38.9, 28.3, 23.0, and  $40.4 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  from the NO-CTL case. In addition, the normalized mean bias (NMB) ranges from 4.8 % to 14.2 % in the CTL case, which is much lower than the corresponding NMB of 40.0 % to 56.0 % in the NO-CTL case for the four sites. The root mean square error (RMSE) is also reduced in the CTL case. The improvement of model simulation in the CTL case compared to the NO-CTL case indicates that emission controls effectively reduce the aerosol particle concentrations.

Table 3 shows the  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations at the above sites from observations and simulations in the CTL, NO-CTL and NO-CTL07 cases averaged for the four sub-periods from July to August (i.e., prior to emission controls: 1–19 July; with emission controls prior to Olympic Games: 20 July–7 August; with emission controls during the Olympic Games: 8–24 August; and with emission controls post-Olympic Games: 25–31 August). At Aoyuncun site, the observed  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration is  $42.4 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, lower than the values of  $68.2$ – $92.4 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (40–50 % lower) during the other periods from July to August 2008. The CTL case also simulates the lowest  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration of  $54.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, compared to the values of  $78.0$ – $112.2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (30–50 % lower) during the other periods from June to

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

August 2008. At Yangfang site, the observed  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration is  $35.3 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is lower than the values of  $48.7\text{--}109.6 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (30–70 % lower) during the other periods from July to August 2008.  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration from the CTL case is  $49.9 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, compared to the values of  $68.8\text{--}107.3 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (30–50 % lower) during the other periods from July to August 2008. At Xinglong site, the observed  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration is  $23.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is 50–75 % lower than the values of  $48.5\text{--}92.6 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods. The CTL case simulated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration is  $38.9 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ , which is 35–50 % lower than the values of  $63.2\text{--}81.6 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods. At Langfang site, the observed  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration is  $47.2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is 40–60 % lower than the values of  $77.8\text{--}117.5 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods. Simulated  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration in the CTL case is  $70.2 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is 25–50 % lower than the values of  $94.6\text{--}129.1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods. From the above discussion, modeled  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration from the CTL case during the Olympic period is 25–50 % lower than the values during the other periods. Observations show even larger reductions (by up to 75 %). This is because the model simulation (CTL) underestimates  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration during 20 July–7 August (Fig. 2). Thus the modeled difference between this period and the Olympics period is underestimated.  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration during the Olympic period decreased by 30 ~ 50 %, compared to the values in the NO-CTL07 case for the same period for all the four sites.

Table 4 lists the aerosol concentrations of  $\text{SO}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{NH}_4$ , BC, and OC from observations at the CMA site ( $116.33^\circ \text{E}$ ,  $39.95^\circ \text{N}$ ) (X.-Y. Zhang et al., 2010) and model simulations in the CTL and NO-CTL cases averaged for the five sub-periods from 1 June to 31 August 2008. In general, the model underestimates observed  $\text{SO}_4$ , which may be caused by the underestimation of  $\text{SO}_2$  emission in the model. Both observations and model simulations in the CTL case show that the aerosol species concentrations are much lower during the Olympic period (8–24 August) than those during the pre- and post-Olympic periods. The observed  $\text{SO}_4$  concentration is  $12.0 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the

Olympic period, lower than the values of  $19.9\text{--}25.2\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (35–50 % lower) during the other periods from June to August 2008. The CTL case also simulates the lowest  $\text{SO}_4$  concentration of  $9.4\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, compared to the values of  $15.2\text{--}18.6\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (40–60 % lower) during the other periods from June to August 2008. For  $\text{NO}_3$ , model results are higher than observations, reflecting the difficulty of model to simulate the partitioning of  $\text{HNO}_3$  (g) into aerosol phase. The observed  $\text{NO}_3$  concentration is  $7.0\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is also 30–60 % lower than the values of  $11.4\text{--}20.4\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods from July to August 2008. In the CTL case,  $\text{NO}_3$  concentration is also the lowest with the value of  $15.5\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during Olympic period, comparing to  $21.6\text{--}40.8\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (30–60 % lower) during other periods from June to August 2008. The observed  $\text{NH}_4$  concentration is  $6.6\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, which is 30–50 % lower than the values of  $9.4\text{--}12.7\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the other periods from June to August 2008. In the CTL case, there is the lowest  $\text{NH}_4$  concentration of  $8.0\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, compared to the values of  $12.1\text{--}18.8\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (30–50 % lower) during the other periods from June to August 2008. The model simulated BC concentrations for the CTL case agree well with observations. The observed BC concentration is  $3.0\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, lower than the values of  $4.8\text{--}6.5\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (35–50 % lower) during other periods from June to August 2008. The CTL case also simulates the lowest BC concentration of  $3.8\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  during the Olympic period, compared to the values of  $5.6\text{--}7.3\ \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  (35–50 % lower) during the other periods from June to August 2008. For OC, model significantly underestimates observations because of the treatment of secondary organic aerosol (SOA) in the WRF-Chem model (e.g., Li et al., 2010; Shrivastava et al., 2010). OC concentrations from both model simulations for the CTL case and observations during Olympics are about 60 % of those prior to Olympics. As discussed above, both observations and model results show that the concentrations of all the aerosol species are about 35 % ~ 50 % lower during the Olympic period than those in the other periods from June to August 2008.

