For a point-by-point response to the reviews, please see what we uploaded to the open discussion. Below is a track-changes version of the manuscript that shows that changes we made in response to the reviews.

New-particle formation, growth and climate-relevant particle production in Egbert, Canada: Analysis from one year of size-distribution observations

J. R. Pierce[1,2], D. M. Westervelt[3], S. A. Atwood[1], E. A. Barnes[1], W. R. Leaitch[4]

[1]{Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA}
[2]{Department of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Dalhousie University~~Colorado State University~~, Halifax~~Fort Collins~~, NS~~CO~~, Canada~~USA~~}
[3]{Program in Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy (STEP), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA}
[4]{Environment Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada}

Correspondence to: J. R. Pierce (jeffrey.pierce@colostate.edu)

Abstract

Aerosol particle nucleation, or new-particle formation, is the dominant contributor to particle number in the atmosphere. However, these particles must grow through condensation of low-volatility vapors without coagulating with the larger, pre-existing particles in order to reach climate-relevant sizes (diameters larger than 50-100 nm), where the particles may affect clouds and radiation. In this paper, we use one year of size-distribution measurements from Egbert, Ontario, Canada to calculate the frequency of regional-scale new-particle formation events, new-particle formation rates, growth rates and the fraction of new particles that survive to reach climate-relevant sizes. Regional-scale new-particle formation events occur~~red~~ on 14-31% of the days (depending on the stringency of the classification criteria), with event frequency peaking in the spring and fall. New-particle formation rates and growth rates are~~ewer~~ similar to those measured at other mid-latitude continental sites. We calculate that roughly half of the climate-relevant particles (with diameters larger than 50-100 nm) at Egbert are formed through new-particle formation events. With the addition of meteorological and SO_2 measurements, we find that new-particle formation at Egbert often occur~~red~~s under synoptic conditions associated with high surface pressure and large-scale subsidence that cause sunny conditions and clean-air flow from the north and west. However, new-particle formation also occurs~~red~~ when air flows~~ came~~ from the polluted regions to the south and southwest of Egbert. The new-particle

formation~~nucleation~~ rates tend to be faster during events under the polluted south/southwest flow conditions.

1. Introduction

Atmospheric aerosols may impact climate directly by scattering and absorbing solar radiation, and indirectly by modifying the albedo and lifetime of clouds (Forster et al., 2007). For both of these effects, aerosol particles with diameters larger than 50-100 nm dominate the climate effects since (1) accumulation-mode (~100-1000 nm particles) tend to dominate the direct scattering/absorption effects in most parts of the atmosphere (Charlson et al., 1992; Seinfeld and Pandis, 2006) and (2) particles larger than about 50-100 nm act as Cloud Condensation Nuclei (CCN), the seeds upon which cloud droplets form (e.g. Dusek et al. (2006); Seinfeld and Pandis (2006)). (The actual lower cutoff diameter for CCN depends on the updraft velocity in the cloud and the composition of the aerosols.)

Aerosol nucleation, the formation of new ~1-nm particles by the aggregation of low-volatility vapor molecules (including sulfuric acid, organics, ammonia and water), is likely the largest contributor to aerosol number in the atmosphere (Kulmala et al., 2004; Pierce and Adams, 2009; Spracklen et al., 2006). When nucleated particles grow to sizes where they are measured in the atmosphere (between 1-10 nm depending on the measurement instruments), the phenomena is generally called new-particle formation to distinguish these measured events from nucleation, which ~~instrumentssomemay be occurring even when not measured by~~ is generally not measured directly. New-particle formation has been observed in a large number of continental boundary-layer (BL) locations, the free troposphere and some marine locations (e.g. Kulmala et al. (2004) and references therein).

While new-particle formation occurs in many regions of the atmosphere and contributes a significant number of particles, these new particles must grow to larger sizes (50-100 nm) in order to have an appreciable e~~a~~ffect on climate. The growth of the new particles occurs primarily through the condensation of sulfuric acid vapor and low-volatility organic vapors (Boy et al., 2005; Kuang et al., 2012; Kulmala et al., 2005; Riipinen et al., 2011, 2012). However, these growing particles may be removed, primarily by coagulation with larger particles, before reaching climate-relevant sizes. The competition between condensational growth and coagulational losses has led to the adoption of the term Survival Probability (SP) for the fraction of newly formed particles that grows to a climate-relevant size without being scavenged through coagulation (Kuang et al., 2009; Pierce and Adams, 2007; Westervelt et al., 2013). In environments with a large source of condensible vapors and a low amount of pre-existing particles, new particles grow quickly (both due to the high production of

condensible vapors and the low sink of condensible vapors to the pre-existing particles) and are lost by coagulation slowly. Under these conditions, the survival probability is high and has been observed to exceed 99% (to 50 nm) in some atmospheric conditions (Westervelt et al., 2013). On the other hand, under conditions with a small source of condensible vapors and a high amount of pre-existing particles, the survival probability is low and has been observed to be less than 1% under these conditions (Westervelt et al., 2013). In order to understand how ~~nucleation and~~ new-particle formation contributes to climate-relevant aerosol concentrations, both new-particle formation rates and survival probabilities must be understood in different atmospheric regions and under varying conditions.

New-particle formation may occur over relatively small spatial scales (kilometers or smaller) in plumes from individual sources or clumps of sources (e.g. an urban plume) (Junkermann et al., 2011; Lonsdale et al., 2012; Stevens and Pierce, 2013; Stevens et al., 2012; Yu, 2010), or it may occur more homogeneously over relatively large spatial scales (100s of kilometers) when a synoptic air mass is relatively homogeneous for both aerosols/gases and meteorology (Jeong et al., 2010). For regional-scale ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation, ~~new-particle~~ formation and growth rates may be calculated from the timeseries of aerosol size-distribution measurements at stationary sites (Dal Maso et al., 2005). This is done by observing how the number of particles at the smallest ~~observed~~ sizes changes with time and by tracking~~ingobserv~~ the growth in the diameter of these particles. These properties can be calculated only when the air mass is relatively homogeneous. In air masses that have aerosol size distributions that vary spatially, aerosol size distributions will change due to advection. If the air mass is assumed to be homogeneous~~constant~~ in cases where it is not, there may be apparent appearances, disappearances, growth or shrinking of particles that are not due to physical new-particle formation and growth. In these inhomogeneous cases, particles formed via new-particle formation are still observed by stationary measurement sites, but the air-mass properties change too quickly to determine the formation and growth rates.

Recent studies have used observations of regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth to determine the survival probability of particles at various measurement sites (Kuang et al., 2009; Westervelt et al., 2013). These studies show~~ed~~ that if the air mass over a measurement site is homogeneous for long enough, the growth of new particles to climate-relevant sizes may be explicitly tracked. These direct observations of new-particle formation rates, growth rates and new-particle survival probability are essential for testing the ability of aerosol microphysics models to correctly predict the sources of CCN and other climate-relevant particles in the atmosphere. Westervelt et al. (2013) used the observed values from five locations to test multiple nucleation schemes in the

GEOS-Chem-TOMAS global chemical transport model with online aerosol microphysics, and the model generally reproduces ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth frequency and rates at these locations. Additionally, Kerminen et al. (2012) calculated the contribution of new-particle formation to CCN concentrations at four locations by looking at the change in CCN concentrations before and after the growing nucleation mode reached a CCN size threshold. Thus, they were able to calculate the CCN contribution without using growth rates and survival probabilities.

Given that these recent studies have quantified the contribution of regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation events to the production of climate-relevant particles in several locations, it is useful to understand the factors that contribute to the occurrence of regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation events in order to further test model predictions. Previous studies demonstrate~~have shown~~ that more intense solar radiation (which ~~can~~ enhances photochemistry), high concentrations of precursor species of low-volatility condensible material (e.g. SO_2 and biogenic volatile organic compounds), and low concentrations of pre-existing aerosols (i.e. a low condensation and coagulation sink) all create favorable conditions for regional new-particle formation and growth (Donahue et al., 2011; Kulmala et al., 2005; Pierce et al., 2011, 2012; Sihto et al., 2006). Thus, measurement sites that can provide statistics on ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation rates, growth rates, survival probabilities along with information on the factors that contribute to ~~nucleation~~new-particle-formation/growth events will provide a basis for testing fundamental physical and chemical processes in aerosol models.

