

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Assessment of multi-decadal WRF-CMAQ simulations for understanding direct aerosol effects on radiation “brightening” in the United States” by C.-M. Gan et al.

C.-M. Gan et al.

chuenmeei@gmail.com

Received and published: 18 September 2015

We thank the reviewer for the many helpful comments which have helped us in improving this manuscript.

The topic of the paper is well suited for ACP. However, I feel this paper does not deliver what the title says, that is, to use the WRF-CMAQ simulation for understanding direct aerosol effects on radiation brightening in the United States. Some important aerosol species (dust, organic aerosols) seem to be excluded in the model, the calculated

C6998

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



AOD is much too low, only half of observed values in both west and east US, and the attribution of SW radiation change to aerosol change is not convincing. I recommend a major revision. My comments are given below.

The WRF-CMAQ modeling system used in this study treats all relevant aerosol species, including dust and organic aerosols. Likewise, the model also used comprehensive emission dataset which included dust, organic carbon and CO etc. Additional details on the aerosol speciation represented in the CMAQ model can be found in Carlton et al (2010; ES&T), Foley et al (2010; GMD) and Appel et al (2013; GMD). Further Gan et al. (2014b) detail how the optical properties and AOD is estimated using the CMAQ simulated aerosol size and composition. However, in the analysis in this paper, we mainly focus on the change (i.e. reduction) of sulfate and nitrate which are the aerosol species most affected by emission reductions under the Clean Air Act and its amendments over the past two decades. We agree that other species also contribute to the aerosol direct effect and SW radiation but in order to keep the manuscript focused on trends over time, most of the analysis pertains to the species most strongly affected by emission reductions. However, it is important to note that the estimation of the optical properties and radiative effects of the airborne PM was based on the predicted spatially and temporally varying compositional characteristics which included the full suite of inorganic and organic constituents.

General comments: Aerosol simulations: It has not been made clear how many aerosol species are included in the model. The concentration figures showed sulfate, nitrate, and EC, but no indication on what are included in AOD and SW radiation calculations. I noticed the statement in Figure 2 and Figure 3 captions: “Note that for emission dataset, only SO₂ and NO_x are available”. Does it mean that other aerosols and precursors are not available? If the model omitted other important species, like dust and organic aerosol, then the AOD and SW radiation calculation would be incorrect, and the paper would not be appropriate for assessing the aerosol effects on surface radiation trends.

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

As mentioned above, all relevant aerosol species (including dust, sea-salt and primary and secondary organic aerosols) are included in WRF-CMAQ as well as the radiation calculation (Gan et al, 2014b), and the emission dataset also included all relevant PM and PM precursor species. The reason for focusing on sulfate and nitrate in our analysis was discussed in our response above. The statement in Figure 2 and 3 was meant to indicate that SO₂ emissions are shown along with both SO₄ and SO₂ concentrations since most of the atmospheric SO₄ burden is due to secondary formation from SO₂ rather than primary emissions of particulate SO₄. The coupled WRF-CMAQ model uses a Mie and Core-shell scattering scheme (Gan et al. 2014b) for estimating aerosol optical properties and which are then used in the RRTMG scheme for radiation calculation. Additional clarification and information is added in Section 2.2 in the revised manuscript. For more detail aerosol and radiation calculation please refer to Table 2, Gan et al (2014b), Wong et al. (2012) and below links: http://www.airqualitymodeling.org/cmaqwiki/index.php?title=CMAQ_version_5.0_%28February_2012_release%29_Technical_way_Coupled_WRF-CMAQ http://rtweb.aer.com/rrtm_frame.html

Clear-sky and all-sky SW surface radiation trends: The all-sky brightening trends over both west and east US are evident from the SURFRAD stations, which are pretty much reproduced by the model. Even though there is little change of aerosol concentrations over the west US in the 16-year time period, both model and data show a clear brightening trend in the west under all-sky condition. On the other hand, the model is much less successful in reproducing the SURFRAD trends under clear-sky conditions when aerosol is supposed to be the driver for the clear-sky trends. Such results may suggest (1) aerosol is not the major factor responsible for the all-sky brightening trends, and (2) the change of anthropogenic aerosol simulated by the model cannot explain the observed clear-sky brightening trend. These issues are the core for this investigation and should be seriously addressed.