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## 4.2 Factors for aerosol concentration reduction during the Olympic Games

### 4.2.1 Emission controls

Both observations and model simulations show that aerosol concentrations decreased significantly during the Olympic period compared to the values during the other periods of June–August 2008 or to values during the same period of 2007. In the following, we will investigate the relative roles of emission controls and meteorological conditions in affecting this reduction. Comparing model results between CTL and NO-CTL, emission controls significantly reduce  $PM_{2.5}$  and aerosol species concentrations during the Olympic period (Fig. 2, Tables 3 and 4).  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration is reduced by  $\sim 40\%$  for all the four sites (Fig. 2 and Table 3), while the concentration of  $SO_4$ ,  $NO_3$ ,  $NH_4$ , BC, and OC is reduced by 26 %, 53 %, 44 %, 46 %, and 44 %, respectively at the CMA site (Table 4). Figure 3 shows the spatial distribution of the concentration difference of  $SO_4$ ,  $NO_3$ ,  $NH_4$ , BC, OC, and  $PM_{2.5}$  between the CTL case and the NO-CTL case averaged from July 20 to 31 August (i.e., including both the Olympic period and pre-Olympic period but with emission controls) over Beijing. The reduction of  $SO_4$  is about  $2 \sim 3 \mu g m^{-3}$  over north of Beijing and  $3 \sim 4 \mu g m^{-3}$  over south of Beijing and the relative reduction is  $\sim 20\%$  over Beijing. The reduction of  $NO_3$  is the most among all the species, which is about  $6 \sim 12 \mu g m^{-3}$  over north of Beijing and  $12 \sim 18 \mu g m^{-3}$  over south of Beijing. The relative reduction of  $NO_3$  is  $\sim 40\%$  over Beijing. Reduction of  $NH_4$  is about  $3 \sim 4 \mu g m^{-3}$  over north of Beijing and  $4 \sim 6 \mu g m^{-3}$  over south of Beijing, and the relative reduction is 30–35 % over Beijing. The reduction of BC is about  $1 \sim 3 \mu g m^{-3}$  over Beijing, and the reduction of OC is about  $1 \sim 4 \mu g m^{-3}$  over Beijing. The relative reduction of BC and OC are  $\sim 30\%$ . For  $PM_{2.5}$ , the reduction is  $16 \sim 20 \mu g m^{-3}$  over north of Beijing and  $20 \sim 40 \mu g m^{-3}$  over south of Beijing. The relative reduction of  $PM_{2.5}$  is about 30 % over Beijing. The reduction in aerosol concentrations from emission controls over south of Beijing is larger than that over north of Beijing as south of Beijing is the urban area of Beijing and the concentrations of aerosol pollution are

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



higher there. From the above analysis, emission controls are effective for the reduction of concentrations of all the aerosol species, including SO<sub>4</sub> (20%), NO<sub>3</sub> (40%), NH<sub>4</sub> (30%), BC (30%) and OC (30%) during the period from 20 July to 31 August.

#### 4.2.2 Meteorological conditions

Although the model simulation with emission controls (the CTL case) shows that the aerosol concentrations in Beijing are significantly reduced during the Olympic Games compared to other periods in July and August and also lower than those from the simulation without emission controls (the NO-CTL case) (Fig. 3), we argue that meteorological conditions play a key role in producing the low aerosol concentrations in most of the Olympic period. It is shown that aerosol concentrations from the NO-CTL case during the Olympic period are lower than those from 24 to 26 July, 4 to 7 August, and 28 August (peaks in Fig. 2). In addition, temporal variations of aerosol concentration are large with very high PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations up to 150 μg m<sup>-3</sup> in the first two days of Olympics (8–9 August) and in the period of 24 to 26 July when the full-scale emission controls are already enforced. We further suggest that emission controls have a small impact on the temporal variations of aerosol concentration during the Olympic period, which, instead, results from the meteorological impact, as will be discussed below.

Figure 4 shows daily averaged horizontal wind speed and direction at the lowest three layers, daily averaged surface PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from the CTL simulation, and daily precipitation rate over Beijing from 1 July to 31 August 2008. The direction of arrows in Fig. 4a denotes the horizontal wind direction on the three vertical planes and the length of the arrows denotes the horizontal wind speed. The observed 0.25° × 0.25° hourly precipitation data is from PERSIANN hourly precipitation data, shown in Fig. 4b. The model generally captures the observed precipitation events in July and August 2008. PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are reduced during and immediate after precipitation events (e.g., 29–31 July, 9–11 August) due to the scavenging of aerosols by precipitation. The large fluctuations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration during 1–19 July are caused by the frequent occurrence of precipitation events. The few amounts

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





of precipitation around 26 July and 4–8 August contribute to the high  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration during these periods while the heavy precipitation during 9–11 August decreases the  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration during the Olympics. The model underestimation of observed precipitation after 22 August results in the overestimation of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration during that period (Fig. 2).

