

Climate forced air-quality modeling at urban scale: sensitivity to model resolution, emissions and meteorology.

K. Markakis¹, M. Valari¹, O. Perrussel², O. Sanchez², C. Honore².

[1] {Laboratoire de Meteorologie Dynamique, IPSL Laboratoire CEA/CNRS/UVSQ, Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France }

[2] {AIRPARIF, Association de surveillance de qualité de l'air en Île-de-France, 7 rue Crillon, 75004, Paris, France }

Correspondence to: K. Markakis (konstantinos.markakis@lmd.polytechnique.fr)

Abstract

While previous research helped to identify and prioritize the sources of error in air-quality modeling due to anthropogenic emissions and spatial scale effects our knowledge is limited on how these uncertainties affect climate forced air-quality assessments. Using as reference a 10yr model simulation over the greater Paris (France) area at 4km resolution and anthropogenic emissions from a 1km resolution bottom-up inventory, through several tests we estimate the sensitivity of modeled ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations to different potentially influential factors with a particular interest over the urban areas. These factors include the model horizontal and vertical resolution, the meteorological input from a climate model and its resolution, the use of a top-down emission inventory, the resolution of the emissions input and the post-processing coefficients used to derive the temporal, vertical and chemical split of emissions. We show that urban ozone displays moderate sensitivity to the resolution of emissions (~8%), the post-processing method (6.5%) and the horizontal resolution of the air quality model (~5%) while annual PM_{2.5} levels are particularly sensitive to changes in their primary emissions (~32%) and the resolution of the emission inventory (~24%). The air quality model horizontal and vertical resolution have little effect on model predictions for the specific study domain. In the case of modelled ozone concentrations, the implementation of refined input data results in a consistent decrease (from 2.5% up to 8.3%), mainly due to inhibition of the titration rate by nitrogen oxides. Such consistency is not observed for PM_{2.5}. In contrast this consistency is not observed for PM_{2.5}. In addition we use the results of these sensitivities to explain and quantify the discrepancy between a coarse (~50km) and a fine (4km) resolution simulation over the urban

1 area. We show that the ozone bias of the coarse run (+9ppb) is reduced by ~40% by adopting a
2 higher resolution emission inventory, by 25% by using a post-processing technique based on the
3 local inventory (same improvement is obtained by increasing model horizontal resolution) and
4 by 10% by adopting the annual emission totals of the local inventory. The bias of PM_{2.5}
5 concentrations follows a more complex pattern with the positive values associated with the
6 coarse run (+3.6µg/m³), increasing or decreasing depending on the type of the refinement. We
7 conclude that in the case of fine particles the coarse simulation cannot selectively incorporate
8 local scale features in order to reduce its error.

9

10 **1 Introduction**

11 Recent epidemiological findings stress the need to resolve the variability of pollutant
12 concentrations at urban scale. The International Agency for Research on Cancer recently
13 classified outdoor air pollution as a “leading environmental cause of cancer deaths” (Loomis et
14 al., 2013) while new findings reveal that living near busy roads substantially increases the total
15 burden of disease attributable to air pollution (Pascal et al., 2013). Research on future projections
16 of air-quality should be addressed primarily at such scale especially given the fact that the efforts
17 to mitigate air-pollution are more intense in areas where the largest health benefits are observed
18 (Riahi et al., 2011).

19 Climate and atmospheric composition are related through a series of physical and chemical
20 mechanisms and atmospheric feedbacks. A significant portion of the published literature on this
21 issue uses global scale models to focus on the impact of climate on tropospheric ozone at global
22 or regional scales (Brasseur et al., 1998; Liao et al., 2006; Prather et al., 2003; Szopa et al., 2006;
23 Szopa and Hauglustaine, 2007). More recent studies have integrated advanced chemistry
24 schemes capable of resolving the variability of pollutant concentrations at regional scale, which
25 spans from several hours up to a few days, with chemistry transport models (CTMs) (Colette et
26 al., 2012, 2013; Forkel and Knoche, 2006, 2007; Hogrefe et al., 2004; Katragkou et al., 2011;
27 Kelly et al., 2012; Knowlton et al., 2004; Lam et al., 2011; Langner et al., 2005, 2012; Nolte et
28 al., 2008; Szopa and Hauglustaine, 2007; Tagaris et al., 2009, Zanis et al., 2011). Global models
29 with a typical resolution of a few hundreds of kilometers and regional CTMs used at resolutions
30 of a few tens of kilometers – and their parameterization of physical and chemical processes make
31 them inadequate for modeling air-quality at urban scale (Cohan et al., 2006; Forkel and Knoche,

1 2007; Markakis et al., 2014; Sillman et al., 1990; Tie et al., 2010; Valari and Menut, 2008; Valin
2 et al., 2011; Vautard et al., 2007).

3 The challenge we face is how to model climate forced atmospheric composition with CTMs at
4 fine resolution over urban areas, where emission gradients are particularly sharp, without
5 introducing large errors due to emissions and meteorology related uncertainties as well as to
6 CTMs numerical resolution. In the absence of plume-in-grid parameterization, emissions in
7 CTMs are instantly mixed within the volume of model grid-cells before chemical reaction
8 transport and mixing take place. When the volume of these cells is large compared to the
9 characteristic time scale of these processes, sub-grid scale errors occur such as over-dilution of
10 emissions leading to unrealistic representation of urban scale chemistry such as ozone titration.
11 The resolution of meteorological modeling is another issue: Leroyer et al. (2014) argue that only
12 high-resolution meteorological modeling can correctly capture the urban heat island, also Flagg
13 and Taylor (2011) showed that high-resolution modeling is very much dependent on the
14 resolution of the surface layer input data.

15 Another key issue is the representativeness of top-down emission inventories over cities. The
16 starting point of these inventories is annual totals for families of pollutants at continental,
17 regional or national scale that are temporally and spatially downscaled based on proxies such as
18 land-use and population data, activity-dependent time profiles and chemical speciation to provide
19 gridded hourly emission fields suitable for modeling with CTMs. It has been shown that these
20 inventories cannot adequately portray the plethora and complexity of the anthropogenic
21 emissions over large cities (Gilliland et al., 2003; Markakis et al., 2010, 2012; Russell and
22 Dennis, 2000). In Markakis et al. (2014) we showed that ozone formation occurs under a VOC-
23 limited chemical regime in the 10-year simulations that used the bottom-up emission inventory.
24 This result is consistent with previous studies over the Paris area (Beekmann and Derognat,
25 2003; Beekmann and Vautard, 2010; Deguillaume et al., 2008). On the contrary, when the
26 regional top-down inventory was used instead, ozone formation occurred under a NO_x -limited
27 chemical regime. Such a discrepancy is critical when mitigation scenarios are investigated
28 because they may lead to controversy when studying the ozone response in the future. As shown
29 in Markakis et al. (2014) regional scale modeling and the use of top-down emissions can result to
30 higher future reductions than the urban scale modeling using bottom-up emissions. Other
31 challenges stem from the fact that emission projections are mostly based on scenarios developed

1 to represent changes at global scale and are rarely suited for assessment at regional let alone
2 urban scales. Long-term projections are constrained by the evolution of large scale energy supply
3 and demand and the link between global and regional scale projections is a laborious task (Kelly
4 et al. (2012)).

5 The major caveat of simulating regional scales at high resolution is the enormous computational
6 demands and that is particularly relevant to climate studies where the simulated periods extend
7 over several decades. To fill the gap between regional and city-scale assessments we need to
8 combine in a single application the advantages of each scale; on one hand the high spatial
9 coverage (but with low resolution) and on the other a good representation of emissions over
10 cities. To achieve this goal we need to understand the major sources of error and their respective
11 impact on climate forced atmospheric composition simulations at urban scale.

12 This study builds on the previous work of Markakis et al. (2014) where a qualitative comparison
13 was accomplished between an urban (local) and a regional scale simulation over Paris. The aim
14 of the present study is to disentangle modeling errors of climate forced air-quality studies over
15 finer scales due to different factors such as emission and meteorological input as well as the
16 CTM's horizontal and vertical resolution. We use as reference run a 10yr long simulation (1996-
17 2005) over the Ile-de-France region in France (IdF) at 4km resolution, using the high-resolution
18 (1km) bottom-up emission inventory of the region's environmental agency (AIRPARIF, 2012).
19 Boundary conditions for this run are taken from a regional scale simulation at 0.5° over Europe,
20 where the ECLIPSE top-down emissions were used (Klimont et al., 2013, 2015). We carry out
21 several sensitivity tests to quantify the impact of an envelope of effects such as a) meteorology
22 from a climate model versus reanalysis data; b) the spatial resolution of the meteorological input;
23 c) the air-quality model vertical resolution, especially close to the surface; d) bottom-up versus
24 top-down emissions; e) AIRPARIF versus EMEP post-processing information (temporal, vertical
25 and chemical split) of emissions to provide appropriate fluxes on the air-quality modeling mesh
26 grid f) the resolution of the emission input g) the CTM's horizontal resolution. We aim to point
27 out the most influential parameters of model configuration to help improve regional scale climate
28 change assessments.

29

30 **2 Materials and methods**

31 **2.1 Meteorological and air-quality models' setup**

1 The IdF region is located at 1.25–3.58° east and 47.89–49.45° north with a population of
2 approximately 11.7 million, more than two million of which live in the city of Paris (Fig. 1). The
3 area is situated away from the coast and is characterized by uniform and low topography, not
4 exceeding 200 m above sea level.

5 In order to simulate air-quality in the study region we employ a dynamical downscaling
6 approach: at first the IPSL-CM5A-MR global circulation model (Dufresne et al., 2013) is used to
7 derive projections of the main climate drivers (temperature, solar radiation etc.) using the RCP-
8 4.5 dataset of greenhouse gas emissions (van Vuuren et al., 2011). Global climate output is
9 downscaled with the Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) mesoscale climate model
10 (Skamarock and Klemp, 2008) over Europe at a 0.44° horizontal resolution grid (details on these
11 simulations can be found in Kotlarski et al. (2014)). For the purpose of the sensitivities presented
12 in the paper we also employ meteorology driven by ERA reanalysis data at two resolutions; 0.11°
13 and 0.44° (Vautard et al., 2013). The vertical resolution of the meteorological input consists of
14 31 σ -p layer extending to 500hPa.

15 Pollutant concentrations at global scale are modeled with the LMDz-INCA chemistry model
16 (Hauglustaine et al., 2004, 2013) forced with RCP-4.5 emissions. These concentration fields are
17 downscaled at regional scale with the CHIMERE (2013a version) off-line chemistry-transport
18 model (<http://www.lmd.polytechnique.fr/chimere>) in two steps: initially at 0.44° resolution grid
19 (~50 km) over Europe (EEA, 2104) and subsequently at 4km resolution over the IdF region. The
20 nesting scheme is presented in Fig. 1. CHIMERE is a cartesian mesh-grid model including gas-
21 phase, solid-phase and aqueous chemistry, biogenic emissions modeling with the MEGAN
22 model (Guenther et al., 2006), dust emissions (Menut et al., 2005) and resuspension (Vautard et
23 al., 2005). Gas-phase chemistry is based on the MELCHIOR mechanism (Lattuati, 1997) which
24 includes more than 300 reactions of 80 gaseous species. The aerosols model species are sulfates,
25 nitrates, ammonium, organic and black carbon and sea-salt (Bessagnet et al., 2010) and the gas-
26 particle partitioning of the ensemble Sulfate/Nitrate/Ammonium is treated by the ISORROPIA
27 code (Nenes et al., 1998) implemented on-line in CHIMERE. CHIMERE is been benchmarked
28 in the past in a number of model inter-comparison experiments (see Menut et al. (2013a) and
29 references therein).

30 For the reference run at urban scale (hereafter REF), we use the same model setup as in Markakis
31 et al. (2014): the modeling domain has a horizontal resolution of 4 km and consists of 39 grid

1 cells in the west-east direction, 32 grid cells in the north-south direction and 8 σ -p hybrid vertical
2 layers from the surface (999hPa) up to approximately 5.5 km (500hPa) with the surface layer
3 being 25m thick. The configuration of the reference run represents the best compromise between
4 local scale emission data and the high computational demand of a long-term simulation at fine
5 resolution.

