**Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics**
Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Evaluating evidence for Cl sources and oxidation chemistry in a coastal, urban environment" *by* C. J. Young et al.

C. J. Young et al.

cora.young@mun.ca

Received and published: 9 September 2013

We thank the Reviewers for their thoughtful comments. Our responses to the comments are below. Changes to the manuscript are indicated.

Anonymous Referee #2 General Comments: This paper, using the VOC ratio approach, attempts to evaluate the role of Cl initialised oxidation in an intermediate NOx environment. Data analysis of the selected hydrocarbon ratios suggests that Cl does not play a role in oxidation, in contrast to previous work reported from the campaign (Young et al., 2012), which used Cl precursor species to assess the impact of this radical. A model, which utilises the master chemical mechanism, has been used to highlight that the formation of secondary radicals, due to the presence of NO, can

mask the impact of Cl when using the VOC ratio method. Although the paper is well written and presented, the manuscript fails to assess the impact of Cl chemistry in this environment as the VOC ratio approach used was inappropriate. The model results, as presented and utilised in the manuscript at the moment, currently have limited applicability to other studies of this type and although the results fall within the scope of ACP science this paper fails to contribute significantly to scientific progress as is. Therefore, I cannot recommend publication before the comments below are addressed.

We believe there has been a mis-communication in or misunderstanding of the ultimate objective of this paper. Our goal was to rigorously evaluate the most commonly used method to assess the importance of Cl oxidation (the VOC tracer ratio method) in an urban environment. As noted by the Reviewer and demonstrated by this paper, the method can be easily misinterpreted when applied to a high-NOx environment. However, we disagree with the Reviewer's assertion that this method has not been used to describe NOx-influenced environments. The peer-reviewed literature contains examples of the use of VOC tracer ratios in NOx-affected environments (e.g. Rudolph et al., 1997; Gorham et al., 2010) that have not considered the potential influence of NOx. Furthermore, this technique is often used as a first-pass filter to determine whether Cl chemistry influences a given environment, including those influenced by NOx. Thus, we feel that an examination of the limitations of this tracer method is useful to the atmospheric chemistry community.

Major Comments: Throughout the paper a sustained OH to Cl ratio of 200 is discussed as a value above which the influence of Cl oxidation on VOC ratios will not be evident. The model used to calculate this value did not contain NOx (condition set 1) but as highlighted in the paper, secondary chemistry occurring in the presence of NO can mask the influence of Cl atoms on oxidation. It is important to know the OH to Cl ratio required to observe the influence of Cl oxidation using the VOC ratio method at typical NOx levels encountered during CalNex (and over the time period Cl was typically enhanced for). I suspect that the ratio required will be a lot lower and, as

such, would not have been observed during CalNex? This raises the question as to why this approach has been applied to this dataset?

The given ratio of 200 is the value required to observe the influence of Cl. The point of this discussion is that the presence of NOx changes the necessary initial OH to Cl ratio. Hence the simulations over a range of NOx levels, including zero NOx. Indeed, the approach was applied to this data set precisely to demonstrate that it does not work well at high NOx.

The authors even state in the introduction that VOC tracer ratios may not be a good measure of the indicators of oxidation where secondary radicals dominate. One could argue that the paper highlights, through the model, that the VOC ratio analysis is inappropriate when assessing the influence of Cl in NOx influenced environments

Indeed, we agree and this is the conclusion we have drawn in the paper.

– but from looking at earlier, related work listed in this paper, it is evident that in NOx influenced environments this analysis isn't really used and instead previous analyses have tended to rely on other indirect techniques to assess the extent of Cl oxidation.

On this point, we disagree with the Reviewer. Please see comments above regarding the prior use of the VOC tracer ratio method in NOx impacted environments.

Previous work by Knipping and Dabdub, (2003) highlights that Cl atom concentrations need to be present within two orders of magnitude of the OH concentrations to play a role in ozone chemistry. Calculations by Young et al. in this paper predict a Cl atom concentration of 2.3 x 10Ë₃ atoms cm-3 (daytime average) and estimate a daytime average for OH of 2 x 10Ë₆ molecule cm-3 which is three orders of magnitude greater. Thus, in agreement with the VOC ratio data in Fig. 2 evidence for Cl oxidation should not be seen using the VOC ratio method.

Yes, this is the purpose of our analysis.

The objectives of the paper are given at the end of the Introduction – I would argue

that this paper, using the approach taken, is unable to adequately achieve objective 5: examining the impact of chlorine on tropospheric chemistry in Los Angeles.

The paper and its predecessor (Young et al., ES&T, 2012) quantify the role of ClNO2 photolysis as a primary radical source. The point of this paper is that secondary OH generated from reactions of Cl obscures the traditional method used to understand the impact of Cl, even though the Cl plays an important role (9% in this case) in generation of primary radicals.