The change of  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations is also related to the variation of wind direction, which together with the occurrence of precipitation are associated with the weather patterns in Beijing. As discussed in Sect. 2, our model simulations are conducted by reinitializing meteorological conditions every 5 days with NCEP Final reanalysis data and also nudging modeled u-component and v-component of wind, temperature and water vapor mixing ratio with NCEP reanalysis data with a nudging time interval of 6 h. Thus model simulated wind, temperature and water vapor mixing ratio are very similar to the NCEP reanalysis data. Moreover, we evaluated model simulated hourly wind speed, wind direction, temperature and relative humidity with observations obtained at the 325-m Beijing Meteorological Tower for August 2008. In general model simulated meteorological variables agree well with observations (see Fig. S1 in the Supplement). As shown in Fig. 4, high  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations always correspond to the southeasterly, southerly, or southwesterly wind, while low  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations always correspond to the reverse wind direction (e.g., northeasterly wind). Beijing is surrounded by Yanshan Mountain to the northeast, Taihang Mountain to the west, and Mongolian plateau to the northwest, thus northerly wind blow clean air into Beijing, whereas aerosol particles can be transported by the southerly wind from the southern polluted regions and accumulated over the Beijing area. Figure 4 shows that the dominated southerly wind from 22–26 July and from 4–9 August leads to high  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations during these periods, while the northeasterly wind during 11–20 August results in a continuous period with low aerosol concentrations for the Olympic Games.

Two sensitivity simulations (CTL-BJ0 and CTL-RD0) are conducted to investigate the relative impact of emissions of Beijing and its surrounding regions on the air quality in Beijing. Figure 5 shows the daily mean and grid averaged anomalies of surface

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from 20 July to 31 August (the emission control period prior to and during the Olympics) over Beijing from model simulations in the CTL, CTL-BJ0, and CTL-RD0 cases. Anomaly is calculated by subtracting the mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration during 20 July–31 August from its daily values. Figure 5 shows that in the CTL-RD0 case with emissions in the regions outside Beijing turned off, fluctuations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration become much smaller compared to those in the CTL and CTL-BJ0 cases. In comparison, PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from CTL and CTL-BJ0 cases has strong correlation (correlation coefficients are 0.98), indicating that pollutants transported from the regions surrounding Beijing dominate the fluctuations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in Beijing. The anomalies of CTL and CTL-BJ0 are almost the same with large positive value around 26 July and 4 August indicating that the transport from regions outside of Beijing is the main cause for the high PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration during these periods. The anomalies of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in the CTL-RD0 case with all emissions outside Beijing turned off (the green line) change from positive to negative on 8 August, indicating the effect of enhanced emission controls in Beijing during the Olympics. From 8 to 24 August, the averaged anomalies in the CTL-BJ0 case are about  $-10.6 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ , while the averaged anomalies in the CTL-RD0 case are about  $-3.1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ . This indicates that the transport of pollutants from regions outside Beijing has a larger impact on the variations of aerosol concentration than the emission controls in Beijing during the Olympic period. The above results suggest that meteorological conditions determine the temporal fluctuations of aerosol concentration, although emission controls reduce the averaged aerosol concentrations by 30–50 % during the Olympic period.

### 4.2.3 Budget analysis

In order to further understand the source of variations of aerosol concentration during the Olympic period, the budgets of BC from emission, chemistry, transport, and dry and wet deposition are calculated for the CTL case. BC is chosen since it has no chemical production/loss in the model, which makes it simple for the analysis of the relative contribution from the transport and emission. Figure 6 shows the July–August budgets

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



for BC and budget differences between the period (2–10 August and 11–19 August, respectively) and July–August. The positive value denotes increase to concentration and the negative value denotes decrease to concentration over Beijing. “ $\Delta$ concentration” equals to the net of the contributions of the five budget terms. Among the five budget terms (Fig. 6a), emission contribution is always positive, contribution from wet deposition and dry deposition are always negative and transport contribution depends on meteorological conditions. In Fig. 6a, for the budgets in the whole July–August period, the source term of BC is emission and the loss terms of BC are transport, dry deposition and wet deposition.  $\Delta$ concentration is  $-4.2 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ . Emission has the contribution of  $64.5 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ . The contribution of transport is  $-27.9 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  indicating that in July and August 2008, meteorological conditions are favorable for the decrease of air pollutants. The dry deposition loss is  $-30.7 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  and wet deposition loss is  $-10.3 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  for BC.

In Fig. 6b, comparing with the BC budgets in July–August 2008, for the period of 2 to 10 August (red bars), the negative contribution of transport to BC concentration in Fig. 6a is reduced by  $27.1 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  and the positive contribution of emission is reduced by  $9.8 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  indicating the unfavorable meteorological conditions and effectiveness of emission controls in this period. The negative contribution of dry deposition is slightly increased by  $1.2 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  and the negative contribution of wet deposition slightly reduced by  $1.9 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  indicating the contributions of these two terms in this period are similar to the average conditions in July and August. Therefore, the transport which is not favorable for ventilating the air pollution during 2 to 10 August makes BC concentration increasing by  $17.9 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ . For the period of 11 to 19 August (green bars), the positive contribution of emission in Fig. 6a is reduced by  $19.2 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  indicating the enhanced emission controls during this period. The negative contribution of transport is only reduced by a very small amount (about  $1.0 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ , thus the transport loss is  $26.9 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  for this period) indicating that meteorological condition in this period is as favorable as the average conditions in July and August to ventilate the air pollutants in Beijing. As dry deposition is proportional to the concentrations and the