We agree that factors other than the changing aerosol burden may contribute to the observed “brightening”. Nevertheless, as indicated by our analysis of direct aerosol

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

effects, i.e. the differences in simulated trends between the feedback and no-feedback simulations, there is a clear association between the change in aerosol burden and changes in clear sky radiation which are not explained when aerosol direct effects are not considered (as in the base model simulation; see Xing et al., 2015 for additional analysis). Secondly, the change of anthropogenic aerosol in the model and clear-sky SW radiation simulated by the model cannot completely represent the observed clear-sky brightening effect because of several factors listed below which are also discussed in the manuscript. First, the observed clear-sky SW radiation is influenced by the contrails and cirrus cloud, these phenomena are not included in the current WRF-CMAQ model. Second, the observed clear-sky SW radiation is an estimated product derived from the all-sky measurements so it does contain uncertainty which had been discussed in the previous study Gan et al. (2014a) and Long et al. (2009). For example, as discussed in Long et al. (2009) and Gan et al. (2014a), some amount of condensed water in the atmospheric column is allowed under the “clear sky” classification. Dupont et al. (2008) show that up to an optical depth of 0.15, elevated ice crystals are still typically classified as clear sky. However, in the model, clear-sky SW radiation is 100% cloud free which implies that discrepancies can be expected when they are quantitatively compared. Lastly, even though the modeled clear-sky SW radiation trend is underestimated direction of the trend (i.e. increasing especially eastern US) is captured only when the aerosol direct radiative effects are included in the model.

Multi-decadal: The analysis and comparisons in this work is from 1995 to 2010, i.e., 16 years, which is not “multi-decadal”. The title should be modified.

The underlying WRF-CMAQ simulations were actually performed for the entire 1990–2010 time period, but due to the lack of observations covering the entire time period the analysis presented in this manuscript covered the 1995 – 2010 time period. Following the reviewer’s suggestion the title has been changed from “multi-decadal” to “long-term”.

Uncertainty and error estimation and range of data: Because of the omission of the

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

aerosol species in the model, it is necessary to provide uncertainties and estimated errors in model calculations. The uncertainty of the data should also be presented. In addition, the comparisons are shown for the aggregation of sites over multiple sites, the range or standard deviation of both data and model should be shown in the comparison figures, as well as the statistic measures (e.g., correlation coefficients, biases, errors, etc.).

As stated previously in our response to the reviewer's comments, there is no omission of aerosol species in the model. The uncertainty in the estimated trends is quantified by the significance ratio and confidence levels included in Tables 3-5. Standard errors of trends for observations and models have been added to Table 3, 4 and 5. Measurement errors have been summarized in Gan et al. (2014a) but quantifying their impact on estimated trends is beyond the scope of our study. Data from individual sites (both observed and model) is not shown to avoid cluttering the figure and obscuring the "main" trends for comparison. However, the measurements from each sites were presented in a previous study (Gan et al. 2014a).

Specific comments: Page 17713, line 2-3: Does this opening sentence suggest you only consider sulfate and nitrate?

No, please see our detailed response to the general comments.

Page 17713, line 19-21: I don't understand why the "irregular" aerosol distribution of aerosol would be a big challenge for measurements to quantify the aerosol forcing. To me, the big challenge is the clouds that may dominate the all-sky radiative flux and may still contaminate the "clear-sky" data. Besides, "heterogeneous" is a better word than "irregular".

Both factors (heterogeneous aerosol distributions and clouds effects on radiation) are challenging because they cannot be quantified separately in radiation measurements. It is difficult to state which one is more important. Thank you for the suggestion, "irregular" is replaced with "heterogeneous" in the revised manuscript.

[Interactive
Comment](#)

Page 17716, line 5: What aerosol and precursor species are included in this “comprehensive emission data”? This sentence contradicts the sentence in the captions for Figure 2 and Figure 3 saying “for emission dataset, only SO₂ and NO_x are available”, as I mentioned earlier. Does the wild fire emission included? And dust? Page 17717, line 15: Add “that” in between “estimated trend” and “is statistically”.

Please see our detailed response above for clarification on the aerosol species included in the model and how the aerosol size and composition is used to estimate the optical and radiative properties as well as clarification on Fig 2 and 3. Yes, both forest fires and dust were included in our emission dataset. As mentioned in Xing et al. (2013), forest fires account for 7 and 17% of the total PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emission, including wildland and prescribed fires. The dust sources considered in the emission were windblown, construction, mining and quarrying dust. The captions for Figures 2 and 3 are meant to indicate that SO₂ emissions are shown along with both SO₄ and SO₂ concentrations since most of the atmospheric SO₄ burden is due to secondary formation from SO₂ rather than primary emissions of particulate SO₄.

Page 17717, line 21-23, sentence begins with “The size of the circle”: This is a bit out of context – are you talking about the circles in some of the figures? You should talk about this together with the figures.

Yes, we agree with this suggestion. The sentence has been rewritten as “The size of the circle in the Figures 4, 5, 6 and 9 represents the level of the significance (e.g. the bigger the circle, the higher the significance).”

Page 17718, line 4: “feedback simulations” – if the meteorological fields are “nudged”, how would feedback change them? Does feedback matter?

Yes, despite nudging there still is a clear effect of aerosol feedbacks as evident from a comparison of the feedback and no-feedback simulations in Table 5. It should be noted that the nudging employed in this study is weaker than the nudging employed in typical uncoupled retrospective WRF simulations. Hogrefe et al. (2015) showed

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

that this weak nudging led to only a small reduction of the simulated direct aerosol effect on temperature compared to a no-nudging simulation while improving model performance. This information has been added to page 5 line 124-128. The “nudged” meteorological fields (e.g. temperature, wind and moisture) affect the calculation of aerosol fields in CMAQ, which are then transferred back to WRF where they affect the radiation calculation. The strength of the nudging was chosen so as not to squelch this feedback effect (Hogrefe et al., 2015). As shown in Table 5, radiation trends from feedback and without feedback were different. More detail for the feedback and without feedback comparison can be found in Wong et al. (2012). Additional explanations regarding “feedback” simulation is added into section 2.2.

Page 17718, line 5-6: “...the observed and modeled surface aerosol concentrations... are presented in Figs 2 and 3” – SO₂, shown in Fig. 2, is not aerosol. It is a gas.

Thank you for pointing out this oversight, the sentence is rewritten as follows: “First, the observed and modelled surface aerosol and gas concentrations are assessed at the CASTNET and IMPROVE monitors.”

Page 17718, line 20-22: “...the model predictions agree well with surface measured aerosol concentration” – there is no comparisons of actual concentrations, only the concentration anomalies are compared.

The sentence is rewritten as follows: “Overall, the model trend predictions agree well with surface observation trends for both networks, especially SO₄⁽²⁻⁾.”

Page 17718, line 21 and 23, page 17719, line 2 and 12, and page 17723, line 23: “...well...” – how well is “well”? This is a subjective term and should be avoided. The degree of agreement should be presented by statistics, such as correlation coefficient, bias, and error.

Following the reviewer’s suggestion, a new table 6 with statistical metrics has been added to the revised manuscript.

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

Interactive
Comment

Page 17719, line 8-9, trends of PM_{2.5}, AOD: They don't necessarily change together in the same directions, as several previous studies showed positive correlation in the eastern US for some seasons but weak or even negative correlations over the western US. The relationship depends on aerosol vertical distributions, compositions, among others.

Yes, we agree with this comment and have removed the sentence in question.

Page 17719, line 22-23: The observed trend is 9 times stronger than the model simulated trend. Such difference means that the model is not able to "capture trends similar to observations".

We agree that from a numerical perspective the observed trend in the west is nine times larger than the modeled trend (obs_west: 0.0009 year⁻¹, sim_west: 0.0001 year⁻¹) but would like to note that the absolute magnitude the trends are relatively small for both. In contrast, the comparison for the eastern US shows much closer agreement (obs_east: -0.0012 year⁻¹, sim_east: -0.0017 year⁻¹). The sentence has been modified.

Page 17719, line 24-27: Which one of these possibilities is the most important one? What fire emission data are you using? Since dust is an important aerosol component in the west, omission of dust would be a significant problem for model. Sea salt contributions should be negligible for the sites shown in Figure 1.

In this statement, we are providing several potential explanations for the underestimation of AOD. Yes, the seasalt contribution should not be the main reason for the underestimation of AOD in this study. Note that dust emissions are included in our study. The source of wild fire emission is obtained from https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_statistics.html

Page 17720, line 1-4: Yes both model and data show a brightening trend, but is this trend due to the change of aerosols?

As elaborated to in our response earlier, in the current calculations we only consider

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

the aerosol direct effect, and our results indicate that aerosols do contribute to the brightening effect (especially in the eastern US) but in the measurements other factors can also contribute to this effect.

Page 17720, line 13-15: Is the PM concentration underestimated in the model? By how much? The AOD is underestimated by a factor of 2.

The underestimation of AOD cannot necessarily be attributed to an underestimation / incomplete representation of PM concentrations. As stated in Gan et al. (2014b), several possible reasons for this model AOD underestimation are the underestimation of specific aerosol constituents such as organic carbon, low sea-salt concentration in the accumulation mode and uncertainties in characterizing the water soluble portion of the organic carbon leading to poor representation of refractive indices of organic aerosol. Furthermore, the hygroscopic effects of water soluble OC and external mixing are not considered in the current version WRF-CMAQ model. The omitted effects and uncertainties in representation of mixing state can play an important role in the apportionment of extinction. (Gan et al. 2014b, Curci et al., 2014). Another study, Hogrefe et al. (2015) also showed in their Figure 2 that the underestimation of AOD occurs throughout all season despite the fact that the analysis of 24-hr average surface PM_{2.5} predictions (Table 1 in Hogrefe et al., 2015) indicate overestimations of PM_{2.5} during winter but largely unbiased PM_{2.5} prediction during summer. Note that the PM_{2.5} concentration represents a ground-level measurement while the AOD is an integration of aerosol extinction over a vertical column. Model predicted extinctions in any one layer depends not only on aerosol concentrations and properties but also relative humidity; thus differences in the vertical distribution of modeled aerosol concentrations and relative humidity would yield different calculated AOD even if PM_{2.5} column mass was consistent. This sentence is removed since section 3.2 is restructured and simplified. Additional clarification is added on pages 8-9 of the revised manuscript.

Page 17720, line 25 to page 17721, line 2: Do you expect the anthropogenic emission should change with El Nino? How? Also, from Figure 6, the disagreement of modeled

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

and observed AOD for 1998-1999 is similar to that for other years!

The anthropogenic emission should not change with El Nino. They are separate factors and are discussed separately in the revised manuscript. The discussion was attempting to convey that "in general, the emission estimates for more recent years (after 2000) are better because of improvements in measurement techniques and greater availability of information for constructing the emission dataset". This statement "... may also be due to errors in model representation of emissions...". has been rephrased. Second, we were trying to explain the factors which affect the anomalies of observed clear-sky SW radiation for 1998-1999. Discussions for underestimated AOD and observed clear-sky SW radiation anomaly are separated into two paragraphs in the revised manuscript to avoid confusion. Please see page 11 in the revised manuscript.

Page 17721, line 10-14: Indeed, if the clear-sky radiation change is dominated by aerosols, with the decrease of aerosols, the total and direct radiation should increase but the diffuse radiation should decrease. How is "clear-sky" defined in the SURFRAD data? What is the uncertainty in the clear-sky radiation observations?

These continuous clear-sky radiation estimates are a product from measured clear-sky SW rad together with all-sky SW radiation by using Radiative Flux Analysis (RFA). RFA is a series of codes developed to examine the time series of the broadband radiation measurements and detect periods of clear (i.e. cloudless) skies, then use the detected clear-sky data to fit appropriate functions, interpolate the fit coefficients across cloudy periods and thus produce continuous clear-sky radiation estimates. The resultant measured and clear-sky data are then used to infer various atmospheric and cloud microphysical properties, including daylight fractional sky cover for an effective field of view of 160 degrees, effective cloudy sky SW transmissivity calculated as the ratio of the total downwelling SW over the corresponding clear-sky total SW, and visible optical depth for overcast periods. For the observations of downwelling direct, diffuse and all-sky SW, the approximated uncertainties are 3% or 4 W/m², 6% or 20 W/m² and 6% or 10 W/m², respectively (Stoffel, 2005). However, in this RFA, there is some

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



amount of condensed water in the atmospheric column under the “clear sky” classification. Dupont et al. (2008) show that up to an optical depth of 0.15 of primarily elevated ice crystals are still typically classified as clear sky. Clarification is added in revised manuscript at page 11. Additional details on SW radiation measurements can be found at Gan et al. (2014a).

Page 17722, line 3-4: The model-data discrepancy is much larger for clear-sky than for all-sky. If the implementing aerosol indirect effect might help improve the all-sky simulation, it would not be helpful for clear-sky simulations.

Yes, we agree with this statement. For the clear-sky scenario, including aircraft contrails, cirrus cloud and air traffic emission might improve the clear-sky SW radiation calculation especially diffuse radiation. This will be explored in future studies.

Page 17721-17723 of Section 3.2: The comparisons and discussions of radiation trends should be better organized. It is said in line 3-4 that “this study focuses on clear-sky SW radiation in the following discussion”, but then the all-sky and clear-sky results are shown alternately without much organization.

Yes, we agree with the reviewer that this discussion is confusing. In the revised manuscript we have reorganized and simplified this section.

Page 17723, line 25-27: There is no sufficient evidence to point that the inaccurate emission before 2000 is responsible for the model-data discrepancy of AOD and radiative fluxes. As I said earlier, the agreement of simulated AOD and concentration trend before 2000 are similar to that after 2000.

We do believe that more recent emission datasets benefit from improved or more detailed measurements / information available from field studies, industries or local agencies. For example, wild fire emissions are provided by states after 2002 instead of national totals. As mentioned in Xing et al. (2013), for earlier years, information for some sectors was not as detailed as recent data so scaling factors based on activities were

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

used to estimate some of the emissions for earlier years. Additionally, for some sectors information was not available at the appropriate spatial resolution, so assumptions in spatial allocation of emissions could potentially influence model spatial distributions and thus comparisons with measurements paired in space and time. We agree that this does not necessarily imply that the underestimation of AOD and discrepancy in clear-sky diffuse radiation from the model can be attributed to emission uncertainties alone. Nevertheless uncertainties in the historical record of emissions need to be considered when interpreting long-term model results. Clarification is added on page 13.

Page 17724, line 2-4: If the model cannot reproduce the trends over the available observation sites, will it be a mistake to use such model to fill the observational gaps?

As noted above, the model does reproduce the directionality of the trends in PM concentrations, AOD, total all-sky and total clear-sky radiation and also captures regional differences in trends. We believe that despite the differences in magnitude between observed and modeled trends, the modeled fields can still provide valuable information about trends at unmonitored locations and the model evaluation results presented in this study can serve as a reference point for interpreting these model results at unmonitored locations.

Page 17723, line 12: "...influence by local terrain influences" – how? What are the references? This is not mentioned anywhere in the previous sections.

This was discussed in previous study, Gan et al. (2014a). References and additional explanation are added on page 13 of the revised manuscript.

Table 3 and 4: What quantity is in the "significance" column? Needs clarification.

"Significance" in this study is the absolute trend relative to its uncertainty, please see Section 2.3 page 6 for clarification.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 17711, 2015.