6

7 **2.2 Climate and emissions**

8 The RCP-4.5 long-term scenario of greenhouse gases, used as global scale predictor of present-
9 time climate, displays a 20% GHG emission reduction for Europe, constant population at about
10 575 million inhabitants and mid-21st century change in global radiative forcing by 4 W/m²,
11 increasing to 4.5 W/m² by 2065 and stabilizing thereafter. The RCP-4.5 also includes century-
12 long estimates of air pollutant emissions and aerosols and was used to drive the LMDz-INCA
13 simulations at the global scale.

14 The regional scale simulations for the present-time (2010) employ an emission database
15 developed in the framework of the ECLIPSE (Evaluating the Climate and Air Quality Impacts of
16 Short-Lived Pollutants) project (Klimont et al., 2013; 2015) implementing emission factors from
17 GAINS (Amann et al., 2011). Present-time emissions (as areas sources) are compiled by the
18 International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) and as regards Europe they include
19 the results of the work undergone in the UNECE Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air
20 Pollution (CLRTAP). The emission estimates are available at a 0.5° x 0.5° resolution grid.

21 Present-time (2008) emission estimates for the IdF region are also available in hourly basis over
22 a 1km resolution grid. This emission inventory is compiled by the Ile-de-France environmental
23 agency and combines a large quantity of city-specific information (AIRPARIF, 2012) based on a
24 bottom-up approach. The spatial allocation of emissions is either source specific (e.g., locations
25 of point sources) or completed with proxies such as high-resolution population maps and a
26 detailed road network. The inventory includes emissions of CO, NO_x, Non-methane Volatile
27 Organic Compounds (NMVOCs), SO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} with a monthly, weekly and diurnal -
28 source specific- temporal resolution. Emissions from point sources are inputted as area emissions
29 in the model and the grid cells containing those sources adopt a vertical distribution across model
30 layers which varies in time-dependent from several meteorological variables such as temperature
31 and wind inputted in a plume-rise algorithm (Scire et al., 1990). Consequently the distribution of

1 emissions among different activity sectors reveals that in the IdF region the principal emitter of
2 NO_x, on annual basis, is the road transport sector (50%), for NMVOCs the use of solvents (50%)
3 and for fine particles the residential sector (37%). The raw data of the 1km resolution emissions
4 were aggregated to the 4km resolution modeling grid.

6 **2.3 Data and metrics for model evaluation**

7 Model results from the different sensitivity runs are compared against observational data for O₃,
8 NO, NO₂ and PM_{2.5}. Pollutant concentrations measured at 29 sites of the air-quality network of
9 AIRPARIF (17 urban, 4 suburban and 8 rural) are compared to first-layer modeled
10 concentrations on the grid-cells containing the corresponding monitor sites. To benchmark model
11 performance we use the skill score S which is based on the equations of Mao et al. (2006):

$$13 \quad S = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left| \frac{BIAS}{MGE} \right| + \left| \frac{MGE}{RMSE} \right| \right) \quad (1)$$

14
15 where MGE represents the absolute mean gross error and RMSE the root mean square error. A
16 skill score close to 1 is indicative of an unbiased model with no significant errors present, but in
17 the case of biased results this rating masks the information on the magnitude of the bias and the
18 corresponding error. For this reason, alongside S , we employ the mean normalized bias (MNB)
19 and mean normalized gross error (MNGE) as regards ozone evaluation and the Mean Fractional
20 Bias (MFB) and Mean Fractional Error (MFE) as regards PM_{2.5} (EPA, 2007).

21 We extract these metrics from the daily concentration values and not the decade average bearing
22 in mind that this is not typical for runs forced by climate simulations but for operational forecast
23 evaluation. We should note here, that it is reasonable to expect lower scores than those achieved
24 in operational forecast analysis due to the presence of climate biases (Colette et al., 2013; Menut
25 et al., 2013a). As in Markakis et al. (2014) we aim to evaluate our simulations by utilizing
26 metrics that are time averaged on a scale finer than a climatological one.

28 **2.4 Description of the sensitivity simulations**

29 Through a number of test cases we study the ability of the model to predict present-time decadal
30 air-quality with respect to emission and meteorological input as well as the CTM's horizontal
31 and vertical resolution. For that purpose we conduct five sets of 10yr long simulations (1996-

1 2005) over a 4km resolution grid covering the IdF region (see Table 1). In all our comparisons
2 we use as a measure of sensitivity of modeled ozone and PM_{2.5} the absolute difference between
3 the mean of daily averaged concentrations ($|\Delta c|$) as well as the absolute change in the skill score
4 *S*. For ozone we also compare the MNB, MNGE and for PM_{2.5} the MFB and MFE. All scores are
5 calculated to represent an average of all urban, suburban or rural stations. For PM_{2.5} for which
6 only observations from urban stations are available we represent the results for summer, winter
7 and in annual basis of urban stations.

8 The first sensitivity case focuses on the climate bias due to the meteorological forcing. It is well
9 established that ozone and certain particulate matter species are sensitive to temperature changes
10 (Fiore et al., 2012; Im et al., 2011, 2012; Jacob and Winner, 2009; Megaritis et al., 2014). Menut
11 et al. (2003) using an adjoint model studied the sensitivity of ozone concentrations at the
12 afternoon peak to numerous model processes and inputs for a typical summer episode in Paris
13 and found that temperature and wind speed were the most influential parameters to the observed
14 changes. For our test we utilize meteorological input that stems from a WRF run employing
15 ERA40 reanalysis data over a 0.44° resolution regional scale grid (ERA05) and compare with the
16 REF simulation utilizing climate model meteorology. Both configurations share identical
17 emission inventories (AIRPARIF) and vertical resolution (8 σ -p layers). Modeled meteorological
18 fields are further interpolated over the 4km-resolution IdF grid for the air-quality simulation. We
19 note here, that interpolating the 0.44° resolution meteorology over the 4km resolution CHIMERE
20 grid adds a source of uncertainty in modeled pollutant concentrations, but due to the flat
21 topography of the area and as shown in previous research studies in the same region, increasing
22 the resolution of the meteorological input does not improve model performance (Menut et al.,
23 2005; Valari and Menut, 2008). To study the impact of the resolution of the input meteorology
24 here, we conduct a second sensitivity run where meteorological input stems from a WRF
25 simulation using ERA40 reanalysis data over a finer resolution mesh with grid spacing of 0.11°
26 (ERA01) and compare with the ERA05 run.

27 The third sensitivity test addresses the issue of the CTM's vertical resolution (VERT). A
28 previous sensitivity analysis conducted with the same air-quality model showed only small
29 changes in modeled ozone and PM₁₀ concentrations over the IdF region due to increase in the
30 CTM's vertical resolution (Menut et al., 2013b). On the other hand Menut et al. (2003) showed
31 that vertical diffusivity was one of the most influential parameters to the observed daily peak

1 concentrations of ozone for a typical summertime episode in IdF. Here, we undertake a similar
2 analysis but in a climate modeling framework, where enhanced meteorological bias is expected.
3 VERT implements a 12 vertical σ -p layers instead of 8. The major difference between the two
4 configurations (REF vs. VERT) is not the number of layers but the depth of the first model layer,
5 which is reduced from 20 to 8 m in VERT. We note that because the WRF meteorology
6 (resolved in 31 layers) is interpolated to the CTM's vertical grid, technically, increasing the
7 number of vertical layers in CHIMERE from 8 to 12 will result in a refinement of the
8 meteorological input used for the chemical simulations as well.

9 The fourth sensitivity case estimates the discrepancy in modeled ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations
10 between two runs where emission totals stem from different inventories, namely the local
11 AIRPARIF inventory and the ECLIPSE regional-scale dataset. In Menut et al. (2003) it was
12 shown that the sensitivity of ozone concentrations in the afternoon peak hour due to surface
13 emissions was the second largest after the sensitivity associated with meteorology. In Markakis
14 et al. (2014) we compared the two approaches as for their ability to correctly represent ozone
15 photo-chemical production under typical anticyclonic summer conditions and also found
16 important differences. In the present work we push the analysis a step further and quantify model
17 response to the emission input over longer timescales. For this purpose we compile a new 4km
18 resolution emission dataset over the IdF domain (ANN) in which annual emission fluxes match
19 the ECLIPSE emissions (0.5° resolution) but are downscaled spatially and temporally to obtain
20 4km-resolution and hourly emissions based on the local scale information implemented in the
21 bottom-up approach of the AIRPARIF emission inventory. The same approach is applied on the
22 chemical speciation of the inventory's pollutants to obtain emissions for all the species required
23 by the CTM's chemical mechanism. Therefore the only difference amongst the two runs stem
24 from the use of different annual quantified emission fluxes for the region (Table 1). To give a
25 sense of the discrepancies between the two inventories over IdF we compare the annual domain-
26 wide fluxes of NO_x, NMVOCs and PM_{2.5} (Fig. 2). NMVOCs emissions are considerably higher
27 in the ECLIPSE inventory while NO_x emissions are lower than AIRPARIF. In terms of
28 photochemical ozone production, this makes ECLIPSE more favourable of NO_x-limited
29 conditions than the bottom-up AIRPARIF inventory, which is consistent with the findings of
30 Markakis et al. (2014). Fine particle emissions are 2.4 times more in ECLIPSE, which probably
31 stems from the use of a population proxy to spatially allocate wintertime emissions from wood-

1 burning. We note here, that the interest of comparing the two emission inventories is strictly to
2 quantify the added value of implementing local scale information in city-scale climate studies
3 and not by any means to compare qualitatively the two datasets. It should be made clear that
4 ECLIPSE dataset is not meant to accurately represent emissions at such fine scales.

5 In the fifth sensitivity case we study the impact of the post-processing methodology e.g., the
6 process followed in order to split the annual emission totals into hourly emission fluxes for all
7 the species and vertical layers required by the air-quality model. Menut et al. (2012a) showed
8 that model performance improves when time-variation profiles developed on the basis of
9 observations are applied for the temporal allocation of emissions instead of the EMEP
10 coefficients. Mailler et al. (2013) found that model results are highly sensitive to the coefficients
11 used for the vertical distribution of emissions. Makar et al. (2014) investigated the response of
12 modeled concentrations to the refinement of the spatial and temporal allocation of input
13 emissions and found that the model was as sensitive to these improvements as to the vertical
14 mixing parameterization. Also they conclude that the temporal distribution of emissions in
15 particular, could be very important in stable urban atmospheres and that this sensitivity is
16 reduced with increased mixing conditions. For our test emission totals must match between the
17 two emission datasets. We compile a new emission dataset (POST) where the ECLIPSE annual
18 totals are spatially (both horizontally and vertically) and temporally downscaled on the 4km-
19 resolution IdF grid. This procedure is based on coefficients extracted from the ECLIPSE post-
20 processed inventory which in turn derive from the EMEP model. Comparing between the POST
21 and ANN runs (Table 1) we can model the impact on pollutant concentrations of integrating a
22 bottom-up approach in regional emission modeling.

23 Finally the impact of model horizontal resolution is a crucial issue for air-quality modeling. As
24 regards urban ozone there are plentiful studies on the effect of model resolution refinement with
25 an overall tendency to show improvement of the model's quality when increasing resolution
26 from about 30-50km to 4-12km (Arunachalam et al., 2006; Cohan et al., 2006; Tie et al., 2010;
27 Valari and Menut, 2008). On the other hand reports are scarce for fine particles: Pungert and
28 West. (2013) show that increasing the resolution from 36km to 12km improved the 1h daily
29 maximum concentrations but not the daily average, Stroud et al. (2011) reported better
30 agreement of fine particles of organic origin with measurements from a modeling exercise at a
31 2.5km resolution domain over a 15km resolution domain while Queen and Zhang. (2008) also

1 show improvement but their results include the effect of increasing the resolution of the
2 meteorological input as well. Valari and Menut. (2008) showed that the impact of the resolution
3 of emissions on modeled concentrations of ozone may be higher than the model resolution itself.
4 This question has not yet been raised in the framework of climate driven atmospheric
5 composition modeling at the local scale. In our study we disentangle the impact of the resolution
6 of the emission dataset from the effect of model resolution itself by conducting two more tests.
7 In the first test we employ the 0.5° resolution simulation (REG hereafter) from which all
8 aforementioned simulations take their boundary conditions. We also compile the AVER database
9 which uses as a starting point the modeled concentrations at 4km resolution from the POST run
10 spatially averaged over the 0.5° grid-cells of the REG resolution mesh. REG vs. AVER (see
11 Table 1) can provide information on the influence of model resolution while comparing AVER
12 against POST provides the sensitivity to the resolution of the emission inventory.