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



BC concentration decrease significantly in this period, the negative contribution of dry deposition in Fig. 6a is reduced by  $15.1 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ . The change of negative contribution of wet deposition is also very small at about  $2.2 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ . Therefore, during 11 to 19 August, under favorable meteorological conditions ( $26.9 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$  for transport loss), large decrease in emission ( $19.2 \text{ ton day}^{-1}$ ) is effective for the improvement of air quality during the Olympic Game. From the above analysis, comparing with the average conditions in July and August in 2008, when meteorological conditions are not favorable (such as the period of 2–10 August), BC concentration could still be high even though full-scale emission controls are enforced. On the other hand, when the meteorological condition is favorable (for the period of 2–10 August, emission controls can be effective for decreasing the air pollutants in Beijing.

## 5 Summary and conclusions

To improving the air quality during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, emission control measures have been implemented by the City Government of Beijing. This provides a unique opportunity for examining the emission control policy on air quality in megacities. By using the fully coupled meteorology-chemistry model (WRF-Chem), we conducted several numerical experiments: NO-CTL, CTL, CTL-BJ0, CTL-RD0 and NO-CTL07 for the period of July to September in 2008 to investigate the factors contributing to the observed aerosol concentration reduction during the Olympic Games.

In general, the modeled results of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  and aerosol species concentrations in the CTL case during the Olympic Games can reproduce the observations, providing the basis of the following sensitivity analysis. During the Olympic period from 8 to 24 August 2008, aerosol species and  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentrations were significantly reduced compared to the concentrations in the other periods from June to August in 2008 and the same period in 2007: at the CMA site,  $\text{SO}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_4$ , BC, and OC decreased by 35% ~ 50%, and at Aoyuncun, Yangfang, Xinglong, and Langfang sites,  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  decreased by about 30% ~ 50%. The model simulations also show that the  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ,  $\text{NH}_4$ ,

### Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



BC, and OC concentrations decreased by about 30 % over Beijing due to emission controls. The reduction of NO<sub>3</sub> and SO<sub>4</sub> is about 40 % and 20 % respectively.

Although the mean aerosol concentrations are lower during the Olympic period, there are still occasional high PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (above 150 μg m<sup>-3</sup>) during the emission control. The meteorological condition is found to be the cause for the fluctuations of aerosol concentrations. Southerly winds are always associated with high concentrations and northeasterly winds with low concentrations. Southerly and southwesterly winds and low precipitation around 26 July and 4–9 August are the reasons for the high concentrations before the Olympic Games, while northeasterly winds on 11–20 August and precipitation around 10 August contribute to the low concentrations during the Olympic period. The sensitivity simulations showed that the pollutant transport from the regions surrounding Beijing determines the fluctuation of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations. The emissions over the surrounding regions contribute more to the variation of Beijing PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations than do the emissions over Beijing. Although emission controls result in a ~30 % reduction of particle concentrations, the air pollutants surrounding Beijing along with the favorable meteorological conditions contribute to the occasional high concentrations during the emission control.

Furthermore, the budget analysis shows that the contribution of emission, transport, dry deposition, and wet deposition are 64.5, -27.9, -30.7, and -10.3 ton day<sup>-1</sup> respectively to the BC burden, resulting in a reduction of -4.2 ton day<sup>-1</sup> in July and August 2008. The budget analysis between the period of 2–10 August and July–August shows that the ventilation effect of transport is weakened by 27.1 ton day<sup>-1</sup>, reflecting that the unfavorable transport is the main reason for the high aerosol concentrations on 2–10 August. On the other side, the budget analysis between the period of 11–19 August and July–August shows that the emission control with favorable transport condition can effectively improve the air quality, particularly for particle matter, over Beijing. This study suggests that the emission control on regional scale is necessary in order to improve the air quality over Beijing.

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



---

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

---

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



There are uncertainties with the emissions used in our model simulations. First, some emission control measures started before 20 July 2008 (M. Wang et al., 2009), and the actual dates of emission control are different from what officially reported. However, in this study we focus our analysis on the period of August 2008 for the importance of meteorological conditions. Since aerosol has a lifetime of a few days in the atmosphere, the uncertainties with the actual dates of emission control will not change our conclusions. Second, there are uncertainties with the emission reductions in Beijing and in the provinces outside Beijing during the full-scale emission control period (i.e., after 20 July 2008). The model simulation in the CTL case has a positive bias during the Olympic period and for the period of July and August as indicated in Table 2 and Fig. 2, which may result from uncertainties in the emission estimations. However, our analysis in Figure 3 depends on the relative difference of emissions used in the CTL and NO-CTL cases, rather than on the absolute emissions in each case (i.e., emission in the CTL case is estimated from that in the NO-CTL case). Likewise, analysis shown in Fig. 5 examines the anomaly of PM concentrations by subtracting the averaged concentration from its daily values for different cases (CTL, CTL-BJ0 and CTL-RD0) rather than the daily values to show the effect of transport on temporal variations of PM concentration in Beijing. For the analysis shown in Fig. 6 we compare the BC budget differences between different time periods. Thus, although the absolute values of aerosol concentrations from each simulation can be impacted by the emission uncertainties, our conclusion regarding the role of meteorological conditions versus emission control in determining the aerosol pollution during the Olympics will not change.