In this study, we use one year of size-distribution measurements (May 2007 – May 2008) to determine statistics on regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation, growth and survival probability to climate-relevant sizes at Egbert, Ontario, Canada. Additionally, we look at the environmental factors that control the occurrence of these events at this location. Egbert generally experiences remote continental air when air masses move from the north and generally more polluted when air masses move from the south (Rupakheti et al., 2005); thus, like many mid-latitude continental locations, Egbert experiences a mixture of natural and anthropogenic influences (Slowik et al., 2010). ~~Nucleation~~New-particle formation at Egbert was explored for a 3-week period with 4 other Ontario sites (Jeong et al., 2010), and ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation at Egbert for a~~the~~ full year ~~tested here~~ was investigated for coherence with ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation with a site in Indiana, US (Crippa and Pryor, 2013), but neither of these studies presented comprehensive statistics on ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation, growth and the contribution to climate-relevant particles.

In the following section, we describe the methods for our analysis. In section 3, we present our

results, including the statistics of ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation, growth and survival probability at Egbert as well as an analysis of the meteorological and chemical factors associated with the ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth events. The conclusions are in section 4.

2. Methods

2.1. Location

The measurements ~~duse~~in this paper were taken from 3 May 2007 until 15 May 2008 at the Center for Atmospheric Research Experiments (CARE) in Egbert, Ontario, Canada (44.23 °N, 79.78 °W; 251 m a.s.l) operated by Environment Canada. ~~During the 2007-2008 period above, additional aerosol and gas measurements were taken, and these will be described in the following subsection.~~ Egbert is located ~70 miles north of Toronto. While the region close to Egbert is a mixture of forests and farmland, Toronto and the southern Ontario region has ~8 million people. Thus, when winds are from the south, Egbert is influenced by the outflow from the densely populated southern Ontario region as well as the US northeast. When winds are from the north, the air generally has little recent anthropogenic influence (an exception is industry in the isolated city of Sudbury ~300 km to the north) and may have significant biogenic influence during the spring, summer and early fall (Slowik et al., 2010).

2.2. Instrumentation

The base meteorological measurements at the Egbert site includ~~ed~~ pressure, temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and direction (using a R.M. Young Model 05103 Wind Monitor) and solar irradiance. During ~~the period studied in this paper~~2007 to 2008, the ambient aerosol number size distribution was measured with a Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer (SMPS) system comprised of a TSI 3071 Electrostatic Classifier and a TSI 3010 Condensation Particle Counter (UCPC), which measured the size distribution from 10– 420 nm with a time resolution of about 5 minutes. Flows were calibrated with Gilibrator and sizing was checked several times during the year with nearly monodisperse particles generated from a separate Electrostatic Classifier as well as with particles of polystyrene latex. Additional details of the SMPS system are discussed in Riipinen et al. (2011). SO_2 measurements were made with a TECO 43-S Sulfur Dioxide Monitor. Calibrations were done using a NIST traceable SO_2 gas source and a dilution system. The detection limit was 200 pptv for the 15-minute averages that we use here.

2.3. New-particle formation, growth and survival probability analysis

2.3.1 Event classification

We classify new-particle formation events each day using the event classification routine of Dal Maso et al. (2005), and a brief description of this classification follows. A total number of 327 days are~~were~~ analyzed, which is fewer than the total number of days (370) because we ~~did not consider~~exclude days that d~~o~~id not have SMPS measurements for at least 75% of the day's duration (the sample time resolution is ~5 minutes). We classify e~~E~~ach ~~analyzed~~ day ~~is classified~~ as either a new-particle-formation event day or a non-event day. To be considered a new-particle-formation event day a distinct mode of particles with diameters smaller than 20 nm must appear during the day (regardless of the time at which it appears). This classification (and the event classification described below) is~~was~~ done visually and subjectively as ~~done~~ in Dal Maso et al. (2005).

For days that are considered new-particle formation days, we classify events as class ~~1a~~I, class II~~1b~~ and undefined~~class 2~~ event days, also following Dal Maso et al. (2005) ~~with the exception that our class 2 events encompass both the class 2 events and the "undefined" events in Dal Maso et al. (2005) as there was a strong continuum between these two event types in the Egbert data (most of the focus of this paper will be on the class 1a and 1b events that may be regional events)~~. However, we do not sub-classify I events to Ia and Ib events as in Dal Maso et al. (2005) as the nucleation mode is generally always distinguishable from the background distribution (Ia events in Dal Maso et al. (2005)). Examples of each class are given in Figure 1; however, even within event classes, there is significant variability between event days in terms of observed behavior.

Class ~~1a~~I days (e.g. Figure 1a) exhibit new-particle formation and an obvious, traceable growth of the nucleation mode to at least 50 nm before the nucleation mode disappears. Class ~~1a~~I days are most likely widespread, regional new-particle formation events with a relatively homogeneous air mass advecting over the Egbert measurement site. The example in Figure I shows an air mass that is not completely homogeneous as the growth in the nucleation mode is not smooth. However, we are still able to retrieve formation and growth rates on these days.

Class II~~1b~~ days (e.g. Figure 1b) exhibit new-particle formation and some growth (in some cases to over 50 nm); however, we do not trust the ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation, growth and survival probability statistics on class II~~1b~~ days to the same degree as class ~~1a~~I events due to a variety of factors.~~, which include~~ These factors include possible changes in the air mass during the growth, shrinking after the growth (which may be a sign of a plume event), or it not being clear if the growing

particles are the same particles as the newly formed particles (as is the case in Figure 1b). Class II~~1b~~ events may be regional in nature, but the air mass is~~was~~ not homogeneous enough to clearly track ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth from the stationary Egbert site.

Undefined~~Class 2~~ events (e.g. Figure 2) exhibit particles ~~being~~ measured at the smallest sizes of the SMPS, and there is either no growth or there is growth followed by shrinking (as is the case in Figure 1c). These events may be particles that nucleate~~d~~ across spatial scales smaller than regional-scale events, such as point-source or urban plumes, or they may be regional events in a relatively inhomogeneous or changing airmass. They may also be small primary particles from nearby sources. C~~In c~~ases where particles appear to grow and then shrink~~, these~~ may indicate plume nucleation events where the direction of the wind changes with time~~ such that~~ T~~t~~he smallest particles are observed when the edges of the plume are over the measurement site, and the larger new particles are observed when the center of the plume is over the measurement site. Larger new particles (particles that nucleate~~d~~ closer to the source and have ~~had~~ more time to grow) are observed in the middle of plumes with more-recently nucleated particles towards the edges (Stevens et al., 2012).

2.3.2 New-particle formation and growth rates

The details of the calculation of new-particle formation and growth rates are discussed in detail in Westervelt et al. (2013) and Kulmala et al. (2012), but we ~~will~~ briefly summarize them here. The rate of new-10nm-particle formation (J10) is calculated from the time-dependent change in the nucleation-mode (defined here as 10-25 nm) concentrations from the SMPS. We correct these formation rates for the coagulational loss rate of these particles and the loss of particles by condensational growth to sizes larger than 25 nm. The correction for these coagulational and condensational losses increases the~~our~~ calculated J10 from the uncorrected values. We implicitly assume that all particles entering the 10-25 nm size range are from new-particle formation during class ~~1a~~I and II~~1b~~ events and not from primary emissions. In this paper, we present J10 values as both the mean J10 during the period where new-particle formation is~~was~~ occurring ~~(typically 2-4 hours)~~ as well as 24-hour mean values to normalize the total particle production between short and long events.

The particle diameter growth rates (GR) are calculated by tracking the change in the diameter of the peak value of the aerosol size distribution for the growing nucleation mode between 10 and 25 nm. We use a linear fit of the peak diameter (defined by maximum concentration) over time to estimate the mean growth rate during the observable growth period. When able, we also calculate the mean growth rate between 25 and 50 nm and between 25 and 100 nm using the same technique. Each of these

growth rates is used for calculating the survival probability to 50 and 100 nm (described next). Growth-rate statistics are presented for the 10-25 nm size range.