To achieve this, the authors could perhaps look at VOC oxidation products in the model or even O3 production with and without Cl oxidation as the model does not seem to be constrained to O3?

We agree with the Reviewer concerning O3 modeling, which would be very useful in helping to assess the influence of Cl. We have commenced such an effort, but have judged it to be beyond the scope of this manuscript.

Section 3.3: One problem with this analysis is that the impact of NOx on secondary radicals will be dependent upon the total VOC concentration and so (because the [VOC] was fixed) the results from the model have limited applicability to other studies. I suggest that further model simulations where the total [VOC] is varied relative to a fixed NOx concentration could perhaps be more revealing?

We further agree with the Reviewer that the results of this study are limited by the VOC mixture chosen. However, this was limited by the available Cl kinetic and mechanistic data available in the literature. The concentrations chosen do represent those observed in Los Angeles during CalNex. However, even with varied concentrations, the trends observed in this proof-of-concept will be maintained. We have run additional model simulations with varied VOC concentrations. With increased VOC concentrations, secondary OH also increases. This would affect the quantitative impact of NOx, but the qualitative effect remains unchanged. We have added a figure to the SI demonstrating this effect and text in the paper: "These model results describe a single VOC con-

centration. Results are qualitatively similar when concentrations of VOCs are changed (Figure S2)."

Minor Comments: Pzsenny is spelt wrong throughout the manuscript. This has been corrected.

Pg 13668, ln 20: Reference required for stated Cl concentration Text altered to read: "...predicted ambient Cl concentrations are small (<106 atoms cm 3, e.g. (Riedel et al., 2012))..."

Page 13689, Riemer et al., (2008) conclude that Cl chemistry does not compete substantially with oxidation chemistry dominated by OH in Houston which contrasts with the statement in the paper that states that these three indirect methods have shown that Cl may be an important oxidant. We agree with the Reviewer that this could cause confusion. We have removed the reference to Riemer et al. from this statement.

Section 2.1 – the list of measurements is not necessary as these are given in Table 1. Much of the text in the first paragraph of section 2.1 has been removed and now reads: "Ground site measurements used in this analysis are summarized in Table 1."

Page 13691, line 14: 'modestly decrease' – by what percentage? We did not quantify the impact of this effect, but are confident that it will not impact the trends observed (see new Figure S2).

Page 13691: Comment on the impact of underestimating the total VOC concentration in the model on the sensitivity of the VOC tracer ratio. Since, as the Reviewer points out, we have not considered all VOCs in our model, we have added text to clarify this point: "Measurements of methane from the NOAA P-3 aircraft during CalNex showed mixing ratios up to 2.1 ppmv over the Los Angeles Basin (Peischl et al., 2013). In addition, many other VOC species are likely present at low levels, but were not included in this study. Inclusion of a higher methane mixing ratio and additional VOCs would modestly decrease the sensitivity of VOC tracer ratios to the presence of Cl through consumption

C6707

of a slightly larger fraction of these radicals to reaction with species other than the VOC tracers."

Page 13691: Comment on the validity of using the average measured VOC concentrations from just before sunrise to initialise the model – how variable is the VOC concentration? In this proof-of-concept model, our goal was to minimize the number of variables that could affect the data. The model represents ideal conditions for the use of VOC tracer ratios: i.e. no emissions and no transport.

Page 13694, condition set 3b: why not just switch off the ClNO2 photolysis – why is it necessary to produce OH from this? In order to have a single variable change between model runs, we included the formation of OH from ClNO2 photolysis, so the radical source strength and timing would be equivalent in condition sets 3a and 3b. This same text has been added to the paper for clarity.

Page 13694, line 21: NO2 was fixed at 18 ppbv – please justify this value – later you state that the mean NOx concentration was 15.2 ppbv. This has been clarified by revising the text as follows: "For each condition in set 3, NO2 was fixed at 18 ppbv, comparable to the mixing ratio observed in the morning during CalNex...".

Section 3.3: would be useful for the reader to reiterate which model condition set was used in this section – model condition set 2? We have included an additional reference to the model used in the text: "Using this same model simulation (condition set 2)..."

Page 13702, ln 19: '..incorporation of faster-reacting compounds into VOC tracer ratios provides a more sensitive measure of the influence of Cl.' What OH:Cl ratio does the model calculate is necessary to observe the influence of Cl oxidation using these faster reacting compounds? Because the data precision and variability for all the VOCs were similar, the ratio required is the same. However, the time required to detect the change would decrease for a more sensitive set of tracers. Text has been added to describe this point: "...this OH to Cl ratio would have to be sustained for more than one day to be detectable. With a faster-reacting set of VOC tracers, this time period would decrease

C6708

to about half a day."

Figure 4B: Why does the black line which represents the model run at 0 ppt NO2 not overlap with the Cl only reactions? The Master Chemical Mechanism includes formation of OH from RO2 + RO2 reactions. Thus, secondary OH is still formed in the absence of NOx.

Figure S1: Comment on the modelled [O3] being approximately double the observed concentration. The model used here is a proof-of-concept sensitivity study, and we agree that it does not fully reproduce the conditions seen during CalNex. Our intent was to use these simulations to test the sensitivity of an approximation of the CalNex chemical conditions to the inclusion of Cl reaction mechanisms. Constraining the model O3 concentration in these simulations to the observations significantly changes the calculated NOx ratio, due to simplifications in the NOx, VOC and photolysis constraints used, as well as the treatment of the physical removal of O3. As the concentration of NOx is central to the chemistry being tested in these simulations, it was decided that the factor of 2 disagreement between model and measured O3 concentration was satisfactory for this purpose. The likely impact of this over prediction in O3 concentrations is elevated OH production from O1D + H2O, which would act to decrease the apparent effect of Cl chemistry in these simulations and thus not change any of the conclusions of this work. We agree with the Reviewer that the simplified nature and purpose of these simulations may not have been made clear in the original manuscript, and we have modified the text to clarify this point: "The model does not attempt to replicate the complex meteorology or emissions within the Los Angeles Basin, but is instead used to assess the sensitivity of a more realistic VOC and radical precursor mixture to Cl reactions. Despite the approximations made, the model was able to reasonably estimate observed conditions, with the fixed NO2 mixing ratio of 18 ppbv reproducing observed NO mixing ratios to within 20% on average (Figure S1B). The model calculated O3 is approximately a factor of two larger than the observed, likely due to the approximation of NOx emissions to a fixed NO2 mixing ratio, simplifications in the constraining VOCs,

and the use of calculated photolysis rates (Figure S1A). Constraining to the observed O3 mixing ratios would result in a significant change to the modeled NOx ratio and so for the purposes of these sensitivity studies was allowed to vary with the chemistry scheme."

Figure S1 caption: '..calculated using condition set 3..' – is there no observable difference in O3 between condition set 3a or 3b? The caption has been changed to read: "Comparison between concentrations calculated using AtChem with MCM (Condition set 3a) and CalNex measurements. . ."

Table S6: It would be clearer if an absolute [OH] and [Cl] is given in column one, so these values can easily be obtained by the reader. An additional table (Table S7) has been added to provide the absolute concentrations of OH and Cl used in Condition Set 1.

References: Young et al., Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 10965-10973, 2012. Knipping and Dabdub, Environ. Sci. Technol., 37, 275-284, 2003. Riemer et al., J. Atmos. Chem., 61, 227-242, 2008. Sources Cited Alicke, B., Platt, U. and Stutz, J.: Impact of nitrous acid photolysis on the total hydroxyl radical budget during the Limitation of Oxidant Production/Pianura Padana Produzione di Ozono study in Milan, Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 107, 8196, doi: 8110.1029/2000JD000075, 2002.

Gorham, K.A., Blake, N.J., VanCuren, R.A., Fuelberg, H.E., Meinardi, S. and Blake, D.R.: Seasonal and diurnal measurements of carbon monoxide and nonmethane hydrocarbons at Mt. Wilson, California: Indirect evidence of atomic Cl in the Los Angeles basin, Atmos. Environ., 44, 2271-2279, 2010.

Peischl, J., Ryerson, T.B., Brioude, J., Aikin, K.C., Andrews, A.E., Atlas, E., Blake, D., Daube, B.C., de Gouw, J.A., Dlugokencky, E., Frost, G.J., Gentner, D.R., Gilman, J.B., Goldstein, A.H., Harley, R.A., Holloway, J.S., Kofler, J., Kuster, W.C., Lang, P.M., Novelli, P.C., Santoni, G.W., Trainer, M., Wofsy, S.C. and Parrish, D.D.: Quantifying sources

of methane using light alkanes in the Los Angeles basin, California, J. Geophys. Res., doi: 10.1002/jgrd.50413, 2013.

Riedel, T.P., Bertram, T.H., Crisp, T.A., Williams, E.J., Lerner, B.M., Vlasenko, A., Li, S.-M., Gilman, J., de Gouw, J., Bon, D.M., Wagner, N.L., Brown, S.S. and Thornton, J.A.: Nitryl chloride and molecular chlorine in the coastal marine boundary layer, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 10463-10470, 2012.

Rudolph, J., Ramacher, B., Plass-Dulmer, C., Muller, K.-P. and Koppmann, R.: The indirect determination of chlorine atom concentration in the troposphere from changes in the patterns of non-methane hydrocarbons, Tellus, 49B, 592-601, 1997.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 13685, 2013.

C6711

Fig. 1. Relationship between integrated secondary OH and NO2 mixing ratio as a function of VOC concentration (Figure S2).