**Supplementary material related to this article is available online at:**

**[http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/11/16655/2011/  
acpd-11-16655-2011-supplement.pdf](http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/11/16655/2011/acpd-11-16655-2011-supplement.pdf)**

*Acknowledgements.* Xiaohong Liu was funded by the US Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program. Meigen Zhang was funded by the National Basic Research Program of China (2007CB407303) and the Knowledge Innovation Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (KZCX2-YW-Q11-04).  
5 The Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is operated for DOE by Battelle Memorial Institute under contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830.

## References

- Ackermann, I. J., Hass, H., Memmesheimer, M., Ebel, A., Binkowski, F. S., and Shankar, U.:  
10 Modal aerosol dynamics model for Europe: Development and first applications, *Atmos. Environ.*, 32, 2981–2999, 1998.
- An, X., Zhu, T., Wang, Z., Li, C., and Wang, Y.: A modeling analysis of a heavy air pollution episode occurred in Beijing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 3103–3114, doi:10.5194/acp-7-3103-2007, 2007.
- Beijing Environmental Bulletin, 1994–2005, Beijing Municipal Environmental Protection Bureau, Beijing, available at: <http://www.bjepb.gov.cn/>, last access: 10 November 2010.
- 15 Binkowski, F. S. and Shankar, U.: The regional particulate matter model, 1. mode description and preliminary results, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 26191–26209, 1995.
- Cermak, J. and Knutti, R.: Beijing Olympics as an aerosol field experiment, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L10806, doi:10.1029/2009GL038572, 2009.
- 20 Chan, C. K. and Yao, X.: Air pollution in mega cities in China, *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 1–42, 2008.
- Diner, D. J., Abdou, W. A., Bruegge, C. J., Conel, J. E., Crean, K. A., Gaitley, B. J., Helmlinger, M. C., Kahn, R. A., Martonchik, J. V., and Pilorz, S. H.: MISR aerosol optical depth retrievals over southern Africa during the SAFARI-2000 dry season campaign, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28, 3127–3130, 2001.
- 25 Dubovik, O. and King, M. D.: A flexible inversion algorithm for retrieval of aerosol optical properties from sun and sky radiance measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105, 20673–20696, 2000.
- Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y. J., King, M. D., Tanré, D., and Slutsker, I.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in worldwide locations, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 59, 590–608, 2002.
- 30 Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Zhang, Y., Saylor, R. D., Chapman, E. G., Laulainen, N.

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

S., Abdul-Razzak, H., Leung, L. R., Bian, X., and Zaveri, R. A.: MIRAGE: Model Description and Evaluation of Aerosols and Trace Gases. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D20210, doi:10.1029/2004JD004571, 2004.

5 Fahey, K. M. and Pandis, S. N.: Optimizing Model Performance: Variable Size Resolution in Cloud Chemistry Modeling, *Atmos. Environ.*, 35, 4471–4478, 2001.

Fast, J. D., Gustafson Jr., W. I., Easter, R. C., Zaveri, R. A., Barnard, J. C., Chapman, E. G., and Grell, G. A.: Evolution of ozone, particulates, and aerosol direct forcing in an urban area using a new fully-coupled meteorology, chemistry, and aerosol model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D21305, doi:10.1029/2005JD006721, 2006.

10 Ghan, S., Laulainen, N., Easter, R., Wagener, R., Nemesure, S., Chapman, E., Zhang, Y., and Leung, R.: Evaluation of aerosol direct radiative forcing in MIRAGE, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 5295–5316, 2001.

Grell, G. A., Peckham, S. E., Schmitz, R., and McKeen, S. A., Frost, G., Skamarock, W. C., and Eder, B.: Fully coupled “online” chemistry within the WRF model, *Atmos. Environ.*, 39, 6957–6976, 2005.

15 Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P. I., and Geron, C.: Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 3181–3210, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3181-2006, 2006.

20 Gustafson, W. I., Chapman, E. G., Ghan, S. J., Easter, R. C., and Fast, J. D.: Impact on modeled cloud characteristics due to simplified treatment of uniform cloud condensation nuclei during NEAQS 2004, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L19809, doi:10.1029/2007GL030021, 2007.

Han, Z. W., Zhang, R. J., Wang, Q. G., Wang, W., Cao, J. J., and Xu, J.: Regional Modeling of Organic Aerosols over China in summertime, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D11202, doi:10.1029/2007JD009436, 2008.

25 Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanr' e, D., Buis, J. P., Stezer, A., Vermote, E., Reagan, Y., Kaufman, U. J., Nakajima, T., Lavenu, F., Jankowiak, I., and Smirnov, A.: AERONETA federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 66, 1–16, 1998.