2.3.3 Survival probability and climate-relevant particle formation rates

We calculate the survival probabilities to 50 and 100 nm (SP50 and SP100, respectively) by using the Probability of Ultrafine Growth (PUG) model (Pierce and Adams, 2007). These 50 and 100 nm cutoffs are used as proxies for CCN cutoffs; however, CCN cutoffs also vary as a result of aerosol composition (e.g. Paramonov et al., (2013)). The application of the PUG model to SMPS measurements is described in detail in Westervelt et al. (2013). The PUG model calculates the SPs using the mean GRs described above and the coagulation sink of the growing particles to larger, pre-existing particles. The coagulation sink represents the first-order loss rate of the growing particles by coagulation, and we calculate it using the measured SMPS size distributions and Brownian coagulation theory (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2006). The PUG model calculates the survival probability over small, incremental steps of growth (~2 nm for 10-nm particles and ~10 nm for 100 nm particles; these are the bin spacings of the SMPS) by calculating how many particles will be lost by coagulation in the time it takes the particles to grow by the incremental amount. For each growth step, the coagulation sink is recalculated. The overall survival probabilities to 50 or 100 nm are calculated as the products of the probabilities of surviving each incremental step.

We calculate the formation rates of climate-relevant particles (J50 and J100) as the product of the J10 with SP50 (for J50) and J10 with SP100 (for J100). We present J50 and J100 as 24-hour-mean values rather than the event-mean values to represent the mean climate-relevant particle production rates on event days. These values are used to estimate the total contribution of regional-scale new-particle formation events to 50 and 100 nm particle concentrations.

2.4. Reanalysis meteorology and back trajectories

W~~For investigating the large-scale meteorology on event days, w~~e use the NCEP/NCAR Reanalysis (Kalnay et al., 1996) to investigate the large-scale meteorology on event days. ~~We use the 500 hPa geopotential heights, surface pressures and large-scale vertical velocities (omega) in the archives that are closest to the time of the new-particle formation events.~~Specifically, we analyze the fields of 500 hPa geopotential heights, surface pressures and large-scale vertical velocities (omega) at time-steps that are closest to the time of the new-particle formation events.

In order to assess the meteorological conditions and source regions associated with air masses

arriving at Egbert, we utilize back trajectory analysis. The NOAA HYSPLIT Lagrangian trajectory model (Draxler, 1999; Draxler and Hess, 1997, 1998) is run using the GDAS 1°x1° meteorological dataset supplied by the NOAA Air Resources Laboratory. Back trajectories are shown for 24-hours prior to their arrival at 100 m above ground level at Egbert. We generate eight trajectories per day with the trajectory arriving closest to the period of interest (e.g. the middle of a new-particle formation event) selected as characteristic of surface level transport at that time. ~~We examined additional arrival heights~~Note that we also examined other arrival heights, but these were found to be similar to the 100 m heights for trajectories arriving within the boundary layer (0 m, 500 m) and not characteristic of transport to the surface for arrival heights above the typical boundary layer (1500 m).

3. Results

Figure 2 shows the fraction of days in each month that exhibited class ~~1a~~I, ~~1b~~II, undefined~~2~~ events and non-events. Each month provides~~d~~had at least 22 days with sufficient SMPS data ~~to be used in the~~for this analysis (10 months had at least 26). The potentially regional new-particle formation classes, I~~1a~~ (observable and quantifiable growth of new particles) and II~~1b~~ (similar to I~~1a~~ but less confidence in quantification), exhibit~~show a~~ bimodal seasonal cycle with peaks in the spring and the fall. Either class I~~1a~~ or ~~1b~~II events occur~~red~~ on about half of the days during the peak seasons and only about 20% of the days during summer and winter (except January where there was only one ~~1b~~II event and no ~~1a~~I events). Most of the ~~1a~~class I+~~1b~~II seasonality is driven by the seasonality of the ~~1a~~class I events. The winter minimum in ~~1a~~class I and ~~1b~~II event frequency may be due to a low source of biological volatile organic compounds (BVOCs), precursors for secondary organic aerosols that may be involved in new-particle formation and growth (Riipinen et al., 2011, 2012) as well as lower solar radiation, during cold months. Unfortunately, we do not have measurements of BVOCs or aerosol organics throughout this full time period. The summer minimum may be due to the minimum monthly mean SO_2 mixing ratios occurring during July and August. Monthly mean SO_2 mixing ratios are~~were~~ 0.6-0.7 ppbv during these summer months and 1-2 ppbv during the other months. Additionally, a proxy we use for H_2SO_4 concentrations (described in section 3.2) also has a minimum during the summer. We go into more detail regarding these factors and the occurrence of new-particle formation events in section 3.2.

~~Class 2~~Undefined events (no quantifiable growth after new-particle detection), which may be plume-scale formation events or plumes of ultrafine primary emissions, tend~~ed~~ to be most frequent during the winter. Up to 80% of the days during the winter and ~35% of days during the summer ~~we~~are ~~class 2~~undefined days. As some ~~class 2~~undefined events occur on days where class ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II

events also occurred (but these events are ignored here), this may be an upper bound of the season cycleseason cycle may not be this strong because there may be class 2undefined events hidden in class Ia and IbII event days. Regardless, the number of non-event days peakwere highest during the summer (nearly 40% of days during July), which may be related to the low SO_2 mixing ratios and H_2SO_4 proxy during the summer as mentioned earlier.

3.1. Particle formation rates, growth rates and CCN formation

Figure 3 shows cumulative distribution functions for J10, GR, SP50, SP100, J50 and J100 for the full year of measurements. The medians and means for these distributions as well as the total number of days in each event class are shown in Table 1. J10 and GR statistics are presented for class Ia days as well as the sum of class Ia and IbII days (we have less confidence in these value statistics due to the inclusion of class IbII days). We present survival probability, J50 and J100 statistics only for class Ia days as most class IbII days doid not have measuredexhibit growth to at least 50 nm. For J10, we present both the new-particle formation rate averaged over the period where new-particle formation was observed (usually 2-4 hours) as well as the 24-hour average rate over the day (which leads to values generally 5-10x lower than the values during the event period). J50 and J100 values are the 24-hour average values. The 24-hour average values are useful in that the total daily and annual production rates may be calculated from these values without needing to know the duration of each event.

The event-mean J10 values on class Ia days ranged from under 0.1 cm^{-3} s^{-1} to about 10 cm^{-3} s^{-1} with a mean of 0.84 cm^{-3} s^{-1} and median of 0.64 cm^{-3} s^{-1}. These values are about 25-50% lower when class IbII days are also included, due to class IbII days having somewhat lower particle formation rates in general. As stated above, the 24-h mean J10 values are 5-10x lower than the event-mean values. For Iaclass I days, the annual mean and median values of the 24-hour mean formation rates and median values arewere 0.13 and 0.12 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, respectively. Thesse mean, median and data range o valuesf are consistent with the range of values given for non-urban continental sites in the review paper by Kulmala et al. (2004). Westervelt et al. (2013) presented 24-hour-mean new-particle formation rate statistics at 3 nm (J3) for 5 locations (Pittsburgh, Hyytiälä, Atlanta, St. Louis and the Po Valley) and find that t. The observed annual means for the 24-hour J3s at these locations ranged from 0.58 to 8.7 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, and the annual medians ranged from 0.09 to 0.55 cm^{-3} s^{-1}. These J3 values are generally larger than the J10 values derived here for Egbert; however, J10 values include the loss of particles by coagulation as the particles grow between 3 and 10 nm, which cause J10 values to be lower than J3.

We estimate the mean survival probability between 3 nm and 10 nm to be ~0.25 for the Egbert study, which gives us estimated mean/median J3s of about 0.5 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, in line with the estimates of Westervelt et al. (2013).

Diameter GRs rangeđ from less than 0.5 to about 10 nm hr^{-1} and arewere similar on class 1aI and 1bII days. The mean GR iswas 3.1 nm hr^{-1} and the median iswas 2.2 nm hr^{-1}. Again, these mean, median and range of values are consistent with range of values presented for non-urban continental sites in Kulmala et al. (2004). Thcise mean and median values are at the low end of the range inas those analyzed by Westervelt et al. (2013) at the 5 locations. At these locations, GRs means rangeđ from 2.8 to 6.9 nm hr^{-1} and medians rangeđ from 2.4 to 5.8 nm hr^{-1}. The SP50 values at Egbert rangeđ from 1% to close to 100% depending on the event. This range along with the median and medians also are consistent with the 5 locations analyzed in Westervelt et al. (2013). However, and the SP100 values at Egbert, which rangeđ from 0.3% to over 90% with a mean and median of 19% and 7% (the mean is higher than the median due to 2 high outliers, see Figure 3) were higher than the 5 sites in Westervelt et al. (2013) (means and medians all between 1.7% and 4.4%). Part of this higher SP100 in this study may be due to having a starting diameter of 10 nm in this study versus 3 nm in Westervelt et al. (2013); however, if this were the case, we would also expect to see higher survival probabilities of growth to 50 nm in this study (compared to Westervelt et al. (2013)). Additionally, in this study we follow the growing nucleation mode beyond midnight when calculating the survival probabilities, whereas in Westervelt et al. (2013) if the nucleation mode did not make it to 50 or 100 nm by midnight, it was not included in the SP analysis. It is not obvious if/how this procedural difference would bias the results. Finally, it is possible that the SP100 at Egbert was actually higher than at the 5 sites examined in Westervelt et al. (2013).