13

14 **3 Model evaluation**

15 **3.1 Evaluation of present-time meteorology**

16 There are three WRF simulations involved in the study: i) climate model driven meteorology
17 downscaled from a global scale climate model (MET_CLIM); ii) meteorology from reanalysis
18 datasets at 0.5° resolution (MET_ERA05) and iii) meteorology downscaled from reanalysis data
19 at 0.11° (MET_ERA01). In this section we present a short evaluation of these datasets comparing
20 model results against surface observations from seven meteorological monitoring sites existing
21 in the domain. We note here, that from these monitors only one is located inside the highly
22 urbanized city of Paris. A thorough evaluation of the reanalysis dataset in Europe may be found
23 in Menut et al. (2012b).

24 The mean wintertime (DJF) and summertime (JJA) modeled and observed daily average values
25 are compared for four different meteorological variables relevant for air-quality, namely 2m-
26 temperature, 10m-wind speed, relative humidity and total precipitation (Table 2). A strong
27 positive bias is observed in modeled wind speed for both MET_CLIM and MET_ERA05
28 meteorology especially during the winter period. Such a bias, consistent with previous studies
29 (see e.g., Jimenez et al. (2012) for WRF or Vautard et al. (2012) for other models), is expected to
30 enhance pollutants' dispersion and lead to less frequent stagnation episodes. The bias is stronger
31 for the MET_CLIM dataset than for the MET_ERA05. A systematic wet bias in both

1 summertime and wintertime precipitation is observed for the two datasets. This can significantly
2 reduce PM concentrations through rain scavenging (Fiore et al., 2012; Jacob and Winner, 2009).
3 MET_ERA05 fields provide a better representation of precipitation especially in wintertime
4 where the bias is reduced by a factor of more than 2 compared to MET_CLIM. Summertime
5 temperature is adequately represented in the climate dataset whereas a wintertime weak cold bias
6 (-0.3°C) is observed. A strong hot bias during the winter is found for the reanalysis meteorology.
7 A warmer climate can increase ozone formation through thermal decomposition of PAN
8 releasing NO_x (Sillman and Samson, 1995). RH is generally well represented in both cases.
9 Finally we notice that the finer resolution reanalysis dataset (MET_ERA01) is not able to reduce
10 the observed domain-wide biases of the coarse meteorological run with the exception of specific
11 locations such as the Montsouris station in Paris where the bias in wintertime precipitation and
12 wind speed bias is reduced by 22% and 40% respectively.

13

14 **3.2 Evaluation of the reference simulation (REF)**

15 Mean modeled daily surface ozone and the daily maximum of 8-hour running means (MD8hr)
16 are compared against surface measurements in urban, suburban and rural stations (Fig. 3a). The
17 results presented are averaged over the ozone period (April-August). We also use odd oxygen
18 $O_x = O_3 + NO_2 - 0.1 * NO_x$ (Sadanaga et al., 2008) as an indicator of the efficiency of the model to
19 represent photochemical ozone build-up. Contrary to O₃, the concentration of O_x is conserved
20 during the fast reaction of ozone titration by NO and is therefore, a useful metric for the
21 evaluation of the photochemical ozone build-up by ruling out titration near high NO_x sources
22 (Vautard et al., 2007).

23 The model performs well in the urban areas capturing the mean daytime ozone levels (bias
24 +1.8ppb) while O_x is also accurately represented with an underestimation of only 4.1%,
25 illustrating the efficiency of the model to reproduce both daytime formation and titration of
26 urban ozone. The bias in daytime average is smaller and less than 1ppb. The O_x bias in daily
27 averages is similar to the daytime one, suggesting underestimation of nighttime titration. This is
28 consistent with other studies using CHIMERE (Szopa et al., 2009; Van Loon et al., 2007;
29 Vautard et al., 2007). Model benchmark ratings show a high skill score (0.78) while MNB and
30 MNGE are +20.6 and 38.9 respectively.

1 We observe an overestimation of mean daytime suburban ozone (+5ppb). The small bias in O_x
2 (+0.6ppb) suggests that the problem stems from the representation of local titration and more
3 specifically daytime titration; the daily average ozone bias drops to +3.9ppb while O_x is
4 accurately represented in this case (-0.2ppb). Suburban stations present the lowest skill score
5 (0.63) compared to urban and rural. Model performance over rural stations is adequate, with an
6 overestimation in mean daily ozone of 8.2% (bias=+2.8ppb) and a good skill score (0.73). The
7 two major downwind locations in the IdF domain which present the lowest biases (less than
8 0.1ppb and 1.1ppb for the south-west and north-east directions respectively). The bias of the
9 daytime average reaches +2.1ppb.

10 Ozone daily maxima in the urban and rural stations are underestimated by 10% (-4.2ppb) and 7%
11 (-3.2ppb) respectively but we consider the magnitude of the underestimation small given the
12 climate framework of the simulation. Daily average ozone is better represented than daily
13 maxima, highlighting model sensitivity to accumulated errors (Valari and Menut, 2008).
14 Modeled peak concentrations are particularly sensitive to temperature compared to the daily
15 averages as shown in Menut et al. (2003). This could also be due to the fact that 4km is still an
16 insufficient model resolution.

17 The evaluation of $PM_{2.5}$ (Fig. 3b) shows a good representation of daily average levels during
18 wintertime where the highest annual concentrations are presented (bias less than $1\mu g/m^3$). In
19 annual basis the bias is also small while a larger underestimation is predicted for the summertime
20 season (bias= $2.8\mu g/m^3$). The latter can be due to underestimation of summertime emission fluxes
21 (resuspension emissions are not considered in our simulations) and underestimation of secondary
22 organic aerosols formation (Hodzic et al., 2010; Markakis et al., 2014; Solazzo et al., 2012). The
23 overestimation in wind and precipitation also contributes to the observed PM underestimation.
24 Wintertime and annual statistics show a high skill score. Interestingly in wintertime and in
25 annual basis the site located in downtown Paris presents the lowest bias ($<0.3\mu g/m^3$). Overall
26 the results indicate that the fine scale setup is able to predict the main patterns of ozone and fine
27 particle pollution in the area.

28

29 **4. Sensitivity cases**

30 **4.1 Sensitivity to climate model driven meteorology (REF vs. ERA05)**

1 This case study estimates the discrepancy between an air-quality model run where regional
2 meteorology is downscaled with WRF from reanalysis data (ERA05) and a simulation where
3 meteorology is downscaled from a global scale climate model (REF). The wet bias in
4 MET_CLIM meteorology is significantly reduced with meteorology from reanalysis data (Sect.
5 3.1). This is expected to have a significant role in the modeled PM concentrations. Another
6 influential factor is the colder bias found in summertime temperature in the MET_ERA05
7 dataset. This could lead to decreased reaction rates, less biogenic emissions and consequently to
8 less ozone. The lower bias in 10m wind speed under MET_ERA05 is bound to increase surface
9 concentrations through reduced dispersion. We also compare the average modeled boundary
10 layer height (PBL) for the summer and winter periods between the two datasets: PBL is reduced
11 by 5% and 12% in summer and winter respectively (not shown) when reanalysis data are used
12 instead of climate model output. This may result in less dilution of emissions and therefore
13 higher surface concentrations for primary emitted species, such as PM and NO_x.

14 Comparing the results of the two air-quality model runs for ozone (Fig. 4a and Table 3) we find
15 only a small sensitivity to using meteorology from a climate model or reanalysis data over all
16 three types of monitor sites ($|\Delta c| \sim 1$ ppb or 3.4%). The small improvement of model performance
17 with the reanalysis dataset (ozone decreases through higher NO_x emissions following the PBL
18 scheme described above) is due to the fact that titration is more realistically represented in
19 ERA05 (the difference is O_x between the two runs is negligible). The response of urban daily
20 maximum values to the meteorological dataset is also negligible ($|\Delta c| = 0.1$ ppb or 0.3%).

21 Wintertime PM_{2.5} concentrations, on the contrary show a large sensitivity to the meteorological
22 dataset. The change in the daily average concentrations is 3.1μg/m³ (17.6%) while summertime
23 levels remain unchanged (Table 3). Focusing on the annual averages, the small underestimation
24 observed in the REF run turns into small overestimation in the ERA05 run ($|\Delta c| = 1.4$ μg/m³ or
25 9.4%). The use of the reanalysis data leads to a strong overestimation of wintertime
26 concentrations (Fig. 4b), which stems directly from the reduction (and improvement) of
27 precipitation by a factor of 2 in the meteorology from reanalysis. This leads to the conclusion
28 that the small bias observed in the REF simulation during wintertime (Fig. 4b) could be due
29 model error compensation such as unrealistically high precipitation and possible inhibition of
30 vertical mixing or overestimation of wintertime emissions. The scores suggest a slight
31 deterioration in model performance when passing from meteorology from a climate model to

1 reanalysis meteorology in both winter and summer but improvement when focusing on the
2 annual statistics.

3 We conclude that using climate model driven meteorology has a small impact on modeled ozone
4 whereas larger sensitivity is observed for wintertime $PM_{2.5}$ levels due to the accuracy of modeled
5 precipitation.

6

7 **4.2 Sensitivity to the resolution of the meteorological input (ERA01 vs. ERA05)**

8 Here we model the sensitivity of modeled ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations to the resolution of the
9 meteorological input (Fig. 5 and Table 3). Daily average ozone shows a very weak response over
10 urban and rural sites ($|\Delta c| < 0.4$ ppb or $< 0.8\%$) and daily urban maxima improve slightly with the
11 ERA01 run ($|\Delta c| = 0.4$ ppb or 1%). At the suburban area the impact, though small ($|\Delta c| = 1.4$ ppb or
12 4.3%), is definitely higher than over urban or rural sites. O_x change at the suburban area (not
13 shown) is much weaker compared to ozone ($|\Delta c| \sim 0.5$ ppb or 1.2%) showing that the increase in
14 the resolution of meteorology has an impact on the representation of ozone titration leading to
15 improved model performance. The skill score over suburban sites increases by 9% while NMB
16 improves by 22% from 26.1 in ERA05 to 20.3 in ERA01. Interestingly, the response of suburban
17 ozone to the resolution of the meteorological input is the strongest modeled sensitivity for this
18 variable amongst all studied cases.

19 Weak sensitivities are modeled for $PM_{2.5}$ (Table 3) during summertime ($|\Delta c| = 0.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 3.4%)
20 and on annual basis ($|\Delta c| = 0.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 4%), but stronger during the winter season ($|\Delta c| = 1.3$
21 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 6.8%). In fact, wintertime statistics suggest that model bias actually increases with the
22 refinement of the meteorological grid as a consequence of the reduced modeled precipitation
23 (less scavenging), and PBL by 20% (weaker dispersion) in MET_ERA01 compared to the
24 climate model driven meteorology (Sect. 3.1). Again, this points to the same error compensation
25 scheme described in the REF vs. ERA05 comparison (Sect. 4.1).

26 We conclude that the resolution of the meteorological input has a small impact on modeled
27 ozone while moderate sensitivity is observed for suburban ozone and wintertime $PM_{2.5}$. Never
28 the less this result could reflect the local area's characteristics (flat terrain, situated away from
29 the coast) confirming previous studies (Menut et al., 2005; Valari and Menut, 2008). In regions
30 with more complex topography or close to the coast the resolution of the meteorological input
31 could have a profound effect on the simulated meteorological conditions (Leroyer et al., 2014).

1 We note here that the refinement in the resolution of the meteorological model from 0.5° to 0.1°
2 may not be sufficient for the CTM to simulate noticeable concentration responses. For example
3 Leroyer et al. (2014) (see also references therein) observed that substantial changes in vertical
4 and horizontal transport in an urban environment occurred mostly in the transition from
5 resolutions of 2.5km to 1km and even higher (250m).

6

7 **4.3 Sensitivity to the resolution of the CTM's vertical grid (REF vs. VERT)**

8 This study addresses the impact of the resolution of the CTM's vertical mesh and more
9 specifically of the thickness of the first CTM layer, on modeled ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations
10 (Fig. 6). Mean daily ozone is practically insensitive to the refinement of the vertical mesh at the
11 urban, suburban and rural areas (Table 3). Similarly, maximum ozone at the urban area changes
12 by only 0.5ppb (1.4%) with increased bias in the VERT run. Changes in summertime and annual
13 modeled $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are also small, while the wintertime daily average shows some
14 weak sensitivity ($|\Delta c|=0.5\mu g/m^3$ or 2.2%). Scores are hardly affected.

15 Interestingly, the impact of the refinement of the vertical grid on daily averaged O_x is much
16 stronger than on ozone: O_x , changes by 0.9ppb in the urban and suburban areas. The change in O_x
17 is reasonable since in VERT, NO_x emissions are released within a surface layer thinner by 60%
18 compared to REF (from 20m to 8m) leading to higher NO_x concentrations. That should normally
19 affect titration which is the driver of urban ozone concentrations. The fact that ozone remains
20 insensitive to the change in NO_x concentrations suggests that some other modeled processes
21 counteracts titration. To further investigate this issue we study the change in dynamical processes
22 such as vertical mixing and dry deposition. We extract the vertical diffusion coefficient K_z (m^2/s)
23 and dry deposition rates (g/m^3) for ozone, NO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ for all grid cells that include an urban
24 monitor site and look how modeled sensitivities change as a function of these parameters (Fig.7).
25 NO_2 concentrations increase with the refinement of the first vertical layer of the CTM for all
26 vertical mixing conditions (Fig. 7a). However it is only under low vertical mixing ($1 < K_z < 5$
27 m^2/s) that ozone sensitivity becomes positive (Fig. 7b). Under stronger turbulence ($K_z > 5$ m^2/s),
28 the 12-layer setup leads to higher first-layer NO_2 concentrations (stronger titration) leading to
29 negative values for ozone sensitivity (such conditions account for the 93% of the simulated
30 period). On the other hand the refinement of the vertical mesh primarily affects NO_2 deposition
31 rates which accelerate by 14.3% but leaving ozone deposition rates unaffected. We may assume

1 that under low mixing conditions, the increased deposition rate of NO_2 slows down the increase
2 in NO_2 concentration due to the emission effect and dynamical processes become more
3 influential than titration. As a result the surface layer is enriched in ozone by getting mixed with
4 air from higher atmospheric layers (Menut et al., 2013b).

5 For almost the entire K_z range, $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations increase with VERT (Fig. 7c). This is due to
6 the fact that emissions are released in smaller volumes as discussed above. On the other hand,
7 here too, the refinement of the vertical resolution of the CTM, enhances deposition rate. These
8 two conflicting effects explain the small impact of the CTM's vertical resolution on $\text{PM}_{2.5}$
9 concentrations.

10 We conclude that both ozone and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ sensitivities to the refinement of the vertical mesh are
11 small. Our analysis suggests that in both cases this is the result of two competing processes,
12 either titration against vertical mixing (ozone) or emission versus deposition ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$). Although
13 in the Ile-de-France area (low topography) the overall effect is insignificant, it may not be the
14 case in other regions with more complex topography.

15

16 **4.4 Sensitivity to the annual emission totals (REF vs. ANN)**

17 This case study compares modeled concentrations between two runs where annual emission
18 totals stem from either the AIRPARIF inventory (REF) or the ECPLISE dataset (ANN). Changes
19 in modeled urban daily average ozone concentrations are small ($|\Delta c|=0.8\text{ppb}$ or 2.5%) with the
20 regional inventory (ECLIPSE) to tend to increase the bias of the REF run (Fig.8a and Table 3).
21 This is due to the fact that when passing from the AIRPARIF to the ECLIPSE inventory (see
22 also Fig. 2) NO_x emissions decrease (weakening titration) and NMVOCs increase (intensifying
23 production). This is also seen in the weaker sensitivity of O_x (0.4ppb or 1%) suggesting that the
24 main reason for the improvement brought about by the use of the local inventory (REF run) is
25 due to a better representation of the ozone titration process. At the suburban area, the sensitivity
26 is larger ($|\Delta c|= 1.1\text{ppb}$ or 3.2%) and of the same order of magnitude as the sensitivities to climate
27 model driven meteorology and to the resolution of the meteorological input. The weaker change
28 in suburban O_x ($|\Delta c|=0.1\text{ppb}$ or 0.3%) suggests that this area benefits more than the urban area
29 from the improvement in the titration process. The skill score associated to the REF run is also
30 higher by 8% (Fig. 8a). Changes in daytime averages at both urban and suburban areas are
31 similar to those in the daily averages suggesting that modeled sensitivity stems mainly from

1 daytime titration. Rural ozone is practically unaffected ($|\Delta c| = 0.3 \text{ ppb}$ or 1%). It is noteworthy
2 that the absolute change in modeled ozone concentrations is in the order of 1 ppb or less despite
3 the large differences in ozone precursors' emissions between the local and the regional
4 inventory.

5 Changes in the daily average fine particle concentrations in summertime, wintertime and in the
6 annual basis are much stronger than ozone ($|\Delta c| = 4.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 33%, $6.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 33.8% and
7 $5.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 31.9% respectively). $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations modeled with the ANN run are
8 significantly higher than those modeled with the REF run (Fig. 8b). Wintertime bias in ANN
9 reaches $+5.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ showing that fine particle emissions from the ECLIPSE inventory are
10 overestimated (see also Fig. 2). The main source of primary wintertime $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ emissions over the
11 IdF region as well as in Paris in the ANN run is wood burning (see discussion in Sect. 2.4),
12 which is unrealistic for a city like Paris and stems directly from the use of the population proxy
13 to spatially allocate national totals over the finer scale. This is consistent to the fact that the
14 summertime bias in the ANN run is much lower ($+1.4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). In fact, in this case the ANN bias
15 is even smaller than the REF bias ($-2.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) enhancing our hypothesis that summertime fine
16 particle emissions in the AIRPARIF inventory are underestimated (see also Sect. 2.1). The skill
17 score in REF is higher than in ANN in wintertime and lower in summertime.

18 We conclude that ozone sensitivity to the annual emission totals is low but strong for fine
19 particles.

20

21 **4.5 Sensitivity to emission post-processing (ANN vs. POST)**

22 Here we use identical annual totals but two different methods for their vertical and temporal
23 allocation to obtain hourly fluxes over the 4km-resolution domain as well as different matrices
24 for their chemical speciation. The ANN dataset uses the AIRPARIF bottom-up approach
25 whereas the EMEP methodology is applied to the POST dataset. To compile the ANN inventory
26 we had to extract the post-processing coefficients of the bottom-up inventory and apply them on
27 the ECLIPSE annual totals. This procedure though was not emission source-sector oriented and
28 this inconsistency definitely affects model results. On the other hand the post-treatment of the
29 (sectoral) raw emissions in large-scale applications are typically based on sectoral coefficients
30 that don't link back to the same quantified emissions either. For example in the regional
31 application used this study (REG) the sectoral ECLIPSE raw emissions quantified in SNAP level

1 are treated with the respective sectoral coefficients that stems from the EMEP inventory having a
2 very different synthesis of sub-SNAP sources from that of ECLIPSE. Therefore when we
3 compare ANN with POST we consider that what we observe is the bias of this inconsistency in
4 regional modeling. The question raised is: what is the benefit of adopting a bottom-up post-
5 processing for regional scale air-quality modeling?.

6 The effect on ozone concentrations over the urban area is considered moderate ($|\Delta c|=1.9\text{ppb}$ or
7 6.4%) (Fig. 9a and Table 3). Model bias is reduced from +4.5ppb in POST to +2.6ppb in ANN.
8 Ozone sensitivity in this case, is twice as high as the sensitivity to climate model driven
9 meteorology and even higher compared to the impact of annual totals. The ANN simulation is
10 able to increase the skill score by 14% and reduce MNB by 26%. The low O_x sensitivity suggests
11 that discrepancies are mainly due to a better representation of ozone titration. Suburban and rural
12 ozone is practically insensitive to the post-processing technique. Even if emission totals are
13 identical between the two configurations, ozone concentrations over the urban area are lower in
14 the ANN run than in the POST run because ANN has more ground-layer NO_x emissions than
15 POST enhancing ozone titration. This stems from the fact that the annual emission totals are
16 allocated in the CTM's vertical layers very differently. Following the AIRPARIF post-
17 processing (ANN) all urban emissions are released in the surface layer because according to the
18 local point source emission database no major industrial units are found within the urban area.
19 On the contrary, the regional scale post-processing (POST) does not resolve the urban from the
20 suburban and rural areas, where industrial zones are located and assigns only 70% of the total
21 NO_x emissions over Paris in the first model layer.

22 Another important piece of information is the diurnal variation of emissions. Although the time
23 scale of a climate forced run largely exceeds the hourly basis we aim to illustrate how important
24 the choice of the diurnal patterns can be to the final modeled concentrations. Fig. 10a shows the
25 average diurnal variation of modeled and observed urban ozone for ANN and POST (for the
26 modeled fields we use the grid cells of the monitoring sites). The two downscaling approaches
27 compared here, apply different diurnal profiles on emissions to provide hourly fluxes. Between
28 10:00LT and 15:00LT, ANN underestimates ozone concentrations due to too much NO
29 emissions, enhancing titration and this is maximized in the local peak (15:00LT) where NO
30 concentrations are overestimated by a factor of 2 (not shown). The daily maximum concentration
31 shows the highest sensitivity in the emission post-treatment among all the presented cases

1 ($|\Delta c|=2.2\text{ppb}$). This is consistent with Menut et al. (2003) who also found that the afternoon peak
2 concentrations at a typical summertime episode in Paris are very sensitive to the NO emissions
3 change. In the evening (after 15:00LT) ANN deviates from the observations faster than POST
4 because the afternoon peak in traffic emissions is more pronounced in the AIRPARIF diurnal
5 profile compared to that used in the ECLIPSE processing which represents an average situation
6 of anthropogenic sources hence a smoother variation. These results indicate that the diurnal
7 variability of modeled ozone over the urban area is very sensitive to the choice of the diurnal
8 profile. But in the climate concept where hourly values are timely too short to take into account,
9 the sensitivity is considered moderate as seen in Table 3.

10 Modeled $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ sensitivity is significant for both summer and wintertime ($|\Delta c|=3.4\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or
11 24.8% and $4.6\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 18.3% respectively) (Table 3). POST wintertime bias is almost two times
12 higher than ANN (Fig. 9b). This is because the coarse resolution annual post-processing
13 coefficients weight towards allocating more of the annual emissions into the winter period
14 significantly influenced by the residential sector emissions which are overstated in the ECLIPSE
15 inventory. A late afternoon peak is modeled with ANN accounting for the traffic emissions,
16 whereas $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ evening levels modeled with the POST run (after 20:00LT) are related to the
17 residential heating activity (Fig. 10b).

18 What we can conclude is that in a climate forced – air quality framework the model response for
19 daily average ozone by 6.2% is rather small considering the significant differences that the two
20 post-processing approaches prescribe for the vertical distribution of emissions and their diurnal
21 variation. Fine particle concentrations are much more sensitive to the applied emission post-
22 processing technique. We note here, that recent work has pointed out that the sensitivity of
23 modeled concentrations the spatiotemporal resolution of the emission inventory is model-
24 dependent (Makar et al., 2014).

25

26 **4.6 Sensitivity to the emission inventory resolution (POST vs. AVER)**

27 Here, we quantify the effect of the resolution of the emission input. Results show that in the
28 urban areas this sensitivity is the most influential amongst all tests presented in this paper with
29 ozone changes reaching 2.8ppb or 8.3% (Fig. 11a). The change in daily average O_x is smaller but
30 comparable ($|\Delta c|=1.2\text{ppb}$ or 2.9%) suggesting that ozone titration is not the only model process
31 that is affected by the increase in the resolution of the emission dataset. The skill score and MNB

1 improve significantly in the POST run (Table 3). Ozone precursors' emissions from urban
2 sources are mixed with the lower emissions from the surrounding suburban and rural areas inside
3 the large cells of the coarse mesh-grid (AVER). This leads to lower titration rates and therefore,
4 higher ozone levels. Therefore the increase in the resolution of the emission input leads to a
5 reduced positive bias from +7.3ppb (AVER) to +4.5ppb (POST). AVER overestimates ozone
6 peaks by 0.8ppb while POST underestimates them by -1.2ppb. The sensitivity of ozone
7 concentration at the hour of the afternoon peak is linked to NO_x concentration at the same hour,
8 which reaches a local maximum due to the evening rush hour (see also Sect. 4.5). Suburban and
9 rural ozone is less sensitive than urban ($|\Delta c|=0.7\text{ppb}$), with scores practically unchanged (Table
10 3).

11 Fine particle concentrations are also very sensitive to the resolution of the emission input,
12 especially in wintertime ($|\Delta c|=7.1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ or 30%), with higher concentrations modeled with the
13 refined emission inventory in POST (Table 3). Similarly to ozone this is because in the coarser
14 inventory represented here by AVER, emissions in the high emitting areas in the city are
15 smoothed down and diluted when averaged with emissions of the less polluted outer areas.

16 We conclude that the resolution of the emission input is the most influential factor from all the
17 studied cases, even more than model resolution itself. PM_{2.5} showed higher sensitivity than
18 ozone concentrations. The non-linear nature of ozone chemistry suggests that it is important for
19 the ozone precursor emissions to be concentrated correctly to the high emitting areas such as the
20 urban centres.

21

22 **4.7 Sensitivity to model horizontal resolution (AVER vs. REG)**

23 Here, we study the sensitivity of ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations to the CTM's horizontal
24 resolution. We compare the simulations of two different spatial resolutions, the AVER run
25 (averaged over the grid-cells of the coarser grid) and the REG simulation on a grid of 0.5°
26 resolution (Fig. 12). REG, models higher ozone concentrations than AVER over the urban area
27 ($|\Delta c|=1.7\text{ppb}$ or 4.7%). As discussed above, NO_x emissions in the REG simulation are lower than
28 in REF due to dilution in the coarser grid cells leading to lower ozone titration rates. Suburban
29 and rural ozone has low sensitivity to model resolution ($|\Delta c|=0.5\text{ppb}$ or 1.4% and 0.2ppb or 0.5%
30 respectively) because photochemical build-up occurs at larger time and space scales compared to
31 titration and the refinement of the model grid does not increase performance. This confirms the

1 results in Markakis et al. (2014). The effect on modeled $PM_{2.5}$ is very small with concentrations
2 slightly higher over the finer mesh grid as a result of the lower primary emissions in REG.
3 We may conclude that the benefit of increasing the CTM's resolution is insignificant for both
4 ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ especially taking into account the large refinement attempted here (0.5° to
5 4km).

6

7 **5 Sources of error in regional climate forced atmospheric composition** 8 **modeling**

9 In this paper we utilize simulations at two spatial scales: at urban scale over a grid of 4km
10 resolution using the AIRPARIF bottom-up inventory of anthropogenic emissions (REF) and a
11 regional scale run at 0.5° resolution where emissions stem from the ECLIPSE top-down
12 inventory (REG). Both realizations implement identical climate driven meteorology (at 0.44°
13 resolution) and an 8-layer vertical mesh therefore are susceptible to the same sources of error due
14 to climate model driven meteorology, the resolution of the meteorological input and the
15 resolution of the CTM's vertical grid. However the remaining biases presented in Table 3 over
16 urban areas e.g., the emissions resolution, the model horizontal resolution, the annual quantified
17 fluxes and the post-processing method concern mainly the REG run. As regards ozone REG has
18 a positive bias of 9ppb over the city of Paris while the bias of REF is only +1.8ppb (Fig. 13a).
19 The question we raise is “what are the main sources of uncertainty in regional scale climate
20 driven air-quality simulations and how these could be eliminated or at least reduced?”.

21 With this study we are able to identify the source of the excess of $|\Delta c|=7.2$ ppb of ozone modeled
22 with the REG run compared to REF (Table 4); 26.4% ($|\Delta c|=1.9$ ppb) is related to the post-
23 processing of the annual emissions totals which are based on the EMEP factors, 11.1%
24 ($|\Delta c|=0.8$ ppb) to the annual emission totals in the ECLIPSE inventory, 23.6% ($|\Delta c|=1.7$ ppb) to
25 coarse model resolution and 38.9% ($|\Delta c|=2.8$ ppb) to the coarse resolution of the ECLIPSE
26 emission inventory.

27 Considering the discrepancies in the inventorying methodologies used to compile the ECLIPSE
28 and the AIRPARIF datasets (top-down vs. bottom-up), it is very interesting that the least
29 influential factor to the urban ozone response is the annual emissions totals. It seems that the
30 regional simulation would not benefit much from the integration of the local annual totals alone
31 but a more important gain would stem from the application of the AIRPARIF post-processing

1 methodology. The added value from both these factors would reduce the positive bias of REG by
2 2.7ppb. Even largest improvement comes through the better spatial representation of ozone
3 precursors emissions in the local emission inventory ($|\Delta c|=2.8\text{ppb}$) leading to more faithful
4 titration process; O_x levels are very close in REF and REG (Fig. 13a). It could therefore argued
5 that without increasing model resolution of which the gain would reach only 1.7ppb, the REG
6 simulation would benefit significantly by simply integrating the aforementioned local scale
7 information.

8 The difference in modeled ozone between REF and REG is much smaller over the suburban area
9 ($|\Delta c|=2.4\text{ppb}$) and the most influential factor to this difference is the annual emission totals
10 covering 45.8% of this difference. Finally as regards ozone one important result of this study is
11 that in the climate-air quality framework modeled concentrations from a coarse resolution run,
12 well agree with the much more intensive (in terms of computational time) fine resolution run and
13 the bias is considered of small magnitude (Fig. 13a). This is because the formation of rural ozone
14 is a slower process than in urban areas and comparable to the characteristic transport time of
15 precursor's pollutants to the coarse grid cell.

16 Focusing on the wintertime $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations where the largest annual levels are observed,
17 these are better simulated with the REF run with a bias of $-0.8\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and a high skill score of
18 0.78 compared to a strong positive bias of $+3.6\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and a skill score of 0.68 with the REG run
19 (Fig. 13b). We should remind here that both runs suffer from a strong wet bias reducing
20 significantly $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations (see also Sect. 3.1). Contrary to ozone, where information
21 from the local scale improves in all cases model performance, the resolution of the emission
22 inventory seems to deteriorate the modeling performance of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ with increase in the bias by
23 $7.1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. This only means that if the emission totals from ECLIPSE are used over Paris in the
24 coarse REG application then refining the resolution will only accumulate additional emissions in
25 the city augmenting the modeled concentrations. The remaining features have also a positive
26 effect; model resolution reduces the bias by $0.4\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, annual emission totals by $6.6\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and
27 post-processing of the annual totals by $4.5\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. This essentially means that the regional
28 realization cannot selectively incorporate any combination of local-scale features in order to
29 improve performance as in the case of ozone. But the results indicate that by simply integrating a
30 bottom-up post-processing technique would result in an overall bias of the regional application
31 of $-0.9\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

1

2 **6 Conclusions**

3 In the present paper we assess the sensitivity of ozone and fine particle concentrations with
4 respect to emission and meteorological input with a 10yr long climate forced atmospheric
5 composition simulation at fine resolution over the city of Paris.

6 As a general observation our study shows that overall ozone response is considered low to
7 moderate while PM_{2.5} concentrations were generally very sensitive for the presented cases. The
8 largest sensitivity in modeling the average daily ozone concentrations was observed in the urban
9 areas primarily due to the resolution of the emission inventory ($|\Delta c|=2.8\text{ppb}$ or 8.3%) and
10 secondly to the post-processing methodology applied on the annual emission totals ($|\Delta c|=1.9\text{ppb}$
11 or 6.2%). These sensitivities are attributed to changes in the titration process. When post-
12 processing coefficients were derived from the bottom-up AIRPARIF inventory instead of EMEP,
13 too much ozone titration takes place at the hour of the ozone peak and the sensitivity of daily
14 maximum reached its highest value among all the studied cases ($|\Delta c|=2.2\text{ppb}$ or 5.8%). It is
15 interesting that despite the fact that ozone precursor's emissions are very different between the
16 bottom-up and the top-down inventories, ozone sensitivity to the annual totals was shown to be
17 very small ($|\Delta c|=0.8\text{ppb}$ or 2.5%). Also modeled ozone is fairly insensitive to the use of climate
18 model or reanalysis meteorology. Finally all cases of suburban and rural ozone both for average
19 and maximum concentrations showed a sensitivity of less than 5%.

20 Regarding PM_{2.5} concentrations, amongst all the presented factors, the emissions related were
21 those shown to be the most influential. The corresponding sensitivity to the use of annual
22 emission totals from a top-down and a bottom-up inventory reached 33% in summer, 33.8% in
23 winter and 31.9% for the daily average concentrations. This is connected to the downscaling
24 methodology applied in the regional-scale totals of the ECLIPSE inventory; using population as
25 proxy for their spatial allocation, leads to overestimation of particle emissions from wood-
26 burning over the Paris area. Large sensitivity was also shown due to the resolution of the
27 emission inventory (20.3% in the summer, 30% in the winter and 24.2% in annual basis) because
28 the coarser inventory smoothens the sharp emission gradients over the urban area leading to less
29 primary emissions. Fine particle concentrations were also sensitive to the applied emission post-
30 processing technique (22.1% in summer and 16.7% in winter). Only wintertime PM_{2.5}
31 concentrations were significantly affected by the meteorological related sensitivities; by 17.6%

1 due to the use of meteorology from reanalysis instead of climate (mainly because the prescribed
2 changes in modeled precipitation) and by 6.8% due to refinement of the meteorological grid.

3 Both ozone and PM_{2.5} are little sensitive to the CTM's vertical resolution (changes of less than
4 2.2%). Nevertheless we provide evidence that this low sensitivity may be the result of
5 counteracting factors such as ozone titration, dry deposition and vertical mixing, too much
6 dependent on local topography to be able to generalize for other regions. We also note the weak
7 sensitivity of modeled concentrations to the increase in the CTM's and the meteorological
8 model's horizontal resolution at least for the area and the range of resolutions studied here.

9 Excluding the sensitivities having the smallest impact (roughly less than 2%, see Table 3) we
10 observe a very consistent trend in ozone concentration: daily average and maximum ozone
11 decrease as input data become more refined, namely passing from climate meteorology to
12 reanalysis, increasing the resolutions of the horizontal and vertical CTM grid, of meteorology, of
13 emissions and by using bottom-up emissions and post-processing instead of top-down. This
14 decrease in ozone concentrations, from 2.5% up to 8.3%, is observed mainly in the urban and
15 suburban areas and in all cases stems from enhanced NO_x emission fluxes in the surface-layer
16 leading to titration inhibition. Trends and the underlying changes in emissions are highly variable
17 for PM_{2.5} with increase in concentrations that may be as low as 2% or as high as 30% for climate
18 meteorology and resolution of the vertical mesh and also cases where concentration decreases in
19 a wide range of values from 3% up to 34% (annual emissions, model resolution) depending on
20 the season.

21 To fill the gap between regional and city-scale assessments we have to combine in a single
22 application the advantages of regional and local scale applications; the low resolution (but high
23 spatial coverage) from one hand and the good representation of emissions (but limited area of
24 coverage) on the other. The results of this study move towards that goal and can be used in order
25 to identify the main sources of error in regional scale climate forced air-quality modeling over
26 the urban areas. These biases could be taken into account in policy relevant assessments.

27 The difference in modeled daily average ozone between the local and regional application over
28 the urban areas ($|\Delta c|=7.2\text{ppb}$) is attributed to several sources of error: 38.9% is related to the
29 resolution of the emission inventory, 26.4% stems from the post-processing of national annual
30 emission totals, 23.6% is due to model resolution (4km or 0.5°) and 11.1% is associated to the
31 annual emissions used as starting point for the compilation of the anthropogenic emission

1 dataset. Although the greatest benefit in the regional-scale modeling seems to come through the
2 increase in the resolution of the emission inventory, simpler actions may be also meaningful,
3 such as the integration of the locally developed annual totals and the downscaling coefficients
4 derived from the existing bottom-up modeling systems which combined could reduce the bias of
5 the regional application by 37.5%. We note here that $PM_{2.5}$ levels in the urban regions are likely
6 mostly controlled by primary emissions; increasing the emissions inventory resolution will
7 concentrate the $PM_{2.5}$ emissions into a smaller spatial extent of the urban area (the reverse side of
8 the artificial dilution issue taking place at coarse resolution); if the emissions totals are
9 themselves biased high, then the resulting error will only become apparent at higher resolution.
10 Therefore, the emissions resolution may be showing that the emissions totals are too high, and
11 this only becomes apparent at high resolutions.

12 As regards $PM_{2.5}$ modeling our study shows that the regional realization cannot selectively
13 incorporate any combination of local-scale features in order to improve performance as in the
14 case of ozone. The simulation at regional scale (REG) predicts an excess of $3.6\mu g/m^3$ during
15 wintertime compared to the fine scale simulation (REF) showing a bias of $-0.8\mu g/m^3$ and this is
16 attributed to the allocation of wood-burning emissions over the Paris area. Therefore, the most
17 influential factor for $PM_{2.5}$ modeling is the resolution of the emission input (REG-
18 REF= $+7.1\mu g/m^3$). But the implementation of the refined emission resolution of the local
19 inventory alone would not benefit the regional simulation (which would increase the overall bias
20 to $10.7\mu g/m^3$), neither the implementation of the annual emissions of the bottom-up inventory
21 alone (REG-REF= $-6.6\mu g/m^3$) which would generate an overall negative bias of $3\mu g/m^3$. A
22 simpler action would be to integrate the post-processing bottom-up technique (REG-REF=
23 $-4.5\mu g/m^3$) giving an overall bias in REG of $-0.9\mu g/m^3$.

24

25 **Acknowledgements**

26 This work is supported by the ERA-ENVHEALTH project (grand agreement n° 219337), co-
27 funded by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme. The authors would
28 also like to acknowledge Laurent Menut (LMD/Institute Pierre-Simon Laplace) and Augustin
29 Colette (INERIS) for their insightful comments that helped improve this manuscript.

30

31 **References**

1 AIRPARIF, Evaluation Prospective des emissions et des concentrations des polluants atmospheriques a
2 l'horizon 2020 en Ile-De-France – Gain sur les emissions en 2015. Report available at
3 http://www.airparif.asso.fr/_pdf/publications/ppa-rapport-121119.pdf, 2012.

4 Amann, M., Bertok, I., Borken-Kleefeld, J., Cofala, J., Heyes, C., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Klimont, Z.,
5 Nguyen, B., Posch, M., Rafaj, P., Sandler, R., Schöpp, W., Wagner, F., and Winiwarter, W.: Cost-
6 effective control of air quality and greenhouse gases in Europe: Modeling and policy applications,
7 *Environ. Model. Software*, 26, 1489-1501, 2011.

8 Arunachalam, S., Holland, A., Do, B., and Abraczinskas, M.: A quantitative assessment of the influence
9 of grid resolution on predictions of future year air quality in North Carolina, USA, *Atmos. Environ.*, 40,
10 5010-5026, 2006.

11 Beekmann, M., and Derognat, C.: Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis of a regional-scale transport
12 chemistry model constrained by measurements from the Atmospheric Pollution Over the Paris Area
13 (ESQUIF) campaign, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D17), 8559, doi:10.1029/2003JD003391, 2003.

14 Beekmann, M., and Vautard, R.: A modeling study of photochemical regimes over Europe: robustness
15 and variability, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 10067-10084, 2010.

16 Bessagnet B., Seigneur, C., and Menut, L.: Impact of dry deposition of semi-volatile organic compounds
17 on secondary organic aerosols, *Atmos. Environ.*, 44, 1781–1787, 2010.

18 Brasseur, G. P., Jeffrey, T. K., Muller, J.-F., Schneider, T., Granier, C., Tie, X., and Hauglustaine, D.:
19 Past and future changes in global tropospheric ozone: impact and radiative forcing, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*,
20 25, 3807–3810, 1998.

21 Cohan, D.S., Hu, Y., and Russell, A.G.: Dependence of ozone sensitivity analysis on grid resolution,
22 *Atmos. Environ.*, 40, 126–135, 2006.

23 Colette, A., Granier, C., Hodnebrog, O., Jakobs, H., Maurizi, A., Nyiri, A., Rao, S., Amann, M.,
24 Bessagnet, B., D'Angiola, A., Gauss, M., Heyes, C., Klimont, Z., and Meleux, F.: Future air quality in
25 Europe: a multi-model assessment of projected exposure to ozone, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 10613-
26 10630, 2012.

27 Colette, A., Bessagnet, B., Vautard, R., Szopa, S., Rao, S., Schucht, S., Klimont, Z., Menut, L., Clain, G.,
28 Meleux, F., Curci, G., and Rouïl, L.: European atmosphere in 2050, a regional air quality and climate
29 perspective under CMIP5 scenarios, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 7451–7471, doi:10.5194/acp-13-7451-
30 2013, 2013.

31 Clarke, L., J. Edmonds, H. Jacoby, H. Pitcher, Reilly, R., and R. Richels.: Scenarios of Greenhouse Gas
32 Emissions and Atmospheric Concentrations. Sub-report 2.1A of Synthesis and Assessment Product 2.1 by
33 the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research.

1 Department of Energy, Office of Biological & Environmental Research, Washington, 7 DC., USA, pp.
2 154, 2007.

3 Deguillaume, L., Beekmann, M., and Derognat, C.: Uncertainty evaluation of ozone production and its
4 sensitivity to emission changes over the Ile-de-France region during summer periods, *J. Geophys. Res.*,
5 113, D02304, doi:10.1029/2007JD009081, 2008.

6 Dufresne, J.-L., Foujols, M.-A., Denvil, S., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Aumont, O., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S.,
7 Bellenger, H., Benshila, R., Bony, S., Bopp, L., Braconnot, P., Brockmann, P., Cadule, P., Cheruy, F.,
8 Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., de Noblet, N., Duvel, J.-P. Ethé, C., Fairhead, L., Fichefet, T., Flavoni,
9 S., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E., Hauglustaine, D., Hourdin, F., Idelkadi,
10 A., Ghattas, J., Joussaume, S., Kageyama, M., Krinner, G., Labetoulle, S., Lahellec, A., Lefebvre, M.-P.,
11 Lefevre, F., Levy, C., Li, Z. X., Lloyd, J., Lott, J., Madec, G., Mancip, M., Marchand, M., Masson, S.,
12 Meurdesoif, Y., Mignot, J., Musat, I., Parouty, S., Polcher, J., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D.,
13 Szopa, S., Talandier, C., Terray, P., Viovy, N., and Vuichard, N.: Climate change projections using the
14 IPSL-CM5 Earth System Model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5, *Clim. Dynam.*, 40, 2123–2165, 2013.

15 EEA Technical Report, Towards integrated assessment of air quality and climate policies, in review,
16 2014.

17 EPA, Guidance on the Use of Models and Other Analyses for Demonstrating Attainment of Air Quality
18 Goals for Ozone, PM_{2.5} and Regional Haze. EPA -454/B-07-002, April, 2007.

19 Fiore, A.M., Naik, V., Spracklen, D.V., Steiner, A., Unger, N., Prather, M., Bergmann, D., Cameron-
20 Smith, P.J., Cionni, I., Collins, W.J., Dalsøren, S., Eyring, V., Folberth, G.A., Ginoux, P., Horowitz,
21 L.W., Josse, B., Lamarque, J.-F., MacKenzie, I.A., Nagashima, T., O'Connor, F.O., Righi, M., Rumbold,
22 S.T., Shindell, D.T., Skeie, R.B., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Takemura, T., and Zeng, G.: Global air quality and
23 climate, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 41, 6663-6683, 2012.

24 Flagg D.D., and Taylor, P.A.: Sensitivity of mesoscale model urban boundary layer meteorology to the
25 scale of urban representation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 2951-2972, 2011.

26 Forkel, R., and Knoche, R.: Regional climate change and its impact on photo-oxidant concentrations in
27 southern Germany: Simulations with a coupled regional climate–chemistry model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111,
28 D12302, doi:10.1029/2005JD006748, 2006.

29 Forkel, R., and Knoche, R.: Nested regional climate–chemistry simulations for central Europe, *CR*
30 *Geosci.*, 339, 734-746, 2007.

31 Gilliland, A.B., Dennis, R.L., Roselle, S.J., and Pierce, T.E.: Seasonal NH₃ emission estimates for the
32 eastern United States based on ammonium wet concentrations and an inverse modeling method, *J.*
33 *Geophys. Res.*, 108(D15), 4477, doi:10.1029/2002JD003063, 2003.

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

4 Hauglustaine, D. A., Hourdin, F., Jourdain, L., Filiberti, M.-A., Walters, S, Lamarque, J.F., and Holland,
5 E.A.: Interactive chemistry in the Laboratoire de Meteorologie Dynamique general circulation model:
6 Description and background tropospheric chemistry evaluation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 190, D04314,
7 doi:10.1029/2003JD003957, 2004.

8 Hauglustaine, D.A., Balkanski, Y., and Schulz, M.: A global model simulation of present and future
9 nitrate aerosols and their direct radiative forcing of climate, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 6863-6949, 2014.

10 Hodzic, A., Jimenez, J.L., Madronich, S., Canagaratna, M.R., DeCarlo, P.F., Kleinman, L., and Fast, J.:
11 Modeling organic aerosols in a megacity: potential contribution of semi-volatile and intermediate
12 volatility primary organic compounds to secondary organic aerosol formation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10,
13 5491-5514, 2010.

14 Hogrefe, C., Lynn, B., Civerolo, K., Ku, J.-Y., Rosenthal, J., Rosenzweig, C., Goldberg, R., Gaffin, S.,
15 Knowlton, K., and Kinney, P.L.: Simulating changes in regional air pollution over the eastern United
16 States due to changes in global and regional climate and emissions. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D22301,
17 doi:10.1029/2004JD004690, 2004.

18 Im, U., Markakis, K., Poupkou, A., Melas, D., Unal, A., Gerasopoulos, E., Daskalakis, N., Kindap, T.,
19 and Kanakidou, M.: The impact of temperature changes on summer time ozone and its precursors in the
20 Eastern Mediterranean, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3847–3864, 2011.

21 Im, I., Markakis, K., Koçak, M., Gerasopoulos, E., Daskalakis, D., Mihalopoulos, N., Poupkou, A.,
22 Tayfun, K., Unal, U., and Kanakidou, M.: Summertime aerosol chemical composition in the Eastern
23 Mediterranean and its sensitivity to temperature, *Atmos. Environ.*, 50, 164-173, 2012.

24 Jacob, D.J., and Winner, D.A.: Effect of climate change on air quality, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 51-63, 2009.

25 Jimenez, P.A., and Dudhia, J.: Improving the Representation of Resolved and Unresolved Topographic
26 Effects on Surface Wind in the WRF Model, *J. Applied Meteorol. Climatol.*, 51, 300-316, 2012.

27 Jones, P.D., Lister, D.H., Osborn, T.J., Harpham, C., Salmon, M., and Morice, C.P.: Hemispheric and
28 large-scale land-surface air temperature variations: An extensive revision and an update to 2010, *J.*
29 *Geophys. Res.*, 117, 2012. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017139>.

30 Katragkou E., Zanis, P., Kioutsioukis, I., Tegoulas, I., Melas, D., Krüger, B.C., and Coppola, E.: Future
31 climate change impacts on summer surface ozone from regional climate-air quality simulations over
32 Europe, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D22307, doi:10.1029/2011JD015899, 2011.

1 Kelly, J., Makar, P.A., and Plummer, D.A.: Projections of mid-century summer air-quality for North
2 America: effects of changes in climate and precursor emissions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 5367–5390,
3 2012.

4 Klimont, Z., Kupiainen, K., Heyes, C., Cofala, J., Rafaj, P., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Borcken, J., Schöpp,
5 W., Winiwarter, W., Purohit, P., Bertok, I., and Sander, R.: ECLIPSE V4a: Global emission data set
6 developed with the GAINS model for the period 2005 to 2050. Key features and principal data sources,
7 2013. Available at http://eccad.sedoo.fr/eccad_extract_interface/JSF/page_login.jsf.

8 Klimont, Z., L. Hoglund, Heyes, Ch., Rafaj, P., Schoepp, W., Cofala, J., Borcken-Kleefeld, J., Purohit, P.,
9 Kupiainen, K., Winiwarter, W., Amann, M., Zhao, B., Wang, S.X., Bertok, I., and Sander, R.: Global
10 scenarios of air pollutants and methane: 1990-2050. In preparation.

11 Knowlton, K., Rosenthal, J.E., Hogrefe, C., Lynn, B., Gaffin, S., Goldberg, R., Rosenzweig, C., Civerolo,
12 K., Ku, J.-Y., and Kinney, P.L.: Assessing Ozone-Related Health Impacts under a Changing Climate,
13 *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 112 (15), 1557-1563, 2004.

14 Kotlarski, S., Keuler, K., Christensen, O.B., Colette, A., Déqué, M., Gobiet, A., Goergen, K., Jacob, D.,
15 Lüthi, D., van Meijgaard, E., Nikulin, G., Schär, C., Teichmann, C., Vautard, R., Warrach-Sagi, K., and
16 Wulfmeyer, V.: Regional climate modeling on European scales: a joint standard evaluation of the EURO-
17 CORDEX RCM ensemble, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 1297-1333, 2014.

18 Lam, Y.F., Fu, J.S., Wu, S., and Mickley, L.J.: Impacts of future climate change and effects of biogenic
19 emissions on surface ozone and particulate matter concentrations in the United States, *Atmos. Chem.*
20 *Phys.*, 11, 4789–4806, 2011.

21 Langner, J., Bergstrom, R., and Foltescu, V.: Impact of climate change on surface ozone and deposition of
22 sulphur and nitrogen in Europe, *Atmos. Environ.*, 39, 1129–1141, 2005.

23 Langner, J., Engardt, M., Baklanov, A., Christensen, J. H., Gauss, M., Geels, C., Hedegaard, G. B.,
24 Nuterman, R., Simpson, D., Soares, J., Sofiev, M., Wind, P., and Zakey, A.: A multi-model study of
25 impacts of climate change on surface ozone in Europe, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 10423-10440, 2012.

26 Lattuati, M.: Contribution a l'étude du bilan de l'ozone troposphérique a l'interface de l'Europe et de
27 l'Atlantique Nord: modelisation lagrangienne et mesures en altitude, Phd thesis, Université P. M. Curie,
28 Paris, France, 1997.

29 Leroyer, S., Bélair, S., Husain, S.Z., and Mailhot, J.: Sub-Kilometer Numerical Weather Prediction in an
30 Urban Coastal Area: A Case Study over the Vancouver Metropolitan Area, *App. Met., and Clim.*,
31 doi:10.1175/JAMC-D-13-0202-2013, 2014.

32 Liao, H., Chen, W.-T., and Seinfeld, J.H.: Role of climate change in global predictions of future
33 tropospheric ozone and aerosols, *J. Geophys. Res.* 111, doi:10.1029/2005JD006862, 2006.

1 Loomis, D., Grosse, Y., Lauby-Secretan, B., El Ghissassi, F., Bouvard, V., Benbrahim-Tallaa, L., Guha,
2 N., Baan, R., Mattock, H., and Straif, K.: The carcinogenicity of outdoor air pollution. (On behalf of the
3 International Agency for Research on Cancer Monograph Working Group IARC, Lyon, France.) The
4 Lancet Oncology, 2013.

5 Mailler, S., Khvorostyanov, D., and Menut, L.: Impact of the vertical emission profiles on background
6 gas-phase pollution simulated from the EMEP emissions over Europe, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 5987-
7 5998, 2013.

8 Makar, P.A., Nissen, R., Teakles, A., Zhang, J., Zheng, Q., Moran, M.D., Yau, H., and diCenzo, C.:
9 Turbulent transport, emissions and the role of compensating errors in chemical transport models, Geosci.
10 Model Dev., 7, 1001-1024, 2014.

11 Mao, Q., Gautney, L.L., Cook, T.M., Jacobs, M.E., Smith, S.N., and Kelsoe, J.J.: Numerical experiments
12 on MM5-CMAQ sensitivity to various PBL schemes, Atmos. Environ., 40, 3092–3110, 2006.

13 Markakis, K., Poupkou, A., Melas, D., and Zerefos, C.: A GIS based methodology for the compilation of
14 an anthropogenic PM₁₀ emission inventory in Greece, Atmos. Poll. Res., 1 (2), 71-81, 2010.

15 Markakis, K., Im, U., Unal, A., Melas, D., Yenigün, O., and İncecik, S.: Compilation of a GIS based high
16 spatially and temporally resolved emission inventory for the İstanbul Greater Area, Atmos. Poll. Res., 3,
17 112-125, 2012.

18 Markakis, K., Valari, M., Colette, A., Sanchez, O., Perrussel, O., Honore, C., Vautard, R., Klimont, Z.,
19 and Rao, S.: Air quality in the mid-21st century for the city of Paris under two climate scenarios; from the
20 regional to local scale, Atmos. Chem. Phys. 14, 7323-7340, 2014.

21 Menut, L.: Adjoint modeling for atmospheric pollution process sensitivity at regional scale, J. Geophys.
22 Res., 108(D17), 8562, doi:10.1029/2002JD002549, 2003.

23 Menut, L., Coll, I., and Cautenet, S.: Impact of meteorological data resolution on the forecasted ozone
24 concentrations during the ESCOMPTE IOP2a and IOP2b, Atmos. Res., 74, 139–159, 2005.

25 Menut, L., Goussebaile, A., Bessagnet, B., Khvorostiyarov, D., and Ung, A.: Impact of realistic hourly
26 emissions profiles on air pollutants concentrations modeled with CHIMERE, Atmos. Environ., 49, 233-
27 244, 2012a.

28 Menut, L., Tripathi, Om P., Colette, A., Vautard, R., Flaounas, E., and Bessagnet, B.: Evaluation of
29 regional climate simulations for air quality modeling purposes, Clim. Dynam., 40 (9-10), 2515-2533,
30 2012b.

31 Menut, L., Bessagnet, B., Khvorostiyarov, D., Beekmann, M., Colette, A., Coll, I., Gurci, G., Foret, G.,
32 Mailler, S., Monge, J.-L., Turquety, S., Valari, M., Vautard, R., and Vivanco, M.G.: Regional
33 atmospheric composition modeling with CHIMERE, Geosci. Model Dev., 6, 203-329, 2013a.

1 Menut, L., Bessagnet, B., Colette, A., and Khvorostiyarov, D.: On the impact of the vertical resolution on
2 chemistry-transport modeling, *Atmos. Environ.*, 67, 370-384, 2013b.

3 Nenes, A., Pilinis, C., and Pandis, S.: ISORROPIA: A new thermodynamic model for inorganic
4 multicomponent atmospheric aerosols, *Aquatic Geochem.*, 4, 123–152, 1998.

5 Nolte, C.G., Gilliland, A.B., Hogrefe, C., and Mickley, L.J.: Linking global to regional models to assess
6 future climate impacts on surface ozone levels in the United States, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D14307,
7 doi:10.1029/2007JD008497, 2008.

8 Pascal, M., Corso, M., Chanel, O., Decleq, C., Badaloni, C., Cesaroni, G., Henschel, S., Maister, K.,
9 Haluza, D., Martin-Olmedo, P., and Medina S.: Assessing the public health impact of urban air pollution
10 in 25 European cities: results of the Aphekom project, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 449, 390-400, 2013.

11 Prather, M., Gauss, M., Bernsten, T., Isaksen, I., Sundet, J., Bey, I., Brasseur, G., Dentener, F., Derwent,
12 R., Stevenson, D., Grenfell, L., Hauglustaine, D., Horowitz, L., Jacob, D., Mickley, L., Lawrence, M.,
13 von Kuhlmann, R., Muller, J.-F., Pitari, G., Rogers, H., Johnson, M., van Weele, M., and Wild, O.: Fresh
14 air in the 21st century?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1100, doi:10.1029/2002GL016285, 2003.

15 Pungler, M., and West, J.: The effect of grid resolution on estimates of the burden of ozone and fine
16 particulate matter on premature mortality in the USA, *Air. Qual. Atmos. Health*, DOI 10.1007/s11869-
17 013-0197-8, 2013.

18 Queen, A., and Zhang, Y.: Examining the sensitivity of MM5–CMAQ predictions to explicit
19 microphysics schemes and horizontal grid resolutions, Part III - The impact of horizontal grid resolution,
20 *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 3869-3881, 2008.

21 Riahi, K., Rao, S., Krey, V., Cho, C., Chirkov, V., Fischer, G., Kindermann, G., Nakicenovic, N., and
22 Rafaj, P.: RCP 8.5-A scenario of comparatively high greenhouse gas emissions, *Clim. Change*, 109, 33-
23 57, 2011.

24 Russell, A., and Dennis, R.: NARSTO critical review of photochemical models and modelling, *Atmos.*
25 *Environ.*, 34, 2261-2282, 2000.

26 Sadanaga, Y., Shibata, S., Hamana, M., Takenaka, N., and Bandow, H.: Weekday/Weekend Difference of
27 Ozone and its Precursors in Urban Areas of Japan, Focusing on Nitrogen Oxides and Hydrocarbons,
28 *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 4708–4723, 2008.

29 Scire, J.S., Strimaitis, D.G., and Yamartino, R.J.: Model formulation and user’s guide for the CALPUFF
30 dispersion model. Sigma Research Corp., Concord, MA, 1990.

31 Sillman, S., Logan, J.A., and Wofsy, S.C.: A regional scale model for ozone in the United States with
32 subgrid representation of urban and power plant plumes, *J. Geophys. Res.* 95, 5731–5748, 1990.

33 Sillman, S., and Samson, F.L.: Impact of temperature on oxidant photochemistry in urban, polluted rural
34 and remote environments, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100 (D6), 11, 497–11, 508, 1995.

1 Skamarock, W.C., and Klemp J.B.: A time-split non-hydrostatic atmospheric model, *J. Comput. Phys.*,
2 227, 3465–3485, 2008.

3 Solazzo, E., Bianconi, R., Pirovano, G., Volker, M., Vautard, R., Appel, K. W., Bessagnet, B., Brandt, J.,
4 Christensen, J. H., Chemel, C., Coll, I., Ferreira, J., Forkel, R., Francis, X. V., Grell, G., Grossi, P.,
5 Hansen, A., Miranda, A. I., Moran, M. D., Nopmongcol, U., Parnk, M., Sartelet, K. N., Schaap, M.,
6 Silver, J. D., Sokhi, R. S., Vira, J., Werhahn, J., Wolke, R., Yarwood, G., Zhang, J., Rao, S. T., and
7 Galmarini, S.: Operational model evaluation for particulate matter in Europe and North America in the
8 context of the AQMEII project, *Atmos. Environ.*, 53, 75–92, 2012.

9 Stroud, C.A., Makar, P.A., Moran, M.D., Gong, W., Gong, S., Zhang, J., Hayden, K., Mihele, C., Brook,
10 J.R. Abbatt, J.P.D., and Slowik, J.G.: Impact of model grid spacing on regional- and urban- scale air
11 quality predictions of organic aerosol, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3107–3118, 2011.

12 Szopa, S., Hauglustaine, D.A., Vautard, R., and Menut, L.: Future global tropospheric ozone changes and
13 impact on European air quality, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L14805, doi:10.1029/2006GL025860, 2006.

14 Szopa, S., and Hauglustaine, D.: Relative impacts of worldwide tropospheric ozone changes and regional
15 emission modifications on European surface-ozone levels, *CR Geosci.*, 339, 709-720, 2007.

16 Szopa, S., Foret G., Menut, L., and Cozic, A.: Impact of large scale circulation on European summer
17 surface ozone and consequences for modeling forecast, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 1189-1195, 2009.

18 Tagaris, E., Liao, K.-J., DeLucia, A.J., Deck, L., Amar, P., and Russell, A.G.: Potential impact of climate
19 change on air pollution-related human health effects, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 43, 4979-4988, 2009.

20 Tie, X., Brasseur, G., and Ying, Z.: Impact of model resolution on chemical ozone formation in Mexico
21 City: application of the WRF-Chem model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 8983–8995, 2010.

22 Valari, M., and Menut, L.: Does an Increase in Air Quality Models’ Resolution Bring Surface Ozone
23 Concentrations Closer to Reality?, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 25, 1955-1968, 2008.

24 van Loon, M., Vautard, R., Schaap, M., Bergström, R., Bessagnet, B., Brandt, J., Builtjes, P. J. H.,
25 Christensen, J. H., Cuvelier, C., Graff, A., Jonson, J. E., Krol, M., Langner, J., Roberts, P., Rouil, L.,
26 Stern, R., Tarrasón, L., Thunis, P., Vignati, E., White, L., and Wind, P.: Evaluation of long-term ozone
27 simulations from seven regional air quality models and their ensemble, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41, 2083-2097,
28 2007.

29 van Vuuren, D., Edmonds, J., Kainuma, M., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Hibbard, K., Hurtt, G., Kram, T.,
30 Krey, V., Lamarque, J.-F., Masui, T., Meinshausen, M., Nakicenovic, N., Smith, S., and Rose, S.: The
31 representative concentration pathways: an overview, *Clim. Change*, 109, 5-31, 2011.

32 Vautard, R., Bessagnet, B., Chin, M., and Menut, L.: On the contribution of natural Aeolian sources to
33 particulate matter concentrations in Europe: testing hypotheses with a modeling approach, *Atmos.*
34 *Environ.*, 39, 3291–3303, 2005.

1 Vautard R., Builtjes, P.H.J., Thunis, P., Cuvelier, C., Bedogni, M., Bessagnet, B., Honore, C.,
2 Moussiopoulos, N., Pirovano, G., Schaap, M., Stern, R., Tarasson, L., and Wind P.: Evaluation and
3 intercomparison of Ozone and PM10 simulations by several chemistry transport models over four
4 European cities within the CityDelta project, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41 (1), 173-188, 2007.

5 Vautard, R., Moran, M. D., Solazzo, E., Gilliam, R. C., Matthias, V., Bianconi, R., Chemel, C., Ferreira,
6 J., Geyer, B., Hansen, A. B., Jericevic, A., Prank, M., Segers, A., Silver, J. D., Werhahn, J., Wolke, R.,
7 Rao, S.T., and Galmarini, S.: Evaluation of the meteorological forcing used for the Air Quality Model
8 Evaluation International Initiative (AQMEII) air quality simulations, *Atmos. Environ.*,
9 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.10.065, 2012.

10 Vautard, R., Gobiet, A., Jacob, D., Belda, M., Colette, A., Déqué, M., Fernandez, J., Garcia-Diez, M.,
11 Goergen, K., Güttler, I., Halenka, T., Karacostas, T., Katragkou, E., Keuler, K., Kotlarski, S., Mayer, S.,
12 Meijgaard, E., Nikulin, G., Patarcic, M., Scinocca, J., Sobolowski, S., Suklitsch, M., Teichmann, C.,
13 Warrach-Sagi, K., Wulfmeyer, V., and Yiou, P.: The simulation of European heat waves from an
14 ensemble of regional climate models within the EURO-CORDEX project, *Clim. Dyn.*, 41, 2555-2575,
15 2013.

16 Zanis P., Katragkou, E., Tegoulas, I., Poupkou, A., Melas, D., Huszar, P., and Giorgi, F.: Evaluation of
17 near surface ozone in air quality simulations forced by a regional climate model over Europe for the
18 period 1991-2000, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 6489-6500, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09, 2011.

1 Table 1. Parameterization of the different sets of simulations presented in the paper. Changes
 2 with respect to the REF case are marked in red. Changes with respect to a simulation other than
 3 REF are marked in green.

| | Annual emission totals ^a | Air-quality model resolution | Emission inventory resolution | Emission post-processing ^b | climate/reanalysis meteorology and resolution | Number of layers in air-quality model |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| REF | AIRPARIF | 4km | 4km | Bottom-up | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 8 |
| REG ^c | ECLIPSE | 0.5° | 0.5° | Top-down | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 8 |
| Sensitivity simulation | | | | | | |
| ERA05 | AIRPARIF | 4km | 4km | Bottom-up | ERA (0.44°) | 8 |
| ERA01 ^d | AIRPARIF | 4km | 4km | Bottom-up | ERA (0.11°) | 8 |
| VERT | AIRPARIF | 4km | 4km | Bottom-up | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 12 |
| ANN | ECLIPSE | 4km | 4km | Bottom-up | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 8 |
| POST ^e | ECLIPSE | 4km | 4km | Top-down | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 8 |
| AVER ^f | ECLIPSE | 4km | 0.5° | Top-down | RCP-4.5 (0.44°) | 8 |

4 ^a The resolution of the emission inventory of AIRPARIF is 1km (aggregated to 4km for the
 5 purpose the local simulations) and the ECLIPSE inventory 50km.

6 ^b Temporal, vertical allocation and chemical speciation.

7 ^c This simulation is used as boundary conditions for all local scale simulations.

8 ^d The ERA01 simulation is compared with the ERA05 not with the REF.

9 ^e The POST simulation is compared with the ANN not with the REF.

10 ^f This is not a standalone simulation. Concentrations modeled at 4km resolution with the POST
 11 run are averaged spatially to match the cells of REG (0.5° resolution simulation). AVER results
 12 are compared to REG to quantify the effect of model resolution and with POST to quantify the
 13 effect of the resolution of the emission inventory.

14

15

16

17

1 Table 2. Observed and modeled daily average meteorological variables over the Ile-de-France
 2 region. MET_CLIM dataset stems from a climate model and MET_ERA05, MET_ERA01 from
 3 reanalysis data at 0.5° and 0.1° resolution respectively. Absolute model bias is given in
 4 parenthesis.

| Variable | <i>Obs</i> | <i>MET_CLIM</i> | <i>MET_ERA05</i> | <i>MET_ERA01</i> |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Summer (JJA) | | | | |
| T2 (°C) | 19.19 | 19.14 (-0.05) | 18.28 (-0.91) | 18.19 (-1.0) |
| WS10 (m/s) | 2.9 | 4.0 (+1.1) | 3.8 (+0.9) | 3.8 (+0.9) |
| RH (%) | 69.1 | 68.1 (-1.0) | 68.3 (-0.8) | 67.3 (-1.8) |
| PRECIP (mm/day) | 0.076 | 0.108 (+0.032) | 0.097 (+0.021) | 0.098 (+0.022) |
| Winter (DJF) | | | | |
| T2 (°C) | 4.3 | 4.0 (-0.3) | 6.0 (+1.7) | 5.8 (+1.3) |
| WS10 (m/s) | 3.6 | 6.2 (+2.6) | 5.7 (+2.1) | 5.5 (+1.9) |
| RH (%) | 85.0 | 80.3 (-4.7) | 79.7 (-5.3) | 79.5 (-5.5) |
| PRECIP (mm/day) | 0.069 | 0.112 (+0.043) | 0.089 (+0.02) | 0.087 (+0.018) |

5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26

1 Table 3. Absolute difference (and percentage in parenthesis) between daily averaged ozone (ppb)
 2 and PM_{2.5} (µg/m³) from two climate forced air-quality runs. The most influential factor for each
 3 sensitivity test is marked in bold.

| Ozone | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Climate meteo (REF vs. ERA05) | 1.0 (3.4%) | 1.1 (3.2%) | 0.9 (2.5%) |
| Meteo. resolution (ERA05 vs. ERA01) | 0.2 (0.6%) | 1.4 (4.3%) | 0.3 (0.8%) |
| Vertical resolution (REF vs. VERT) | 0.3 (1.2%) | <0.1 (0.2%) | <0.1 (1.5%) |
| Annual emis. totals (REF vs. ANN) | 0.8 (2.5%) | 1.1 (3.2%) | 0.3 (1.0%) |
| Emission post-proc. (ANN vs. POST) | 1.9 (6.4%) | 0.1 (0.4%) | <0.1 (0.02%) |
| Emission resolution (POST vs. AVER) | 2.8 (8.3%) | 0.7 (1.9%) | 0.2 (0.5%) |
| Model resolution (AVER vs. REG) | 1.7 (4.7%) | 0.5 (1.4%) | 0.2 (0.5%) |
| PM_{2.5} | Summer | Winter | Annual |
| Climate meteo (REF vs. ERA05) | <0.1 (0.05%) | 3.1 (17.6%) | 1.4 (9.4%) |
| Meteo. resolution (ERA05 vs. ERA01) | 0.3 (3.4%) | 1.3 (6.8%) | 0.6 (4.0%) |
| Vertical resolution (REF vs. VERT) | <0.1 (0.3%) | 0.5 (2.2%) | <0.1 (0.2%) |
| Annual emis. totals (REF vs. ANN) | 4.1 (33.0%) | 6.6 (33.8%) | 5.5 (31.9%) |
| Emission post-proc. (ANN vs. POST) | 3.4 (24.8%) | 4.5 (18.3%) | 0.2 (0.7%) |
| Emission resolution (POST vs. AVER) | 2.1 (20.3%) | 7.1 (30.0%) | 4.3 (24.2%) |
| Model resolution (AVER vs. REG) | 0.4 (4.1%) | 0.4 (1.9%) | 0.7 (0.5%) |

4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20

1 Table 4. Top row presents the coarse resolution application (REG) model bias of the April-
 2 August average urban ozone and wintertime urban PM_{2.5}. Subsequently, marked with italics the
 3 signals -measured as the absolute concentration change from REG- of several refinements such
 4 as increase of resolution (model or emissions) and adaptation of annual quantified fluxes and
 5 post-processing of a bottom-up inventory. The individual signals sum up to the absolute bias
 6 found under the fine resolution simulation (REF).

| Ozone | Ozone (ppb) | PM_{2.5} (µg/m³) |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| REG (50km) | +9.0 | +3.6 |
| Model resolution | <i>-1.7</i> | <i>-0.4</i> |
| Emissions resolution | <i>-2.8</i> | <i>+7.1</i> |
| Annual emission totals | <i>-0.8</i> | <i>-6.6</i> |
| Emissions post-processing | <i>-1.9</i> | <i>-4.5</i> |
| REF (4km) | +1.8 | -0.8 |

7






Figure 1. Overview of the coarse (D1 having 50km resolution) and local scale (D2, illustrated by the red rectangle having 4km resolution) simulation domains. In D2 the city of Paris is located in the area enclosed by the purple line. Circles correspond to sites of the local air-quality monitoring network (AIRPARIF) with red for urban, blue for suburban and black for rural.



1

Figure 2. Domain-wide annual emissions of NO_x, NMVOC (left-axis) and PM_{2.5} (right-axis) from the local (bottom-up) and the regional (top down) inventory (summed across the vertical column).

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18



1

Figure 3. Panel a: Scatter plots and scores of daily average ozone concentrations at urban, suburban and rural stations from the REF simulation. Odd oxygen (O_x) and daily maximum values at urban locations are also shown. Panel b: daily average PM_{2.5} concentrations in wintertime (DJF), summertime (JJA) and on annual basis over urban stations.

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25





Figure 4. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity test on climate model driven meteorology for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

1

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1




2

Figure 5. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity test on the resolution of meteorology for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28


1



2
3

Figure 6. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity test on the CTM's vertical resolution for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



1

Figure 7. Difference in average daily simulated NO₂ (a), ozone (b) and PM_{2.5} (c) concentrations between VERT (12 vertical layers) and REF (8 vertical layers) at urban areas per range of K_z (bins of 1 m²/s). Positive differences indicate that the refined vertical mesh leads to increased pollutant concentration and vice versa. The occurrence of sensitivity values within each K_z range is also provided.





Figure 8. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity test on the annual emission totals for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

1

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1



2

Figure 9. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity on the post-processing (temporal analysis and chemical speciation) technique applied on the annual emission totals for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27





Figure 10. Mean diurnal variation of (a) ozone concentrations averaged over the April-August period and (b) wintertime PM_{2.5} concentrations in the urban area.

36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42



1

Figure 11. Scatter plots and scores for the sensitivity test on the resolution of the emission inventory for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26





Figure 12. Scatter plots for the sensitivity test on model resolution for ozone and PM_{2.5}.

1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25



1

Figure 13. Panel a: Scatter plots of daily average ozone concentrations at urban, suburban and rural stations from the REF and REG simulations. The odd oxygen (O_x) and daily maximum at urban locations is also shown. Panel b: daily average PM_{2.5} concentrations in wintertime (DJF), summertime (JJA) and on annual basis over urban stations.

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25