30 Holben, B. N., Tanré, D., Smirnov, A., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Abuhassan, N., Newcomb, W. W., Schafer, J. S., Chatenet, B., Lavenu, F., Kaufman, Y. J., Vande Castle, J., Setzer, A., Markham, B., Clark, D., Frouin, R., Halthore, R., Karneli, A., O'Neill, N. T., Pietras, C., Pinker, R. T., Voss, K., and Zibordi, G.: An emerging ground-based aerosol climatology:



## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)




[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


- Aerosol optical depth from AERONET, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 12067–12097, 2001.
- Hsu, K., Gao, X., Sorooshian, S., and Gupta, H. V.: Precipitation estimation from remotely sensed information using artificial neural networks, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 36, 1176–1190, 1997.
- Hsu, K., Gupta, H., Gao, X., and Sorooshian, S.: Estimation of physical variables from multi-channel remotely sensed imagery using a neural network: application to rainfall estimation, *Water Resour. Res.*, 35(5), 1605–1618, 1999.
- Huffman, G. J., Adler, R. F., Morrissey, M. M., Bolvin, D. T., Curtis, S., Joyce, R., McGavock, B., and Susskind, J.: Global precipitation at one degree daily resolution from multisatellite observations, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 2, 36–50, 2001.
- Kaufman, Y. J., Tanre, D., Remer, L. A., Vermote, E. F., Chu, A., and Holben, B. N.: Operational remote sensing of tropospheric aerosol over land from EOS moderate resolution imaging spectroradiometer, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 17051–17067, 1997.
- Kulmala, M., Laaksonen, A., and Pirjola, L.: Parameterization for sulphuric acid/water nucleation rates, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 8301–8307, 1998.
- Li, G., Zavala, M., Lei, W., Tsimpidi, A. P., Karydis, V. A., Pandis, S. N., Canagaratna, M. R., and Molina, L. T.: Simulations of organic aerosol concentrations in Mexico City using the WRF-CHEM model during the MCMA-2006/MILAGRO campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3789–3809, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3789-2011, 2011.
- Randerson, J. T., Van der Werf G. R., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., and Kasibhatla, P. S.: Global Fire Emissions Database, Version 2 (GFEDv2. 1), available at: <http://daac.ornl.gov/> (last access: 14 July 2010), Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA, doi:10.3334/ORNLDAAC/849, 2005.
- Schell, B., Ackermann, I. J., Hass, H., Binkowski, F. S., and Ebel, A.: Modeling the formation of secondary organic aerosol within a comprehensive air quality modeling system, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 28275–28293, 2001.
- Shrivastava, M., Fast, J., Easter, R., Gustafson Jr., W. I., Zaveri, R. A., Jimenez, J. L., Saide, P., and Hodzic, A.: Modeling organic aerosols in a megacity: comparison of simple and complex representations of the volatility basis set approach, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 10, 30205–30277, doi:10.5194/acpd-10-30205-2010, 2010.
- Sorooshian, S., Hsu, K., Gao, X., Gupta, H., Imam, B., and Braithwaite, D.: Evaluation of PERSIANN system satellite-based estimates of tropical rainfall., *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 81, 2035–2046, 2000.
- Stockwell, W. R., Middleton, P., Chang, J. S., and Tang, X.: The second generation regional

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)




[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


acid deposition model chemical mechanism for regional air quality modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 95, 16343–16367, 1990.

Streets, D. G., Fu, J. H. S., Jang, C. J., Hao, J. M., He, K. B., Tang, X. Y., Zhang, Y. H., Wang, Z. F., Li, Z. P., Zhang, Q., Wang, L. T., Wang, B. Y., and Yu, C.: Air quality during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41(3), 480–492, 2007.

Tang, Y., Carmichael, G. R., Seinfeld, J. H., Dabdub, D., Weber, R. J., Huebert, B., Clarke, A. D., Guazzotti, S. A., Sodeman, D. A., Prather, K. A., Uno, I., Woo, J.-H., Streets, D. G., Quinn, P. K., Johnson, J. E., Song, C.-H., Sandu, A., Talbot, R. W., and Dibb, J. E.: Three-dimensional simulations of inorganic aerosol distributions in east Asia during spring 2001, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D19S23, doi:10.1029/2003JD004201, 2004.

Wang, M., Zhu, T., Zheng, J., Zhang, R. Y., Zhang, S. Q., Xie, X. X., Han, Y. Q., and Li, Y.: Use of a mobile laboratory to evaluate changes in on-road air pollutants during the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympics, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 8247–8263, doi:10.5194/acp-9-8247-2009, 2009.

Wang, S., Zhao, M., Xing, J., Wu, Y., Zhou, Y., Lei, Y., He, K., Fu, L., and Hao, J.: Quantifying the Air Pollutants Emission Reduction during the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 2490–2496, 2010.

Wang, T. and Xie, S. D.: Assessment of traffic-related air pollution in the urban streets before and during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games traffic control period, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 5682–5690, 2009.

Wang, T., Nie, W., Gao, J., Xue, L. K., Gao, X. M., Wang, X. F., Qiu, J., Poon, C. N., Meinardi, S., Blake, D., Wang, S. L., Ding, A. J., Chai, F. H., Zhang, Q. Z., and Wang, W. X.: Air quality during the 2008 Beijing Olympics: secondary pollutants and regional impact, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7603–7615, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7603-2010, 2010.

Wang, Y., Hao, J., McElroy, M. B., Munger, J. W., Ma, H., Chen, D., and Nielsen, C. P.: Ozone air quality during the 2008 Beijing Olympics: effectiveness of emission restrictions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 5237–5251, doi:10.5194/acp-9-5237-2009, 2009.