JWe calculate J50 is calculated as the product of J10 and SP50 for each class 1aI event. The J50 values rangeđ from 0.001 to about 0.2 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, averaged over the full 24 hours of each 1aclass Ievent day. The mean and median values arewere 0.039 and 0.029 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, respectively, and liewere within the range found at the 5 sites in Westervelt et al. (2013). Similarly, J100 is calculated as the product of J10 and SP100 for each class 1aI event. The J100 values rangeđ from 0.001 to about 0.2 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, averaged over the full 24 hours of each 1aI-event day. The mean and median values awere 0.022 and 0.009 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, respectively. These values awere larger than 4 of the 5 sites in Westervelt et al. (2013) (the polluted Po Valley, Italy site is the exception) due to the larger SP100 values at Egbert. The median formation rates correspond to about 2500 cm^{-3} new N50 cm^{-3} and 790 cm^{-3} new N100 cm^{-3} on each event day. Compared to the four sites examined in Kerminen et al. (2012), our Egbert

climate-relevant particle formation amounts are similar to the ~~the~~ amounts at Botsalano, South Africa site but are larger than the rates at the three other sites, which are located in northern Europe. However, Kerminen et al. (2012) use~~s~~ a different technique for calculating the contribution of new-particle formation to climate-relevant sizes~~.~~ ~~and this~~which may lead to some differences.

One~~We~~ can use the J50 and J100 values to estimate the contribution of regional new-particle formation events to the number of climate-relevant particles in the region near Egbert. The formula that we use is as follows.

$$\overline{N50_{NPF}} = \frac{\overline{J50} \cdot f_{1a} \cdot L50}{BL_{rise}} \quad (1)$$

Where $\overline{N50_{NPF}}$ is the annual-mean concentration of particles larger than 50 nm due to regional-scale NPF at Egbert, $\overline{J50}$ is the mean formation rate of 50-nm particles on class ~~1a~~I event days (0.039 cm^{-3} s^{-1}), f_{1a} is the fraction of analyzed days that are class ~~1a~~I event day (44/327=0.135), L50 is the lifetime of particles larger than 50 nm in the boundary layer near Egbert, and BL_{rise} is the ratio of the boundary layer height when the nucleation mode reaches 50 nm to that when it reached 10 nm. Croft et al. (2013) show~~s~~ that the lifetime of CCN-sized particles in the boundary layer in the mid-latitudes is around 2-4 days, so we ~~will~~ use a value of 3 days. Aircraft measurements of boundary-layer properties near Egbert show that the BLH increases from late morning (when the nucleation mode generally reaches 10 nm) to mid afternoon (when the nucleation mode generally reaches 50 nm) by about a factor of 2, so we set~~will use a~~ BL_{rise} ~~=value~~ 2. With these assumptions, we calculate a $\overline{N50_{NPF}}$ of 682 cm^{-3}. The mean measured N50 throughout the entire time period was 1686 cm^{-3}. This means that about 40% of the N50 in the region around Egbert are formed from regional-scale boundary-layer new-particle-formation events. However, there are uncertainties in L50 and BL_{rise}. Thus, the 40% contribution calculated here could easily be 20% or 60% within the range of uncertainties of these assumptions. Regardless, it is clear the new-particle formation contributes to a significant portion of the climate-relevant particles near Egbert.

We repeat the calculation to estimate $\overline{N100_{NPF}}$ from J100. If we assume that L100 is the same as L50 and that BL_{rise} is the same as the previous calculation, $\overline{N100_{NPF}}$ is 395 cm^{-3}. The mean measured N100 throughout the entire time period is~~was~~ 710 cm^{-3}. Our estimate of regional-scale boundary-layer new-particle formation to N100 is thus 56%. This estimate is larger than our predicted contribution of regional-scale boundary-layer new-particle formation to N50 (40%). Primary emissions tend to ~~will~~ contribute to a larger fraction of the particles with increasing size, so this~~our~~ result is not physically consistent. There are three reasons why our $\overline{N100_{NPF}}$ calculation may be too high relative to our

$\overline{N50}_{NPF}$ calculation: (1) The lifetime of 100-nm particles is likely shorter than 50-nm particles as 100-nm particles will act as CCN in a larger fraction of clouds, and thus 100-nm particles are more susceptible to wet deposition. (2) The boundary layer may ~~have~~ grow~~n~~ in depth between the time the nucleation mode reache~~s~~d 50 nm and when it reached 100 nm. (3) The 2 highest SP100 days shift the mean SP100 (19%) significantly above the median (7%). If we had a larger sample of event days, it is possible that the mean would be closer to the median, and the fractional contribution of new-particle formation to 100nm particles would be lower than the fractional contribution of new-particle formation to 50nm particles.

These estimated contributions of new-particle formation to CCN-sized particles (40-56%) ~~s~~are similar to the global boundary-layer contribution of new-particle formation to CCN-sized particles estimated in the modelling study by Merikanto et al. (2009); however, they show~~found~~ that much of this contribution is~~was~~ due to new-particle formation in the free troposphere (with subsequent subsidence into the boundary layer) rather than boundary-layer new-particle formation.

3.2. Conditions during new-particle formation events

Figure 4 shows box-whisker plots for the atmospheric conditions on each type of event and non-event day. For event days, the values for each variable are taken as the mean value between the start and end of new-particle formation (the period where new particles are arriving at diameters of ~10 nm). For non-event days, the values for each variable are taken from the mean time of day for class I new-particle formation events (approximately 11:00-16:00 local standard time)~~he 24-hour mean of the day~~ since there is no new-particle-formation event time to draw upon. We display the statistical significance of differences between the distributions of each event class using the Mann-Whitney U test. Although not shown on the plots, the distributions for class ~~1a~~I days are statistically different from non-event days to at least the 9~~7~~8% level for all factors except for temperature (81%) and condensation sink (~~76~~89%).

Solar radiation drives photochemistry and thus the oxidation of SO_2 to form condensible H_2SO_4 and volatile organic compounds to form condensible organic species. Previous studies (e.g. Petäjä et al. (2009)) have shown that new-particle formation events are~~to be~~ strongly correlated with solar radiation. Solar radiation on class ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II days ~~we~~are significantly higher than ~~class 2~~undefined and non-event days. All ~~1a~~class I events occur between 7 AM and 7 PM local standard time, and all but 2 (out of 57) ~~1b~~II events occur during this time window (not shown). On the other hand 15 (out of 164) ~~class 2~~undefined events occur outside of this window (not shown)~~, and~~ (the non-event solar

radiation stats are taken from ~11:00-16:00 the mean event time period for I events)~~24-hour averaged~~. These time-of-day differences explain part of the differences in solar radiation; however, differences in large-scale meteorology (and their effects on cloud cover) between event days a~~we~~re likely important too, as will be shown shortly. Class ~~1a~~I days have higher solar radiation than class ~~1b~~II days, on average~~, though the statistical difference is just short of being significant to the 95% level (94.7%)~~. Thus, similar to the previous studies, the amount of solar radiation likely plays a role in initiating clearly defined regional-scale new-particle formation events, and nighttime chemistry appears to be less important as ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II events generally do not occur during dark hours.

While some nucleation theories (e.g. Vehkamäki et al. (2002)) predict increasing~~ed~~ nucleation rates with relative humidity, the data (as well as other observations, e.g. (Hamed et al., 2011)) show a general anti-correlation between ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and relative humidity (relative humidity generally increases moving from class ~~1a~~I to ~~1b~~II to undefined~~2~~ to non-events). This increase in relative humidity is likely not causally linked to the likelihood of regional-scale new-particle formation events, but rather (1) clouds are more likely when the relative humidity is higher, (2) the relative humidity is generally higher at night~~ events and the non-events higher)class 2 (and would bias~~, and (3) the condensation sink generally increases with relative humidity due to aerosol water uptake. While the difference in relative humidity between class ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II events with ~~class 2~~undefined events and non-events is statistically significant, the difference between the ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II events is not.

Temperature anomalies (difference of the event-time temperature from the 4-week running mean) a~~we~~re mostly positive for class ~~1a~~I days (75% of the events) and the data show a decreasing trend moving from class ~~1a~~I to class~~1b~~ II to undefined~~2~~ ~~to non-~~events; however, the difference between successive classes are not significant to the 95% level. ~~(~~Alt~~t~~hough the difference between class ~~1a~~I events ~~class 2~~undefined events~~ or non-events~~ is significant; however, some of these differences may be due to differences in event time of day~~)~~. The cause of the higher mean/median temperature anomaly on class ~~1a~~I days may be due to clear skies from large-scale meteorology and is consistent with the solar-radiation and relative humidity statistics (as will be discussed in the next subsection).

Surface pressure anomalies (also the difference of the event-time pressure from the 4-week running mean) also are~~were~~ mostly positive for class ~~1a~~I days (75% of the events) with decreasing values moving from class ~~1a~~I to ~~1b~~II to~~ 2~~ undefined to non-events. Differences between class ~~1a~~I and class ~~1b~~II events are not statistically significant, whereas the differences between these event classes with ~~class 2~~undefined and non-event days are statistically significant. The positive surface pressure anomaly for ~75% of the class ~~1a~~I and slightly less than 75% of the class ~~1b~~II events shows that

large-scale synoptic meteorology may have played a role in driving many of the regional-scale new-particle formation events. Surface highs in the mid-latitudes are associated with large-scale subsidence in the free troposphere, clear skies and lower-than-normal relative humidities. We will look regionally at differences in large-scale meteorology in the next subsection.

The condensation sink is the rate constant for condensation of a non-volatile condensible species from the vapor phase to the particle phase. Lower condensation sinks favor new-particle formation and growth because concentrations of condensible species may build up and lead to faster ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth rates. This has been observed in previous studies (e.g. Petäjä et al. (2009); Sihto et al. (2006)). However, we find that class ~~1a~~I event days ha~~d~~ve, on average, the highest condensation sinks. The condensation sinks on class ~~1a~~I days a~~re~~were ~~significantly~~ higher than class II~~1a~~ days (though only at the 73% significance level) and significantly higher than undefined~~1b~~ days (though not significantly higher than non-event days). This means that on the days most likely to have regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth at Egbert, the condensation sink is~~was~~ higher ~~than on~~compared to other days. A higher condensation sink must be offset by a high~~er~~ production rate of low-volatility condensible material (e.g. H_2SO_4 and low-volatility organics) to create favorable conditions for new-particle formation and growth. As we discuss in the next subsection, the high condensation-sink days generally occur~~red~~s when air arrive~~d~~s from the heavily populated region to the south of Egbert.

The concentrations of SO_2, the precursor to condensible H_2SO_4 vapor, a~~re~~were highest on average on class ~~1a~~I event days followed by class ~~1b~~II, ~~class 2~~undefined and non-event days. Class ~~1a~~I days a~~re~~were not significantly higher (only 88.6% significant) than class ~~1b~~II days, but they a~~re~~were significantly higher than ~~class 2~~undefined and non-event days. ~~Class 2~~Undefined event days however, ha~~d~~ve ~~54~~ high-concentration outliers that ~~were higher than~~exceed all of the class ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II ~~points~~measurements. These class-2-event results may be indicative of plume-scale ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation in a coal-fired power-plant some other sulfur-rich plume (Junkermann et al., 2011; Lonsdale et al., 2012; Stevens et al., 2012; Yu, 2010). In the next subsection, we will show that the higher SO_2 days generally occur when air arrives from the heavily populated region to the south of Egbert, similar to the condensation sink.

Finally, we use a proxy for H_2SO_4 concentration (Petäjä et al., 2009; Rohrer and Berresheim, 2006; Weber et al., 1997) to determine if H_2SO_4 concentrations a~~re~~were higher during regional ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation events than during other days. The proxy we use is:

$$[H_2SO_4] \propto \frac{SR \cdot [SO_2]}{CS} \quad (2)$$

Where *SR* is the solar radiation and *CS* is the condensation sink. ~~Note, we have plotted this proxy on log scale due to the wide range of values.~~Note, this proxy is plotted on a log scale. Although the condensation sink ~~i~~was highest on average for class ~~1a~~I events, the H_2SO_4 proxy ~~was~~is highest on average for class ~~1a~~I days because both SR and SO_2~~cs~~ a~~we~~re highest on average for these days. The distribution of the H_2SO_4 proxy on the I days is ~~not~~ significantly different at the 95% level ~~(but is at the 90% level)~~ from class ~~1b~~II days (partly because of the higher mean and median, and partly because of the broader distribution). Class ~~1a~~I days a~~we~~re statistically different from ~~class 2~~undefined and non-event days, with higher means and medians.

Unfortunately, we do not have measurements of organics throughout the time period used here, so we are limited to information on sulfuric acid. However, emissions of biogenic volatile organic compounds (precursors for secondary organics that may contribute to ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and growth (Riipinen et al., 2011, 2012)) are more favorable under warmer and sunnier conditions at Egbert (Leaitch et al., 2011) and elsewhere (Paasonen et al., 2013) and thus lead to organic aerosol formation under these conditions. Because class ~~1a~~I events experience~~had~~ the highest amount of solar radiation and temperature anomalies on average, condensation of low-volatility organic vapors to a growing nucleation mode may be more favorable on these days.

While Figure 4 shows the distributions of environmental factors during events in the various classes, it does not show how new-particle-formation rates (J10) or growth rates (GR) vary with the values of these factors. Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients of J10 and GR with the 7 environmental factors in Figure 4 on class ~~1a~~I days. Because J10s and GRs span several orders of magnitude we take the log of these quantities as well as the log of condensation sink, SO_2 and the H_2SO_4 proxy, which each span orders of magnitude (additionally, a log dependence of J with H_2SO_4 is consistent with the nucleation theorem). All of the environmental factors show stronger correlations (or anti-correlations) with J10 than with the GRs. This could be because other, independent factors (e.g. the condensation of low-volatility organics) are~~may be~~ more important to GRs than to J10s. As would be expected, J10 is positively correlated with solar radiation, SO_2 and the H_2SO_4 proxy (albeit weakly). Oddly, J10 is also positively correlated with the condensation sink. However, the condensation sink is also positively correlated with SO_2 (correlation coefficient = 0.74, not shown), which offsets the dampening effect of condensation sink and leads to the weak positive correlation with the H_2SO_4 proxy. Because the correlation of the H_2SO_4 proxy with J10 is weak, it is likely that other

species (e.g. organics) are contributing to J10s also.

3.3. Large-scale meteorology and back trajectories

In this section, we look at the regional meteorological features associated with the different types of events. Figure 5 shows the surface pressure anomaly (differences from the 4-week running mean centered on the event day) for the mean of class ~~1a~~I, ~~1b~~II and ~~2~~ undefined event days (non-event days show only small deviations from the mean, so we have not plotted non-event days here). Regions with a statistically significant (95% confidence relative to randomly chosen sets of days) high surface pressure anomaly are shaded in pink, and regions where there is a statistically significant (95% confidence) low surface pressure anomaly are shaded in blue. Statistical significance is computed following the bootstrap method (Efron, 1979; see Appendix A for details). Consistent with the high surface-pressure anomalies on class ~~1a~~I event days measured at Egbert in Figure 4c, ~~the entire region around Egbert had a surface pressure anomaly of more than 300 Pa and this high anomaly was statistically significant to the 95% level~~the entire region around Egbert exhibits a significant surface pressure anomaly of more than 300 Pa. Although not shown in Figure 5, Egbert is located inside a region with a 99.8% significant high anomaly. We note that not all of the 44 class ~~1a~~I events exhibit~~ed~~ anomalous high pressure over Egbert. 25% of the class ~~1a~~I event days experienced low pressure anomalies at the site (Figure 4de). Class ~~1b~~II events also exhibit~~ed~~ a positive surface pressure anomaly (150 hPa)~~, but no regions were statistically significant to the 95% level~~ but this pattern is not statistically different from background variations. For ~~Class 2~~undefined events, the composite meteorological surface pressure pattern i~~wa~~s markedly different from that of class~~for~~ ~~1a~~I and ~~1b~~II events (Figure 5c). For ~~Class 2~~undefined events, the region of higher surface pressure i~~wa~~s located northeast of Egbert, with a region of low surface pressure to the southwest.

Figure 6 shows composites of the full 500-hPa geopotential height field (i.e. the anomalies have been added back to the mean). Similar to Figure 5, non-event days show only small deviations from the mean, so we have not plotted non-event days in Figure 6. The pink and blue areas show the regions of the statistically significant anomalies. There i~~wa~~s a statistically significant geopotential height anomaly on class ~~1a~~I days west of Egbert, placing Egbert to the east of the ridge. The east sides of the 500-hPa geopotential ridges are associated with tropospheric subsidence and surface highs, consistent with Figure 5. There are no significant height anomalies in the vicinity of Egbert for the class ~~1b~~II or ~~class 2~~undefined days.

We also ~~looked at~~investigated the large-scale vertical velocity (omega) fields from NCEP (not

shown), and consistent with the large-scale dynamics shown in Figures 5 and 6, ~~days had a statistically significant subsidence over and around Egbert1athe class~~ found statistically significant subsidence over and around Egbert for the class I days. Class ~~1b~~II days also showed~~have~~ subsidence over Egbert ~~too~~, but this pattern~~it was~~ not statistically significant. ~~Class 2~~Undefined days showed~~had~~ no major vertical-wind structure.

The NCEP ~~analysis that we have done here shows~~ diagnostics shown here suggest that the regional-scale new-particle formation events (class ~~1a~~I) are often associated with the large-scale synoptic pattern with surface highs, large-scale subsidence and a ridge to the west and a trough to the east of Egbert. This is not entirely surprising since these conditions generally bring sunny conditions over the region of subsidence and allow for a homogeneous boundary layer (assuming somewhat spatially homogeneous emissions). These large-scale conditions may explain the measured solar radiation, relative humidity, temperature anomaly and pressure anomaly presented in Figure 4; however, it is not clear if these conditions also drive the surface-wind directions associated with the high condensation sink and SO_2 concentration seen in class ~~1a~~I days in Figure 4. To explore this, we use HYPLIT back trajectories.

Figure 7 shows one 24-hour HYSPLIT back trajectory for each new-particle formation event from the three event classes (non-events are lumped with undefined events here as their trajectory distributions were similar). The trajectory from each event ends at the hour closest to the middle of the new-particle formation event (for non-event days, we take the 13:00, the mean middle of I events). The trajectories are colored by the condensation sink~~SO_2 mixing ratio~~ during the new-particle formation event. Air masses for class I events are roughly equally likely to have spent time over regions to the north and south, and they are less likely to have come from the west or east. Class II, undefined events and non events are roughly equally likely to have spent time over regions to the north, west and south, and somewhat less likely to come from the east. ~~There does not appear to have been a dominant wind direction to Egbert for any of the new-particle-formation event classes.~~ However, for all event classes, higher condensation-sink ~~SO_2~~ air generally came from the densely populated regions from the south with lower ~~SO_2~~condensation-sink air generally from the north. Each event class exhibits~~had~~ cases with both lower and higher condensation-sink~~SO_2~~ air. A similar analysis looking at SO_2 concentrations rather than condensation sink (not shown), showed a very similar pattern where high-SO_2 air came from the south and low-SO_2 air from the north.

~~Figure 8 shows the same back trajectories but color coded by the condensation sink. The directional dependence of the condensation sink was very similar to that of SO_2.~~ Thus, air from the

south has~~d~~ both high SO_2 and high condensation sink on new-particle formation days for all event classes, which is consistent with earlier studies at Egbert that found that polluted air most often is from the s~~S~~outh (Rupakheti et al., 2005). These results are consistent with the correlation coefficient between SO_2 and condensation sink of 0.74 on class ~~1a~~I days discussed earlier. Interestingly, the regional-scale ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation events (class ~~1a~~I and maybe class ~~1b~~II) a~~we~~re roughly equally likely to occur in clean versus polluted air, which may have been due to the opposing effects of SO_2 and the condensation sink on new-particle formation.

Figure~~s 8~~ 9 ~~and 10~~ shows the same back trajectories but color coded by the pressure anomaly~~ and solar radiation, respectively~~. The figure~~s~~ shows that for class I and class II days, the~~the~~ high pressure-anomaly~~ and high solar radiation~~ days a~~we~~re generally associated with air flowing to Egbert from the ~~east and~~ north.~~ (The class 2 days have some low solar radiation events from all directions due to nighttime events.)~~ A similar analysis looking at the solar radiation rather than the pressure anomaly (not shown) showed that high solar radiation days are also associated with air flow from the north. Thus, the days with high pressure and solar radiation a~~we~~re generally different from the high SO_2 and condensation-sink (although there i~~wa~~s some overlap between high pollution and high solar radiation on days coming from the southeast on class ~~1a~~I days).

Taking into account all of the analyses in sections 3.2 and 3.3, it appears that regional-scale new-particle formation (class ~~1a~~I and possibly class ~~1b~~II events) at Egbert occurs~~red~~ under two~~2~~ different sets of conditions (1) days with the large-scale synoptic meterology shown in Figures 5 and 6 with high surface pressure, large-scale subsidence and clear skies generally driving airflow from the clean regions, and (2) days with polluted (yet relatively homogeneously mixed) air flow from the south. For some cases when air ~~was~~ come~~sing~~ from the southeast, both of these conditions a~~we~~re satisfied and the air i~~wa~~s both polluted and ~~had~~exhibits ~~the~~ favorable synoptic conditions. These two conditions for new-particle formation in the region near Egbert was also noted in Jeong et al. ~~(Jeong et al.,~~ 2010), where they~~o~~ looked at new-particle formation at Egbert and three other sites in Southern Ontario for three weeks during the summer of 2007. As shown in Table 2, we find that J10 and growth rates a~~we~~re correlated with SO_2 and CS, which ~~mean~~suggests that the regional new-particle events occurring in the polluted events from the south a~~we~~re generally more intense than the events occurring in the cleaner air from the north.

4. Summary and cConclusions

In this paper, we use one year of aerosol size measurements at Egbert, ON, Canada from May 2007 through May 2008 to explore new-particle formation and growth to climate-relevant particle sizes at this site. We present both the statistics of formation rates, growth rates and survival probabilities as well as an analysis of the factors that may have contributed to the new-particle formation and growth. We find that the regional-scale new-particle formation event frequency peaksed in the spring and fall (30-50% of the days) with minima in the winter and summer. The winter minimum may have been due to a lack of biogenic organic precursors to nucleationnew-particle formation and growth and lower solar radiation while the summer minimum may be due tohad lower SO_2 mixing ratios than the other seasons.

Observed new-particle formation rates ranged from less than 0.1 to close to 10 cm^{-3} s^{-1} during the events, or (and are about 5-10 times lower when averaged over the event day). The 24-hour mean and median values, 0.13 and 0.12 cm^{-3} s^{-1}, awere within the range of values found at 5 sites investigated by Westervelt et al. (2013). Growth rates ranged from less than 0.5 to over 10 nm hr^{-1} with mean and median values of 3.1 and 2.0 nm hr^{-1}, also within the range of Westervelt et al. (2013). The survival probabilities of growth to 50 and 100 nm (SP50 and SP100) ranged from less than 1% to over 90%. The mean and median values for SP50 (33% and 19%) are consistent with the sites in Westervelt et al. (2013), but the values for SP100 (19% and 7%) are higher than the sites in Westervelt et al. (2013).

We estimate that the mean formation rates of 50 and 100 nm particles on regional new-particle formation days awere 0.039 and 0.022 cm^{-3} s^{-1} (averaged over the full day). From this, we estimate that regional new-particle formation events contributed about half of the climate-relevant particles; however, there is significant uncertainty in our calculation due to uncertainties in aerosol lifetime and changes in the boundary-layer height.

We find that regional new-particle formation events often occurred under synoptic conditions associated with high surface pressure and large-scale subsidence that cause sunny conditions and clean-air flow from the north and west. However, new-particle formation also occursedr when air flows came from the polluted regions to the south and southwest of Egbert. This air is associated with high SO_2 concentrations and high aerosol condensation sinks. The nucleationnew-particle formation rates tended to be faster during events under these south/southwest flow conditions.

A major factor missing from this analysis is the formation rates of secondary organic aerosol (SOA). SOA may form from biogenic volatile organic compounds emitted by vegetation in the region around Egbert or through anthropogenic volatile organic compounds emitted from industry to the south of Egbert. SOA has been shown to be a contributor to both particle formation and growth (Donahue et al., 2011; Metzger et al., 2010; Pierce et al., 2011; Riipinen et al., 2011), and thus variability in SOA formation rates ~~very~~ likely contribute~~d~~ to some of the variability in new-particle formation occurrence, new-particle formation rates, growth rates and survival probabilities reported here. However, we do not have measurements of aerosol composition or of SOA precursor gases for most of the time period explored in this paper and thus do not include it here.

This work provides ~~valuable~~ statistical constraints for testing model predictions of new-particle formation and growth rates (and the driving factors for these rates) at Egbert. Future work will involve comparing the statistics of new-particle formation, growth rates and survival probabilities of an aerosol microphysics model~~, such as GEOS-Chem-TOMAS,~~ to the measured statistics shown here (similar to what was done in Westervelt et al. (2013)). Additionally, these data may be used to~~we can~~ test ~~see to~~if the meteorological and background chemical factors (e.g. SO_2) are similar between~~in~~ the simulations and~~as to the~~ measurements. These comparisons will allow a comprehensive test of modeled ~~nucleation~~new-particle formation and condensational growth schemes.

5. Appendix A: Statistical significance of meteorological patterns

The statistical significance of the meteorological patterns in Figures 5 and 6 are computed using the Bootstrap method (Efron, 1979) to determine if regional-scale new-particle formation events (class ~~1a~~I events and possibly class ~~1b~~II events) were associated with distinct regional meteorology. We summarize the bootstrap method here. We create 10,000 sets of 44 randomly sampled days (the number of class ~~1a~~I days; 57 days for class ~~1b~~II events and 164 for ~~class 2~~undefined events) of surface pressure anomalies, 500-hPa height anomalies and vertical wind anomalies from the NCEP database (from between 1997 and 2009) over the region shown in Figures 5 and 6. Like in Figures 4c and 4d, the anomalies are defined as differences from the 4-week running mean centered on the event day. We calculate the mean anomalies at each grid point for each of the 10,000 sets. Then, at each location, if the observed anomaly falls outside of the 2.5th-97.5th percentile range (confidence interval) of the 10,000 sample-set, we say that the observed anomaly is statistically significant at 95% confidence using a two-tailed test.

6. Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers for their comments that have improved this paper.

Funding was provided through Environment Canada's Grants and Contribution program (G&C 1300358).

7. References

Boy, M., Kulmala, M., Ruuskanen, T. M., Pihlatie, M., Reissell, A., Aalto, P. P., Keronen, P., Dal Maso, M., Hellen, H., Hakola, H., Jansson, R., Hanke, M. and Arnold, F.: Sulphuric acid closure and contribution to nucleation mode particle growth, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 863–878, 2005.

Charlson, R. J., Schwartz, S. E., Hales, J. M., Cess, R. D., Coakley, J. A., Hansen, J. E. and Hofman, D. J.: Climate Forcing by Anthropogenic Aerosols, Science (80-.)., 255(January 24), 423–430, 1992.

Crippa, P. and Pryor, S. C.: Spatial and temporal scales of new particle formation events in eastern North America, Atmos. Environ., 75, 257–264 [online] Available from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231013003051 (Accessed 14 November 2013), 2013.

Croft, B., Pierce, J. R. and Martin, R. V.: Interpreting Aerosol Lifetimes Using the GEOS-Chem Radionuclide Model, Submitt. to Atmos. Chem. Phys., 2013.

Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., Dal Maso, M., Riipinen, I., Wagner, R., Hussein, T., Aalto, P. and Lehtinen, K. E. J.: Formation and growth of fresh atmospheric aerosols: eight years of aerosol size distribution data from SMEAR II, Hyytiala, Finland, Boreal Environ. Res., (October), 323–336 [online] Available from: http://repository.ju.edu.jo/Lists/English_Repository/Attachments/28542/ber10-323.pdf (Accessed 8 November 2013), 2005.

Donahue, N. M., Trump, E. R., Pierce, J. R. and Riipinen, I.: Theoretical constraints on pure vapor-pressure driven condensation of organics to ultrafine particles, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(16), L16801, doi:10.1029/2011GL048115, 2011.

Draxler, R. .: HYSPLIT4 user's guide. NOAA Tech. Memo. ERL ARL-230, Silver Spring, MD., 1999.

Draxler, R. R. and Hess, G. D.: Description of the HYSPLIT_4 modeling system, NOAA Tech. Memo. ERL ARL-224, NOAA Air Resources Laboratory, Silver Spring, MD, Silver Spring, MD., 1997.

Draxler, R. R. and Hess, G. D.: An overview of the HYSPLIT_4 modeling system of trajectories, dispersion, and deposition, Austrailian Meteorol. Mag., 47, 295–308, 1998.

Dusek, U., Frank, G. P., Hildebrandt, L., Curtius, J., Schneider, J., Walter, S., Chand, D., Drewnick, F., Hings, S., Jung, D., Borrmann, S. and Andreae, M. O.: Size matters more than chemistry for cloud-nucleating ability of aerosol particles, Science (80-.)., 312(5778), 1375–1378, 2006.

Efron, B.: Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife, Ann. Stat., 7(1), 1–26 [online] Available

from: http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.aos/1176344552 (Accessed 6 November 2013), 1979.

Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D. W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D. C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schulz, M. and Dorland, R. V: Changes in atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing, in Climate change 2007: the physical science basis. contribution of working group I to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change, edited by S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, pp. 129–234, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 2007.

Hamed, A., Korhonen, H., Sihto, S.-L., Joutsensaari, J., Järvinen, H., Petäjä, T., Arnold, F., Nieminen, T., Kulmala, M., Smith, J. N., Lehtinen, K. E. J. and Laaksonen, A.: The role of relative humidity in continental new particle formation, J. Geophys. Res., 116(D3), D03202, doi:10.1029/2010JD014186, 2011.

Jeong, C.-H., Evans, G. J., McGuire, M. L., Chang, R. Y.-W., Abbatt, J. P. D., Zeromskiene, K., Mozurkewich, M., Li, S.-M. and Leaitch, W. R.: Particle formation and growth at five rural and urban sites, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10(16), 7979–7995, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7979-2010, 2010.

Junkermann, W., Vogel, B. and Sutton, M. a.: The climate penalty for clean fossil fuel combustion, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(24), 12917–12924, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12917-2011, 2011.

Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Jenne, R. and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year Reanalysis Project, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 77(3), 437–471, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2, 1996.

Kerminen, V.-M., Paramonov, M., Anttila, T., Riipinen, I., Fountoukis, C., Korhonen, H., Asmi, E., Laakso, L., Lihavainen, H., Swietlicki, E., Svenningsson, B., Asmi, A., Pandis, S. N., Kulmala, M. and Petäjä, T.: Cloud condensation nuclei production associated with atmospheric nucleation: a synthesis based on existing literature and new results, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12(24), 12037–12059, doi:10.5194/acp-12-12037-2012, 2012.

Kuang, C., Chen, M., Zhao, J., Smith, J., McMurry, P. H. and Wang, J.: Size and time-resolved growth rate measurements of 1 to 5 nm freshly formed atmospheric nuclei, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12(7), 3573–3589, doi:10.5194/acp-12-3573-2012, 2012.

Kuang, C., McMurry, P. H. and McCormick, A. V: Determination of cloud condensation nuclei production from measured new particle formation events, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36(9), n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2009GL037584, 2009.

Kulmala, M., Petaja, T., Monkkonen, P., Koponen, I. K., Dal Maso, M., Aalto, P. P., Lehtinen, K. E. J. and Kerminen, V. M.: On the growth of nucleation mode particles: source rates of condensable vapor in polluted and clean environments, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 409–416, 2005.

Kulmala, M., Petäjä, T., Nieminen, T., Sipilä, M., Manninen, H. E., Lehtipalo, K., Dal Maso, M., Aalto, P. P., Junninen, H., Paasonen, P., Riipinen, I., Lehtinen, K. E. J., Laaksonen, A. and Kerminen, V.-M.: Measurement of the nucleation of atmospheric aerosol particles., Nat. Protoc., 7(9), 1651–67, doi:10.1038/nprot.2012.091, 2012.

Kulmala, M., Vehkamaki, H., Petajda, T., Dal Maso, M., Lauri, A., Kerminen, V. M., Birmili, W. and McMurry, P. H.: Formation and growth rates of ultrafine atmospheric particles: a review of observations, J. Aerosol Sci., 35(2), 143–176, 2004.

Leaitch, W. R., Macdonald, A. M., Brickell, P. C., Liggio, J., Sjostedt, S. J., Vlasenko, A., Bottenheim, J. W., Huang, L., Li, S.-M., Liu, P. S. K., Toom-Sauntry, D., Hayden, K. A., Sharma, S., Shantz, N. C., Wiebe, H. A., Zhang, W., Abbatt, J. P. D., Slowik, J. G., Chang, R. Y.-W., Russell, L. M., Schwartz, R. E., Takahama, S., Jayne, J. T. and Ng, N. L.: Temperature response of the submicron organic aerosol from temperate forests, Atmos. Environ., 45(37), 6696–6704 [online] Available from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231011008843 (Accessed 10 October 2013), 2011.

Lonsdale, C. R., Stevens, R. G., Brock, C. a., Makar, P. a., Knipping, E. M. and Pierce, J. R.: The effect of coal-fired power-plant SO2 and NOx control technologies on aerosol nucleation in the source plumes, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 11519–11531, doi:10.5194/acpd-12-19683-2012, 2012.

Merikanto, J., Spracklen, D., Mann, G. W., Pickering, S. J. and Carslaw, K. S.: Impact of nucleation on global CCN, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 8601–8616 [online] Available from: http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/9/12999/2009/acpd-9-12999-2009.pdf (Accessed 24 November 2012), 2009.

Metzger, A., Verheggen, B., Dommen, J., Duplissy, J., Prevot, A. S. H., Weingartner, E., Riipinen, I., Kulmala, M., Spracklen, D. V, Carslaw, K. S. and Baltensperger, U.: Evidence for the role of organics in aerosol particle formation under atmospheric conditions., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 107(15), 6646–51, doi:10.1073/pnas.0911330107, 2010.

Paasonen, P., Asmi, A., Petäjä, T., Kajos, M. K., Äijälä, M., Junninen, H., Holst, T., Abbatt, J. P. D., Arneth, A., Birmili, W., van der Gon, H. D., Hamed, A., Hoffer, A., Laakso, L., Laaksonen, A., Richard Leaitch, W., Plass-Dülmer, C., Pryor, S. C., Räisänen, P., Swietlicki, E., Wiedensohler, A., Worsnop, D. R., Kerminen, V.-M. and Kulmala, M.: Warming-induced increase in aerosol number concentration likely to moderate climate change, Nat. Geosci., 6(6), 438–442, doi:10.1038/ngeo1800, 2013.

Paramonov, M., Aalto, P. P., Asmi, A., Prisle, N., Kerminen, V.-M., Kulmala, M. and Petäjä, T.: The analysis of size-segregated cloud condensation nuclei counter (CCNC) data and its implications for cloud droplet activation, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13(20), 10285–10301, doi:10.5194/acp-13-10285-2013, 2013.

Petäjä, T., Mauldin III, R., Kosciuch, E., McGrath, J., Nieminen, T., Paasonen, P., Boy, M., Adamov, A., Kotiaho, T. and Kulmala, M.: Sulfuric acid and OH concentrations in a boreal forest site, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 7435–7448 [online] Available from: http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/7435/2009/ (Accessed 10 October 2013), 2009.

Pierce, J. R. and Adams, P. J.: Efficiency of cloud condensation nuclei formation from ultrafine particles, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 1367–1379, 2007.

Pierce, J. R. and Adams, P. J.: Uncertainty in global CCN concentrations from uncertain aerosol nucleation and primary emission rates, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9(4), 1339–1356, doi:10.5194/acp-9-1339-2009, 2009.

Pierce, J. R., Leaitch, W. R., Liggio, J., Westervelt, D. M., Wainwright, C. D., Abbatt, J. P. D., Ahlm, L., Al-Basheer, W., Cziczo, D. J., Hayden, K. L., Lee, A. K. Y., Li, S.-M., Russell, L. M., Sjostedt, S. J., Strawbridge, K. B., Travis, M., Vlasenko, A., Wentzell, J. J. B., Wiebe, H. A., Wong, J. P. S. and Macdonald, A. M.: Nucleation and condensational growth to CCN sizes during a sustained pristine biogenic SOA event in a forested mountain valley, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12(7), 3147–3163, doi:10.5194/acp-12-3147-2012, 2012.

Pierce, J. R., Riipinen, I., Kulmala, M., Ehn, M., Petäjä, T., Junninen, H., Worsnop, D. R. and Donahue, N. M.: Quantification of the volatility of secondary organic compounds in ultrafine particles during

nucleation events, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(17), 9019–9036, doi:10.5194/acp-11-9019-2011, 2011.

Riipinen, I., Pierce, J. R., Yli-Juuti, T., Nieminen, T., Häkkinen, S., Ehn, M., Junninen, H., Lehtipalo, K., Petäjä, T., Slowik, J., Chang, R., Shantz, N. C., Abbatt, J., Leaitch, W. R., Kerminen, V.-M., Worsnop, D. R., Pandis, S. N., Donahue, N. M. and Kulmala, M.: Organic condensation: a vital link connecting aerosol formation to cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) concentrations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(8), 3865–3878, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3865-2011, 2011.

Riipinen, I., Yli-Juuti, T., Pierce, J. R., Petäjä, T., Worsnop, D. R., Kulmala, M. and Donahue, N. M.: The contribution of organics to atmospheric nanoparticle growth, Nat. Geosci., 5(7), 453–458, doi:10.1038/ngeo1499, 2012.

Rupakheti, M., Leaitch, W. R., Lohmann, U., Hayden, K., Brickell, P., Lu, G., Li, S.-M., Toom-Sauntry, D., Bottenheim, J. W., Brook, J. R., Vet, R., Jayne, J. T. and Worsnop, D. R.: An Intensive Study of the Size and Composition of Submicron Atmospheric Aerosols at a Rural Site in Ontario, Canada, Aerosol Sci. Technol., 39(8), 722–736, doi:10.1080/02786820500182420, 2005.

Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 1st ed., John Wiley and Sons., New York., 2006.

Sihto, S.-L., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V.-M., Dal Maso, M., Petaja, T., Riipinen, I., Korhonen, H., Arnold, F., Janson, R., Boy, M., Laaksonen, A. and Lehtinen, K. E. J.: Atmospheric sulphuric acid and aerosol formation: implications from atmospheric measurements for nucleation and early growth mechanisms, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 4079–4091, 2006.

Slowik, J. G., Stroud, C., Bottenheim, J. W., Brickell, P. C., Chang, R. Y.-W., Liggio, J., Makar, P. A., Martin, R. V., Moran, M. D., Shantz, N. C., Sjostedt, S. J., van Donkelaar, A., Vlasenko, A., Wiebe, H. A., Xia, A. G., Zhang, J., Leaitch, W. R. and Abbatt, J. P. D.: Characterization of a large biogenic secondary organic aerosol event from eastern Canadian forests, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10(6), 2825–2845, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2825-2010, 2010.

Spracklen, D. V, Carslaw, K. S., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V. M., Mann, G. W. and Sihto, S. L.: The contribution of boundary layer nucleation events to total particle concentrations on regional and global scales, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 5631–5648, 2006.

Stevens, R. G. and Pierce, J. R.: A parameterization of sub-grid particle formation in sulphur-rich plumes for global and regional-scale models, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13(7), 19583–19623, doi:10.5194/acpd-13-19583-2013, 2013.

Stevens, R. G., Pierce, J. R., Brock, C. A., Reed, M. K., Crawford, J. H., Holloway, J. S., Ryerson, T. B., Huey, L. G. and Nowak, J. B.: Nucleation and growth of sulfate aerosol in coal-fired power plant plumes: sensitivity to background aerosol and meteorology, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12(1), 189–206, doi:10.5194/acp-12-189-2012, 2012.

Vehkamäki, H., Kulmala, M., Napari, I., Lehtinen, K. E. J., Timmreck, C., Noppel, M. and Laaksonen, A.: An improved parameterization for sulfuric acid-water nucleation rates for tropospheric and stratospheric conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 107(D22), 4610–4622, 2002.

Westervelt, D. M., Pierce, J. R., Riipinen, I., Trivitayanurak, W., Hamed, A., Kulmala, M., Laaksonen, A., Decesari, S. and Adams, P. J.: Formation and growth of nucleated particles into cloud condensation nuclei: model–measurement comparison, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13(15), 7645–7663, doi:10.5194/acp-13-7645-2013, 2013.

Yu, F.: Diurnal and seasonal variations of ultrafine particle formation in anthropogenic SO2 plumes., Environ. Sci. Technol., 44(6), 2011–5, doi:10.1021/es903228a, 2010.