Wesley, M. L.: Parameterization of surface resistance to gaseous dry deposition in regional numerical models, *Atmos. Environ.*, 16, 1293–1304, 1989.

Whitby, E. R., McMurry, P. H., Shankar, U., and Binkowski, F. S.: Modal aerosol dynamics modeling, Rep. 600/3-91/020, Atmospheric Research and Exposure Assessment Laboratory, US Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, 1991 (available as NTIS PB91-1617291AS from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA), 1991.

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Xin, J. Y., Wang, Y. S., Tang, G. Q., Wang, L. L., Sun Y., Wang Y. H., Hu B., Song T., Ji, D. S., Wang, W. F., Li, L., and Liu, G. R.: Variability and reduction of atmospheric pollutants in Beijing and its surrounding area during the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, *Chinese Sci. Bull.*, 55, 1937–1944, doi:10.1007/s11434-010-3216-2, 2010.
- 5 Zaveri, R. A. and Peters, L. K.: A new lumped structure photochemical mechanism for large-scale applications, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 30387–30415, 1999.
- Zaveri, R. A., Easter, R. C., Fast, J. D., and Peters, L. K.: Model for simulating aerosol interactions and chemistry (MOSAIC), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D13204, doi:10.1029/2007JD008792, 2008.
- 10 Zhang, Q., Streets, D. G., Carmichael, G. R., He, K. B., Huo, H., Kannari, A., Klimont, Z., Park, I. S., Reddy, S., Fu, J. S., Chen, D., Duan, L., Lei, Y., Wang, L. T., and Yao, Z. L.: Asian emissions in 2006 for the NASA INTEX-B mission, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 5131–5153, doi:10.5194/acp-9-5131-2009, 2009.
- Zhang, Q. H., Zhang, J. P., and Xue, H. W.: The challenge of improving visibility in Beijing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7821–7827, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7821-2010, 2010.
- 15 Zhang, X. Y., Wang, Y. Q., Lin, W. L., Zhang, Y. M., Zhang, X. C., Gong, S., Zhao, P., Yang, Y. Q., Wang, J. Z., and Hou, Q.: Changes of Atmospheric Composition and Optical Properties Over BEIJING-2008 Olympic Monitoring Campaign, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 90, 1633–1651, 2009.
- 20 Zhao, C., Liu, X., Leung, L. R., Johnson, B., McFarlane, S. A., Gustafson Jr., W. I., Fast, J. D., and Easter, R.: The spatial distribution of mineral dust and its shortwave radiative forcing over North Africa: modeling sensitivities to dust emissions and aerosol size treatments, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 8821–8838, doi:10.5194/acp-10-8821-2010, 2010.
- 25 Zhao, C., Liu, X., Ruby Leung, L., and Hagos, S.: Radiative impact of mineral dust on monsoon precipitation variability over West Africa, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 1879–1893, doi:10.5194/acp-11-1879-2011, 2011.

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**Table 1.** Numerical experiments performed in this study.

Experiment	Emission used in the WRF-Chem simulation
CTL	2008 emission with emission controls from 20 July–2 September
CTL-BJ0	2008 emission over Beijing is set to zero and with emission control over the rest of the model domain from 20 July–2 September
CTL-RD0	2008 emission with emission control over Beijing and emission over the rest of model domain is set to zero from 20 July–2 September
NO-CTL	2008 emission without emission control from 20 July–2 September
NO-CTL07	2007 emission from May to September

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

**Table 2.** Statistical analysis of the comparisons between simulated and observed PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) in July and August 2008.

Site name	$N^a$	$C_{\text{OBS}}^b$	$R^c$		MB <sup>d</sup>		NMB <sup>d</sup> (%)		RMSE <sup>e</sup>	
			CTL	NO-CTL	CTL	NO-CTL	CTL	NO-CTL	CTL	NO-CTL
Aoyuncun	58	69.3	0.65	0.62	9.8	38.9	14.2	56.2	38.1	55.6
Yangfang	59	69.4	0.51	0.50	3.3	28.3	4.8	40.8	50.2	58.6
Xinglong	61	57.5	0.61	0.70	5.1	23.0	8.8	40.0	42.8	44.8
Langfang	59	90.3	0.59	0.39	7.2	40.4	8.0	44.8	46.6	68.3

<sup>a</sup>  $N$  is the number of daily samples between observations and model results in July and August.

<sup>b</sup>  $C_{\text{OBS}}$  is the daily value of observations averaged in July and August.

<sup>c</sup>  $R$  is the correlation coefficient between observations and model results of CTL and NO-CTL, respectively.

<sup>d</sup> MB is the mean bias between model results of CTL and NO-CTL and observations, respectively. NMB is the normalized mean bias between model results of CTL and NO-CTL and observations, respectively.

<sup>e</sup> RMSE is the root mean square error between model results of CTL and NO-CTL and observations, respectively.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


**Table 3.** Comparisons of observed and modeled averaged  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentrations ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) during four sub-periods at four sites. The column with numbers in bold denotes the  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration during Beijing Olympic Games (8–24 August).

Site name		1–19 Jul	20 Jul–7 Aug	<b>8–24 Aug</b>	25–31 Aug
Aoyuncun	OBS	70.9	92.4	<b>42.4</b>	68.2
	CTL	92.8	78.0	<b>54.5</b>	112.2
	NO-CTL	92.8	112.9	<b>95.2</b>	159.7
	NO-CTL07	90.1	104.1	<b>73.7</b>	56.4
Yangfang	OBS	66.7	109.6	<b>35.3</b>	48.7
	CTL	86.2	68.8	<b>49.9</b>	107.3
	NO-CTL	86.2	99.0	<b>85.5</b>	149.6
	NO-CTL07	80.2	94.3	<b>58.6</b>	46.8
Xinglong	OBS	48.5	92.6	<b>23.5</b>	64.2
	CTL	74.7	63.2	<b>38.9</b>	81.6
	NO-CTL	74.7	89.6	<b>63.0</b>	111.6
	NO-CTL07	74.7	84.1	<b>65.0</b>	49.3
Langfang	OBS	109.8	117.5	<b>47.2</b>	77.8
	CTL	114.8	94.6	<b>70.2</b>	129.1
	NO-CTL	114.8	135.2	<b>120.4</b>	183.6
	NO-CTL07	96.5	124.0	<b>107.9</b>	81.8

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.


[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[⏪](#)
[⏩](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


**Table 4.** Comparisons of observed and modeled averaged concentrations ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) of aerosol species during five sub-periods at CMA (116.33° E, 39.95° N) site (observations from X.-Y. Zhang et al., 2010). The column with numbers in bold denotes the  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration during Beijing Olympic Games (8–24 August).

Species		June	1–19 Jul	20 Jul–7 Aug	<b>8–24 Aug</b>	25–31 Aug
$\text{SO}_4$	OBS	25.2	19.9	24.0	<b>12.0</b>	
	CTL	16.4	17.4	15.2	<b>9.4</b>	18.6
	NO-CTL	16.4	17.4	19.0	<b>12.7</b>	23.2
$\text{NO}_3$	OBS	20.4	12.4	11.4	<b>7.0</b>	
	CTL	21.6	27.3	22.1	<b>15.5</b>	40.8
	NO-CTL	21.6	27.3	36.8	<b>33.1</b>	64.3
$\text{NH}_4$	OBS	12.7	9.4	11.6	<b>6.6</b>	
	CTL	12.4	14.4	12.1	<b>8.0</b>	18.8
	NO-CTL	12.4	14.4	17.8	<b>14.4</b>	27.4
BC	OBS	6.5	5.0	4.8	<b>3.0</b>	
	CTL	6.8	7.3	5.9	<b>3.8</b>	5.6
	NO-CTL	6.8	7.3	8.5	<b>7.0</b>	8.4
OC	OBS	33.6	24.2	20.7	<b>14.8</b>	
	CTL	10.6	11.0	8.9	<b>5.8</b>	8.9
	NO-CTL	10.6	11.0	12.6	<b>10.3</b>	13.0

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.




**Fig. 1.** Map of (a) the model simulation domain (70° E–150° E, 10° N–55° N) and (b) Beijing (115.42° E–117.50° E, 39.43° N–41.05° N). The blue box in (a) denotes Beijing and is enlarged to the shaded area in (b). The blue triangles in (b) denote four sites in the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Atmospheric Environment Monitoring Network.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)



**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.



**Fig. 2.** Daily  $PM_{2.5}$  from observations and the corresponding WRF-Chem simulations in CTL and NO-CTL cases from 1 July to 31 August at the four sites (Aoyuncun, Yangfang, Xinglong and Langfang).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶


Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion



**Fig. 3.** Spatial distribution of the difference of time-averaged concentration between CTL case and NO-CTL case for **(a)**  $\text{SO}_4$ , **(b)**  $\text{NO}_3$ , **(c)**  $\text{NH}_4$ , **(d)** BC, **(e)** OC, and **(f)**  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  from 20 July to 31 August over Beijing. The color fill is the absolute difference in  $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$  and the red solid contour lines with number are the relative differences in percentage (%).

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions


Y. Gao et al.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


**Fig. 4.** Time series of (a) daily mean and grid averaged horizontal wind speed and direction at the lowest three layers over Beijing and (b) daily mean and grid averaged PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration, daily and grid sum of precipitation rate over Beijing from 1 July to 31 August. Direction of arrows in (a) denotes the direction of horizontal wind and the length of arrows denotes wind speed.

**Emission controls  
versus  
meteorological  
conditions**

Y. Gao et al.



**Fig. 5.** Time series of the anomaly of daily  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  surface concentration in CTL, CTL-BJ0 and CTL-RD0 case from 20 July to 31 August. Anomaly is calculated by subtracting the averaged surface  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  concentration during 20 July–31 August from its daily values.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶


Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Fig. 6.** (a) Budgets in July–August 2008 and (b) budget differences of the period 2 ~ 10 August (red) and 11 ~ 19 August (green) with July–August (blue) for BC over Beijing.  $\Delta$ concentration denotes variation of concentration. The positive value denotes increase to concentration and the negative value denotes decrease to concentration over Beijing. Unit: ton day<sup>-1</sup>.

## Emission controls versus meteorological conditions

Y. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion