A model study of the pollution effects of the first three months of the Holuhraun volcanic fissure: comparison with observations and air pollution effects

4

5 B. M. Steensen¹ and M. Schulz¹ and N. Theys² and H. Fagerli¹

6 [1]{Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Postbox 43 Blindern, 0313 Oslo, Norway }

7 [2]{Belgian Institute for Space Aeronomy, Ringlaan-3-Avenue Circulaire, B-1180 Brussels,
8 Belgium }

9 Correspondence to: B. M. Steensen (birthems@met.no)

10

11 Abstract

12 The volcanic fissure at Holuhraun, Iceland started at the end of August 2014 and continued 13 for six months to the end of February 2015. Lava flow onto the Holuhraun plain combined 14 with SO_2 emissions amounting up to approximately 4.5 times the daily anthropogenic SO_2 15 emitted from the 28 European Union countries, Norway, Switzerland and Iceland. In this paper we present results from EMEP/MSC-W model simulations where we added 750 kg/s 16 17 SO₂ emissions at the Holuhraun plain from September to November at three different 18 emission heights. Model results are compared to satellite observations and European surface 19 measurements. The different runs are weighted with the satellite averaging kernel, the effect 20 of the weighting are dependent on the height of the sulphur dioxide in the atmosphere. 21 Surface observations in Europe showed concentration increases up to 50 µg/m3 averaged over 22 an hour of SO₂ from volcanic plumes passing. Three well identified episodes are documented 23 in detail. For all the events the timing of the observed concentration peaks compared quite 24 well to the model results. The overall changes in the European SO₂ budget due to the volcanic fissure are estimated. Three monthly wet deposition of SO_X in the 28 European Union 25 26 countries, Norway and Switzerland is found to be more than 30 % higher in the model 27 simulation with Holuhraun emission compared to a model simulation with no Holuhraun emission. The largest increases, apart from extreme values on Iceland, are found on the coast 28 of Northern Norway, a region with frequent precipitation during westerly winds. Average SO₂ 29

and $PM_{2.5}$ surface concentrations increase by only ten and six percent over Europe, respectively. Although the percent increase of $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is highest over Scandinavia and Scotland, an increase in PM exceedance days is found over Ireland and the already polluted Benelux region, where a small increase in pollution leads to an increase in exceedances days.

6

7 **1** Introduction

8 Increased seismic activity in the Bárðarbunga volcano was recorded by the Icelandic Met 9 of 2014 (http://en.vedur.is/earthquakes-and-Office from the middle August 10 volcanism/volcanic-eruptions/holuhraun/). The activity continued in the volcano but some 11 tremors appeared also towards the Holuhraun plain, a large lava field north of the Vatnajökull 12 ice cap, the latter covering the Bárðarbunga and Grimsvötn volcano. On August 31 a 13 continuous eruption started at Holuhraun with large amounts of lava pouring onto the plain 14 and large amounts of sulphur dioxide (SO₂) emitted into the atmosphere (Sigmundsson et al. 15 2015). Thordarson and Hartley (2015) estimated SO₂ emissions from the magma at Holuhraun to be around 30 kt/d to 120 kt/d over the first three months of the eruption, with a 16 17 maximum during the first two weeks of September. Schmidt et al. (2015) also found that 18 among several model simulations with different emission fluxes, the model simulations with 19 the largest emission (120 kt/d) compared best with satellite observations at the beginning of 20 September. In comparison, Kuenen et al. (2009) estimated the daily anthropogenic emission 21 from the 28 European Union countries for 2009 to be 13.9 kt/d, while the 2013 estimate is 9.8 22 kt/d (EMEP, 2015). The eruption ended in February 2015 and during the 6 months of eruption 23 a total of approximately 11 (\pm 5) Tg SO₂ may have been released (Gislason et al. 2015), and the total lava field from the fissure were 85 km^2 with a volume of 1.4 km^3 (vedur.is). It is of 24 interest to investigate the impact of these volcanic emissions on current SO₂ levels in Europe. 25 In the last decades, measures have been taken to reduce SO₂ emissions, triggered by the 26 27 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), in Europe. Significant 28 reductions of 75% in emission between 1980 and 2010 are confirmed by observations 29 (Torseth et al., 2012). The impact of volcanic eruptions with SO_2 emissions can thus perturb 30 the European atmospheric sulphur budget to a larger extent than before and potentially lead to new acidification of lakes and soils if the eruption would last over a long time period. 31

For comparison, the big 1783 Icelandic Laki eruption lasted eight months and released a total 1 amount of estimated 120 Tg of SO₂. The resulting sulphuric acid caused a haze observed in 2 3 many countries of the northern hemisphere and increased mortality in Northern Europe 4 (Grattan et al., 2003, Thordarson and Self, 2003, Schmidt et al., 2011). The fissure at 5 Holuhraun was much weaker than the Laki fissure, both in terms of amount of SO₂ released and probably also the height of the eruptive column. Thordarson and Self (1993) estimated 6 7 that the Laki erupted at emission heights up to 15 km, while the observations of the 8 Holuhraun eruptive cloud saw the plume rising up to 5 km (vedur.is). Ground level 9 concentrations exceeded the Icelandic hourly average health limit of 350 μ g/m³ over large parts of Iceland (Gislason et al. 2015). The World Health Organization (WHO) has a 10 10 minute limit of 500 μ g/m³ and a 24-hour limit of 20 μ g/m³. High hourly mean surface 11 concentrations of SO₂ were measured in Ireland (524.2 μ g/m³), but then also in Austria (247.0 12 μ g/m³) and Finland (180 μ g/m³) (Schmidt et al. 2015, Ialango et al. 2015). 13

14 A climate impact of high SO₂ emissions may be suspected, such as a cooling of climate due to 15 an increase in aerosol loadings. Gettelman et al. (2015) using a global climate model found a small increase in cloud albedo due to the Holuhraun emissions resulting in -0.21 Wm⁻² 16 difference in radiative flux at the top of the atmosphere. If the event had happened earlier in 17 the summer a larger radiative effect could be expected (-7.4 Wm⁻²). Understanding the 18 atmospheric sulphur budget associated to such events is thus of great interest also for climate 19 20 science. Unlike the two previous big eruptions in Iceland, Eyjafjallajökull in 2010 and Grímsvötn in 2011, this eruption did not emit important amounts of ash. However, 21 22 uncertainties in volcanic source estimates, time varying emissions from a volcano type of 23 point source and dependence of transport on initial injection height are similar problems for SO₂ and ash plumes. For eruptions where both ash and SO₂ are emitted, SO₂ can act as a 24 25 proxy for ash (Thomas and Prata et al, 2011; Sears et al., 2013), however separation will 26 occur because of density differences and different eruption heights (Moxnes et al., 2014). 27 Proven capability of modelling the transport of a volcanic plume can be useful for judging 28 future eruption scenarios where SO_2 or ash can cause a problem.

The Holuhraun eruption is worth being analysed for several gas and aerosol transport and transformation processes, this study will mainly focus on simulated air quality effects and the perturbed sulphur budget due to the volcanic SO_2 emissions during the first three months of the eruption. Several stations in Europe reported high concentrations of SO_2 during this time

and case studies are chosen to evaluate simulated plume development over Europe. The 1 2 transport is modelled with the EMEP/MSC-W chemical transport model, one of the important models used for air quality policy support in Europe during the last 30 years (Simpson et al. 3 2012). The first two months of the eruption are well covered by satellite observations. Both 4 5 station and satellite data are compared to model results to understand the amplitude and magnitude of the sulphur budget perturbation. The effect of the injection height on the model 6 7 results is studied by sensitivity simulations. Finally the perturbed European sulphur budget, is documented and discussed to investigate the impact of increased SO₂ emission from a 8 9 Icelandic volcano on European pollution levels.

10

11 2 Methods

12 2.1 Model description

13 The model simulations of the transport of the SO₂ Holuhraun emissions are done with the 3-D 14 Eulerian chemical transport model developed at the Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W) for the European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (EMEP). The 15 EMEP/MSC-W model is described in Simpson et al. (2012). SO₂ is oxidized to sulphate in 16 both gas and aqueous phase. In gas phase the oxidation is initiated by OH and is controlled by 17 local chemistry. In aqueous phase the oxidants ozone, hydrogen peroxide and oxygen 18 19 catalysed eventually by metal ions contribute to the oxidation. The dry deposition in the 20 model is parameterized for different land types. Both in-cloud and sub-cloud scavenging are 21 considered for wet deposition.

22 The simulations use the EMEP-MACC (Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate) 23 model configuration. The horizontal resolution of the model simulations is 0.25° (longitude) x 0.125° (latitude). There are 20 vertical layers up to about 100 hPa, with the lowest layer 24 25 around 90 meters thick. The model is driven by meteorology from the European Centre of 26 Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) in the MACC model domain (30° west to 45° 27 east and 30° to 76° north). Iceland is in the upper north-western corner of the domain, which 28 implies losses of sulphur from the regional budget terms in sustained southerly and easterly flow regimes. The meteorology fields used have been accumulated in the course of running 29 30 the MACC regional model ensemble forecast of chemical weather over Europe (http://macc-31 raq-op.meteo.fr), of which the EMEP/MSC-W model is part of. For our hindcast type simulations here, only the fields from the first day of each forecast are used. The meteorology
is available with a three hourly interval. All model simulations are run from September
through November 2014.

4 Emission from the Holuhraun fissure is set to a constant 750 kg/s SO₂ (65 kt/d) for the entire 5 simulation from the total 2.0 \pm 0.6 Tg SO₂ emitted in September estimated in Schmidt et al. 6 (2015). For all model runs the anthropogenic emissions are as standard for our EMEP MACC 7 model configuration. Table 1 shows an overview of the four different model runs that are used 8 in this study. The column height observed both at ground and airborne instruments, varied 9 during the eruption (Schmidt et al., 2015), the mean height was however around 3 km over 10 the period. For the basic run called bas_hol, volcanic emissions at Holuhraun are distributed equally from the ground up to a 3 km emission column height. To test the sensitivity towards 11 12 emission height, two additional model simulations are done. One simulation where the volcanic emission is distributed from the ground up to 1 km called low_hol, and a simulation 13 where the volcanic emission is distributed between 3km and 5 km called high hol. To derive 14 15 the impact purely due to the emissions from Holuhraun, a simulation with no Holuhraun 16 emissions is performed, called no_hol. Sensitivity runs with an almost doubled constant 17 emission rate of 1400 kg/s, and a time varying emission term given in Thordarson and Hartley 18 (2015) were also studied. These resulted in an almost linear increase in concentrations and 19 deposition, and did not compare better to observations and will therefore not be presented 20 here. The sensitivity to height of the emission appeared to be more important and is shown 21 here in more detail.

Anthropogenic SO_2 emissions in the model are described in Kuenen et al. (2014). There is a yearly total SO_2 emission of 13.2 Tg/a corresponding to 2009 conditions, the same year that is used in the reference MACC model configuration. The difference to actual 2014 conditions is assumed to be unimportant here. The inventory includes 2.34 Tg/a SO_2 in yearly ship emissions over the oceans. Over the continents the yearly emissions are 5.08 Tg/a SO_2 for the 28 EU countries, and 5.53 Tg/a SO_2 for the non-EU countries in the MACC domain (including Iceland) covered by the MACC domain.

29 2.2 Observations

The satellite data used in this study stem from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI)
aboard NASA AURA (Levelt et al., 2006). The satellite was launched in July 2004 as part of

the A-train earth observing satellite configuration and follows a sun-synchronous polar orbit. 1 2 The OMI measures backscattered sunlight from the Earth atmosphere with a spectrometer covering UV and visible wavelength ranges. Measurements are therefore only available 3 during daytime. The background SO₂ concentrations are often too low to be observable, but 4 5 increases in SO₂ from volcanic eruptions can produce well distinguishable absorption effects (Brenot et al. 2014). Pixel size varies between 13 km x 24 km at nadir and 13 km x 128 km at 6 7 the edge of the swath. OMI satellite data are affected by "row anomalies" due to a blockage 8 affecting the nadir viewing part of the sensor, which affects particular viewing angles and 9 reduces the data coverage. The zoom-mode of OMI reduces the coverage on some days. The 10 coverage is also reduced by missing daylight, e.g. winter observations from high latitudes are 11 absent. Therefore data from only the two first months from September until the end of 12 October are used in this study.

13 The retrievals are described in Theys et al. (2015). The sensitivity of backscatter radiation to SO₂ molecules varies with altitude (generally decreasing towards the ground level) and 14 15 therefore the algorithms use an assumed height distribution for estimating the integrated SO_2 16 column density. Since often little information is available at the time of eruption and the 17 retrievals produce results daily (even for days with no eruption) an assumed a priori profile is used for the vertical SO₂ distribution. The satellite retrievals used here assume an a priori 18 19 profile with a plume thickness of 1 km that is centred at 7 km, similar to the method described 20 in Yang et al. (2007). As found in Schmidt et al. (2015), this is too high for the Bardarbunga 21 eruption. Therefore, the retrieved SO₂ column densities may be too low. To compare the 22 vertical column density (VCD) from the model to the one from satellite retrievals, the 23 averaging kernel from the satellite has to be used. Each element of an averaging kernel vector defines the relative weight of the true partial column value in a given layer to the retrieved 24 25 vertical column (Rodgers, 2000). Cloud cover also changes the averaging kernel and a spatio-26 temporally changing kernel is part of the satellite data product (an averaging kernel is 27 provided for each satellite pixel).

To apply the averaging kernel on model data, the satellite data are regridded to the model grid so that those data from satellite pixels nearest to any given model grid point are used for that grid point. A smaller area than the whole model domain was chosen to study and compare to the satellite data, 30° west to 15° east and 45° to 70° north (red boxes in Figure 1). The Aura satellite does five overpasses over the domain during daytime, swaths are partly overlapping

in the northern regions. For the grid cells where the swaths overlap, the satellite observations 1 2 are averaged to produce daily average fields. There are also regions that are not covered by satellite observation that will not be taken into account in the model data post processing. To 3 make comparable daily averages of the model data, the closest hour in the hourly model 4 5 output are matched to the satellite swath time and only grid points that are covered by satellite are used. The profiles for the averaging kernel in the satellite product are given on 60 levels, 6 7 the values from these levels are interpolated to model vertical levels. The new adjusted model 8 VCD is then calculated by multiplying the interpolated averaging kernel weights to the SO₂ 9 concentration in each model layer, integrating all layers with the height of each model layer.

10 Because of noise in the satellite data small retrieved VCD values are highly uncertain. A threshold limit is sought to identify those regions that have a significant amount of SO₂. 11 12 Standard deviation for the satellite data is calculated over an apparently SO_2 free North Atlantic region (size 10 x 15 degrees lat lon respectively), and is found to be around 0.13 DU. 13 14 Effects of varying cloud cover are ignored. An instrument detection limit is three times the 15 standard deviation of a blank, so we assume that with a threshold value set to 0.4 DU we exclude satellite data below detection limit. Any grid point with a value over this threshold in 16 17 the satellite data is used along with the corresponding model data. Daily mass burdens for the North Atlantic region are calculated by summing up all the SO₂ VCD in the grid cells above 18 the threshold. One DU is $2.69 \, 10^{20}$ molecules per square metre, which corresponds to a 19 column loading of 28.62 milligrams SO_2 per square meter (mg/m²). 20

21 Data of SO₂ and PM_{2.5} surface concentrations are collected by the European Environment 22 Agency (EEA) through the European Environment Information and Observation Network 23 (EIONET). We make use of two preliminary subsets of this data, one obtained from work 24 within the MACC project to produce regular air quality forecasts and reanalysis (only SO₂), 25 and a second one obtained from EEA as so called up-to-date (UTD) air quality data base, state spring 2016. The two different subsets cover observation data from different countries, and 26 27 have not yet been finally quality assured at the time of writing this paper. We use only station data, which contain hourly data. However, there are missing data and some stations have 28 29 instruments with high detection limits making it difficult to create a continuous measurement series with good statistics. Therefore, in this study some outstanding episodes with high 30 31 concentrations of SO₂ are analysed. For the first six day period between 20th and 26th September, high concentrations of SO₂ were measured over Great Britain and countries 32

further to the south. For the second six day period, a month later (20th to 26th October), the plume was also detected over Great Britain, but was transported further east towards Germany. For the last plume studied, lasting from 29th October to 4th November, the volcanic emission was transported eastward to the coast of Norway and countries to the south. Recent daily deposition data are taken from the EBAS data base (ebas.nilu.no) for those stations were the data are already available. Model data to represent the station values are picked from hourly data at model surface level in the grid cell where the station is located.

8 3 Results

9 **3.1 Comparison to satellite data**

Observations by satellite provide information about SO₂ location and column density. 10 11 Figure 1a shows as an example the VCD from the OMI satellite overpasses on 24 September. Fig. 1b and Fig. 1c show the modelled and the adjusted VCD from the basic run (bas_hol). 12 The observed satellite SO₂ cloud and the model simulated SO₂ cloud show similar shape and 13 14 location. The adjusted model column densities are smaller than the original model VCDs. More weight is given by the averaging kernel to model layers higher up, close to the reference 15 height of 7 km, where there is less SO₂ in our case, with emissions and transport happening in 16 17 the lower part of the troposphere. The reduced column densities are more comparable to the 18 column densities observed by the satellite. There are however some differences of where the 19 maximum column densities are located.

20 A quantitative comparison is attempted here by integrating all satellite - and corresponding 21 model data - above the North Atlantic, between Iceland and Europe, into daily mean column 22 loads. Figure 2 shows time series from September to October of daily satellite coverage and 23 daily mass burdens considered over the area where satellite VCD values exceed the 0.4 DU detection limit as explained above. The area covered by satellite observations at the beginning 24 25 of the period is around 70 percent of the domain used here (red boxes in Fig. 1). Towards the end of the period, the satellite coverage is only around 40 percent because of the increasing 26 solar zenith angle (a satellite zenith angle cutoff of 75° is used for the satellite data). On some 27 days, the satellite cover is even lower because of the OMI zoom mode. The percentage of the 28 satellite data that is above the detection limit is low over the entire two month period, only 29 reaching around ten percent at the end of September and at the beginning of October. 30

On most days, the satellite daily mass burdens are above the model value, not including the 1 2 days where the zoom mode minimizes the coverage. The average mass burden adjusted to the 3 7 km reference height for satellite data are 11.17 kt SO₂ for satellite and 8.72 kt SO₂ for the 4 model. The highest values are at the beginning of the period, 42.11 kt SO₂ for the model data 5 on 7 September, and 37.42 kt SO₂ 20 September for the satellite data. The daily values are decreasing over time, especially during October. At the same time the satellite coverage is 6 7 decreasing. To further investigate whether the increasing solar zenith angle is responsible for 8 the increasing bias of the simulated versus observed VCDs, a new domain further south is 9 used. All the area where satellite observations may be possible until the end of October (61.25° north) is used to calculate another set of daily column loads for satellite and model 10 11 data (see Fig. 2c). Satellite coverage in this southerly domain is not decreasing over time, but 12 it is also not covering Iceland, so the SO₂ from Holuhraun needs to be transported south to be 13 detected. The plume is transported south four times over the two-month period as the peaks in 14 column load values show. In this southerly area the daily accumulated mass burdens are 15 similar in September and in October, supporting the idea that the decrease in mass burden in 16 Fig. 2b is due to reduced satellite coverage. Taking into the account the area in which the 17 satellite observed SO₂ above detection limit, the satellite average column loads are calculated to around 70 mg/m^2 for the start of the period and on 19 September, model values are lower. 18 19 Also the peaks in the middle of October in Figure 2b have a satellite average column value at 62 mg/m^2 . 20

21 Percentile values from the distribution of the daily mass burden in September and October 22 2014 from all the three model simulations, original and kernel weighted are shown in Fig. 3. 23 The kernel weighted model data can be directly compared to the percentile characterisation of the satellite data. As illustrated in Fig. 1, there is a clear decrease in the column load values 24 25 before and after the averaging kernel is applied, because the SO₂ plume was found much 26 below 7 km altitude. The differences between the three model simulations however change 27 before and after the satellite kernel is applied. For the original model data, the model 28 simulation with emissions in the lowest kilometre (low hol) has the highest daily mass 29 burden values, while the run with the emission highest in the atmosphere (high_hol) exhibits a 30 lower mass burden than the two other. The higher values in the low_hol simulation can be explained by less wind and dispersion at low altitudes and thus a more concentrated SO₂ 31 cloud than in the two other model simulations. After the averaging kernel is applied to the 32 33 model data, the high hol model simulation has the highest daily values compared to the other two model simulations. High values in satellite data, and model data with kernel profiles
applied reflect high concentrations and/or volcanic SO₂ at high altitudes.

Comparing the satellite data to the kernel weighted model data; the satellite 75th percentile is 3 higher than the model 75th percentile. The median for the bas hol, low hol and high hol daily 4 mass burden are 7.38 kt, 4.43 kt and 8.34 kt respectively, for satellite the mass burden median 5 6 value is 7.03 kt. The satellite data therefore have higher maximum values that results in the higher average values and the 75th percentile, most of the satellite daily mass burden values 7 8 are however around the model data for the bas run. From all the model simulations, with 9 different emission heights, the bas run is the most similar to the satellite data over the first 10 two months.

11 **3.2 Surface concentrations**

SO₂ from the volcanic eruption on Holuhraun was measured at several surface stations during the period. Three different episodes with clear peaks in observed concentrations at stations around Europe are described in the following paragraphs. Exemplary comparisons are shown and additional comparisons at other stations are available in the supplementary material.

16 Figure 4 shows hourly time series for two stations over Great Britain and France from 20 September to 26 September. Concentrations of 44.25 μ g/m³ SO₂ concentrations were 17 measured 21 September 16 UTC at a station is situated in Manchester (53.48°N and 2.24°W) 18 19 near the west coast of Britain. None of the three model simulations exhibits exactly the same 20 values as observed. Although the model simulations do not reach the observed maximum values, the model field shows areas south of the station nearby Manchester, where the SO₂ 21 concentrations only due to the volcanic eruption are around 50 μ g/m³. Interestingly, the 22 agreement of the model derived volcanic SO₂ time series is better in agreement with 23 24 measurements than the total simulated SO₂ concentration (grey curve), indicating that the 25 model may not resolve SO₂ transport from nearby pollution sources and that the station for 26 these days is rather representative of long range transported SO₂. Observed PM_{2.5} 27 concentration at the station shows, that over the period, the highest concentration (52.1 μ g/m³) 28 - probably anthropogenic - is measured at the start of the period, before any volcanic sulphur contribution is simulated by the model. The next day, the plume has moved further south over 29 France, the station is situated on the west coast of France in Saint-Nazaire (47.25°N and 30 31 2.22°W). The measurements show three peaks over three days, with the highest one (38 1 μ g/m³) measured 12 UTC 23 September. All the three model simulations have the peak 2 concentrations earlier than the observed, and the concentrations from the model are lower 3 than observed. The three simulations do however show increased concentrations at the site 4 due to the volcanic eruption over the three days. The map shows that large parts of France had 5 an increase in SO₂ surface concentrations during this time.

Figure 5 shows the time series for three stations over Scotland and Germany a month later, 6 7 from 20 to 26 October. The high hol simulation shows low concentrations over the Scottish 8 Grangemouth station (56.01°N and 3.70°W), but the bas_hol and low_hol have a plume with 9 high concentrations over the station on 20 October. There are no measurements at this time to compare the model values to. The timing of the second plume 21 October for the two models 10 is a few hours early and the modelled concentrations higher than the 6.09 μ g/m³ observed, 11 especially for the low hol simulation. The map shows a narrow plume from Iceland south to 12 Scotland and the station lies on the edge of this plume. On 22 October, the volcanic SO_2 is 13 14 measured at stations in Germany. Figure 5d shows the plume reaching from Iceland into the 15 North Sea, transported east and south compared to the situation from the day before. The two stations Kellerwald (51.15°N and 9.03°E) and Bremerhaven (53.56°N and 8.57°E) experience 16 the plume differently. While for Bremerhaven the peak observed (41.0 μ g/m³) is short in 17 duration, the peak lasts for one day at Kellerwald with an observed maximum of 10.2 μ g/m³. 18 19 The map shows that the plume is narrow for all three stations and the gradient between where 20 there is no Holuhraun contribution and the maximum concentration is strong.

A third plume is illustrated in Fig. 6 over Northern Europe, occurring from the end of October 21 to the beginning of November. Figure 6a shows the measured SO₂ concentrations at a station 22 in Oslo, Norway (59.92°N and 10.76°E). There are four peaks measured from 29 October to 23 31, the highest one on 29 October (50.4 μ g/m³). The models runs show contribution from 24 Holuhraun SO₂ over the same three days, but do not reach the high measured concentrations, 25 26 especially the first plume is underestimated. On October 30, the plume is transported south 27 east to Poland. The Polish station in Sopot (54.43°N and 18.58°E) experiences a short peak that the model simulates to happen a few hours earlier, With the bas hol simulation has the 28 29 most comparable concentrations.

Figure 7 shows wet deposition for the whole three month period at the Kårvatn station
(62.78°N and 8.88°E) and the west coast of Norway. There are high levels, both observed and
modelled during the last part of September. The model exhibite high values on 27 September,

while the observed deposition is spread out over several days. Summed over the whole period,
the observation has 15.9 gS/m²y while the bas model simulated 19.98 gS/m²y. Comparisons at
other stations in Norway also show the same results (appendix).

4 Transport to Europe is caused by northerly and north-westerly winds. For the first plume, 5 where the model shows low concentrations compared to the observations, there had been 6 southerly winds a time before strong northerly winds transported the SO₂ cloud south over Great Britain and France. Compared to the other two episodes, the SO₂ surface concentration 7 8 due to Holuhraun are higher over a larger area during this episode. The difficulty of the model 9 to simulate the SO₂ transport correctly depends on the uncertainty in the emission term, the 10 meteorology fields, the chemical reactions and deposition. Overall the comparison to 11 observations shows, taking into account satellite and station data, that the bas_hol model 12 simulation matches best with the observed satellite column burdens, their time evolution and for some stations with the magnitude and timing of the observed peaks. 13

14 **3.3** Effects of the eruption on European pollution

The results above show that, although the Holuhraun eruption released large amounts of SO₂, 15 16 the stations in Europe often measured the increase in SO₂ concentration as short peaks 17 (Grislason et al. 2015, Schmidt et al. 2015). The model makes it possible to find a more 18 general view of the impact in the European air quality due to the volcanic emissions. Table 2 19 summarizes the model results for Europe. Grid cells covered by the countries mentioned are 20 used for calculating the results shown in the table. The emission (from anthropogenic 21 sources), concentration and deposition over the oceans are not included. Since a large part of 22 the deposition and concentration increase occurs downwind and to isolate the effect on 23 Iceland itself close to the emission point, the deposition and concentrations over Iceland are 24 given in brackets.

The Holuhraun emission estimate used in this study releases over 4.5 times the anthropogenic emission from the 31 countries (not including ship emissions). The anthropogenic emissions from Iceland are only 18 kilotons, the SO₂ emissions from Iceland increase by more than 300 times.

Over the three months, there is 1.32 times more SO_X wet deposition for the basic run with Holuhraun emission than the MACC reference with no Holuhraun emission. Wet deposition over Europe is dependent on the emission height. The simulation with the emission highest in the atmosphere (high_hol) has the highest contribution to the rest of Europe. For dry deposition, the ten percent increase over Europe is about the same for all the three model simulations with Holuhraun emissions. Close to the source, over Iceland the deposition levels are very dependent on the emissions height, especially for dry deposition.

5 Figure 8 shows the total deposition over Europe for the standard MACC model simulation 6 with no Holuhraun emission (no_hol), the basic model simulation (bas_hol), and the percent 7 increase between these two model runs. Areas that experience the highest percent increase are 8 also areas that have low levels in the model simulation with no emission at Holuhraun. Due to 9 the Holuhraun emissions Iceland has the highest SO_x deposition in Europe, and the coast of 10 northern Norway shows depositions on the same level as the more polluted eastern Europe. 11 Even though the previous section indicated that the model has higher wet deposition levels in 12 northern Norway than observed, it also showed that it is very likely that the observed increases in SO_x deposition levels are due to the Holuhraun emissions. 13

The averaged SO_2 surface concentration over Europe is under normal conditions higher than over Iceland, the volcanic emission caused the concentration level over Iceland to increase by a factor of 177 (for the low_hol simulation). Over the rest of Europe the increase is around the same for all three Holuhraun simulations, even though the time series showed that the different simulations had peaks arriving at often different times. On average, however, vertical mixing has levelled off initial differences in emission height when volcanic plumes arrive in Europe.

The increases in PM2.5 concentrations are due to increased sulphate production from volcanic 21 SO₂. PM_{2.5} is a collection of all aerosols under 2.5 µm, therefore the increased sulphate is 22 23 changing total aerosol mass relatively little. The table shows that Iceland has a lower average 24 concentration than the rest of Europe for all the four runs, even though Iceland is the origin to the increase in aerosol pollution levels. The high_hol model simulation has a higher increase 25 in PM_{2.5} concentration over Europe than the two other simulations. The low_hol simulation 26 27 finds highest sulphate and SO_x deposition on Iceland itself, and possibly over the nearby 28 ocean, that will lead to a lower contribution to pollution levels over the rest of Europe.

The distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ from the no_hol and bas_hol simulation, plotted in Figure 9, shows the same polluted and clean areas as in Fig. 8, although the increase is lower. Over north-west Norway and northern Norway the increase is over 100 percent, Figure 9b shows that although the percentage increase is high, the $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in these areas are still among the least polluted in Europe. The high deposition levels in this region indicate that some of the
 PM_{2.5} is scavenged out.

WHO recommends a 24 hourly average mean concentration level of 25 μ g/m³ for PM_{2.5} not to 3 4 be exceeded over three days over a year (WHO, 2005). Figure 10a shows that over the 5 Benelux region, northern Germany and northern Italy this limit value is exceeded by up to ten 6 days during the three months studied. As the previous plot showed, these are regions with 7 high average PM_{2.5} concentrations. Because the daily concentrations are already high, any 8 increase in days in the model bas_hol simulation due to the Holuhraun emissions is also 9 occurring in these regions, and the areas with the highest percent increase does not experience 10 any days over the limit. The Figure also shows that Northern Ireland experienced up to two 11 exceedance days due to the volcanic eruption.

12

13 **4 Discussion**

14 The variances between the satellite model data and the satellite observations can be due to several factors. a) The model emissions flux may be under or overestimated compared to the 15 real emissions, model VCDs are therefore too low / too large compared to the observed ones. 16 17 b) The areas within which the column mass are constructed depend on the threshold VCD 18 value and the satellite data, so the values in the model depend on the position of the observed 19 SO₂ cloud. If the simulated plume is displaced into an area where the satellite does not show 20 any useful signal, then this part of the model plume is ignored and may lead to underestimates 21 of the model. c) The presence of clouds can increase the uncertainty of the satellite retrieval. 22 d) Schmidt et al. (2015) presents IASI (Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer) plume heights between 5.5 km to 1.6 km derived from an area of 500 km around the volcanic 23 24 location, and a mean IASI centre of mass height between 2.7 km to 0.6 km. The fluctuating 25 real height of the SO₂ plume may introduce additional bias between model and satellite 26 VCDs.

Schmidt et al. (2015) presents a comparison between model, satellite and ground observations for September. Mass burdens from OMI are derived using observed plume heights from the IASI instrument on the MetOp satellite. The model NAME (Numerical Atmosphericdispersion Modelling Environment), a Lagrangian model, is run for September with sensitivity runs testing both emission height and emission flux. Comparing with the two satellite data sets, the model simulation with a plume height of 3 km and doubled emission

flux (~1400 kg/s) matches well with the OMI satellite data for the first days, while for the rest 1 2 of September the model simulation with emission similar to the constant emission used here matches better (~700 kg/s). In this study, since the model data is weighted with the averaging 3 kernel before compared to the satellite data the values are lower, because the assumed plume 4 5 height is 7 km. Both methods show however that for the first days, the satellite had higher values than the model for the first days and at the end of September. Model simulations with 6 7 higher emissions showed better comparison during the first days of September, but overall the 8 height of the plume is more important for the satellite comparison.

9 Our Holuhraun emission term in the three model simulations is constant throughout the 10 simulations both with respect to emission height and emission flux. Maximum fluxes of 1300 kg/s were reported by Barsotti (2014), and Gislason et al. (2015) estimated a 2.5 times the 11 12 average emission term during the first two and a half weeks of the eruption. The assumption of a constant emission term is thus certainly a simplification. The emission height is also 13 14 variable, dependent on initial volcanic eruption characteristics and meteorological conditions 15 like wind speed and stratification (Oberhuber et al. 1998). A better source estimate for the eruption is beyond the scope of this study; however the fluctuations in flux magnitude and 16 17 emission height can explain some of the differences between observed and simulated 18 concentrations, especially the first days of September in the satellite comparison.

19 Surface concentration comparisons presented in this study and in the supplementary material 20 show that the volcanic SO₂ was observed as short singular peaks lasting from a few hours to several peaks over a short set of days. The biggest difference for the three studied plumes is 21 22 for the first one during 20 to 26 September for the Manchester (GB0613A) in Great Britain 23 and the Saint-Naizaire station (FR23181) in France, with up to a factor of four differences 24 between simulated and measured concentrations. Both the measured and simulated 25 concentrations during the September event were higher than the two later events, pointing to a different transport of SO₂ in the first event, and not only higher emissions. Higher emission 26 27 fluxes are also not supported by the satellite comparison over these days either. Changes in 28 emission flux for the EMEP/MSC-W have been shown to have an almost linear change in 29 concentrations (not shown here); even with doubled emissions during this event the model 30 would still simulate concentrations and burdens well below those observed. Station data 31 presented in Schmidt et al. (2015) for these days show the same results, indicating that the models and meteorology had difficulties representing this period. 32

The discrepancies between the model and observations, especially for the station data show that the values presented in Table 2 contain error. Especially the model surface concentrations are low compared to observations; however the map plots show, that sometimes modelled concentrations nearby the stations reached observed levels. The area averaged concentrations presented in table 2 may therefore be close to the real concentration increase. A more thorough study of longer time series with deposition and concentration trends is needed to estimate better the increase in SO_2 concentrations due to the eruption at the stations.

8 The results in this study show that the sulphur depositions from September to November over 9 Northern Norway were at the same levels as the most polluted regions in Europe. Emission ceilings aim set by the Gothenburg Protocol was to reduce the SO_x emissions by 63 % by 10 11 2010 compared to the 1990 levels (EMEP, 2015). Most countries have accomplished these 12 reductions, and the sulphur deposition levels over Europe have decreased. The Holuhraun 13 eruption changed the picture in some areas. Comparing observed deposition levels at 14 Tustervatn station in central Norway, the simulated deposition is higher than the yearly 15 observed averages since 1980. Monthly observed values at this station during the 2011 Grimsvötn eruption show almost as high values as the bas_hol simulation. The time series 16 17 from the Kårvatn station also shows that the increases are due to the Holuhraun volcanic eruption. Northern Norway is more susceptible for volcanic impact because of the 18 geographical position, in addition to high frequency of precipitation on the western coast of 19 Norway. Comparing the mean deposition levels over the three months in 2014 over Norway 20 21 to model simulations with emissions from previous years, they are double to the early 1990s 22 (EMEP, 2015). Southern Norway experienced a sulphur deposition decrease of 40 % from 23 1980 to 1995 due to emission abatement in Europe (Berge et al. 1999). The highest contributors to high deposition levels over Southern Norway were the UK and Germany (18 24 25 % and 15 % respectively). Norway also experienced in 2014 a high percent increase in PM_{2.5} concentrations. The PM_{2.5} levels over Scandinavia are low, and a small increase in the 26 27 concentrations leads to high percent increases. The increase over land shows a similar pattern 28 as the results found in Schmidt et al. (2011) for a hypothetical Laki eruption. Even though the 29 highest increase is over Scandinavia and Scotland, the concentrations are too low to exceed the 25 μ g/m² limit. Already polluted regions like the Benelux region experience more days 30 31 with exceedances as well as North Ireland.

1 **5 Conclusions**

The increase in emitted SO_2 to the atmosphere caused by the volcanic eruption at Holuhraun were observed by satellite and detected at several stations over Europe (Schmidt et al. 2015, Gislason et al., 2015). Model simulations with the EMEP/MSC-W model with emissions from Holuhraun over the period from September to November have been done to investigate the model capability to simulate such events, and also to study the impact of the increased emissions on concentrations and depositions over Europe.

8 The first two months of the model simulations are compared to satellite retrievals from OMI. 9 The retrievals use an assumed plume height of 7 km. Averaging kernels from the satellite data 10 are applied on the model data to compare the model data to the satellite. Because of the 11 weighting, the satellite retrieved mass burden values are dependent on both vertical placement and amount of SO₂. Two sensitivity model simulations with different Holuhraun emission 12 13 height are compared to the satellite data together with the basic simulation. After the kernel is 14 applied, the results are more comparable to the satellite data. The results also show that it is 15 difficult to conclude if the discrepancies are due to the concentrations or the vertical placement. 16

17 The model simulations are compared to observed concentrations at stations over Europe for three different events with high concentrations measured at the stations due to the Holuhraun 18 19 emissions. For all the events, the timing of the model peaks is well compared to the observed 20 peaks in concentration. There is a better timing in the two model simulations where the 21 emissions are injected lowest into the atmosphere, than for the sensitivity run with the highest 22 emission height. Due to the transport of SO₂ during the first event, observed concentrations 23 are higher than during the later events, and the difference between models and observations is 24 largest. PM_{2.5} concentration during this first event is comparable to observations. Uncertainties in the model simulations increase by the length of transport, and some near 25 26 misses of the narrow plumes can clearly explain differences between model and observation. 27 Also, to make a better estimate of the model performance during the whole volcanic eruption, 28 better quality checked station data is needed. Comparison between the model and wet 29 deposition observations over Norway show significant and high contributions from the 30 eruption, although the model over-predicts values at the station studied and other stations showed in the appenidx. 31

1 Studying the changes in pollution levels over Europe, SO_X wet deposition showed the highest 2 increase in the model. For the basic simulation there is 32 % more sulphate wet deposition than the model simulation with no Holuhraun emission over the 28 European Union countries, 3 Norway and Switzerland. The regions that have the highest increase, apart from Iceland, are 4 5 Northern Scandinavia and Scotland, regions that are among the least polluted in Europe. Especially the coast of Northern Norway, with a percent increase in total deposition of over 6 7 1000%, shows levels equal to the most polluted regions in Europe Compared with observed 8 levels since 1980 at the Tustervatn station in central Norway the 2014 model values are earlier only reached in the observations during the Grimsvötn eruption in 2011. Higher values 9 10 measured at the Kårvatn station in 2014 on the coast of western Norway are due to the 11 Holuhraun emissions. Compared to model simulations with meteorology and emission from 12 previous years, the mean deposition levels over Norway are double that of 1990.

13 The difference in SO₂ concentrations over Europe between the no_hol and model simulations 14 with Holuhraun emission are around 13 percent over the same 30 countries and increases 15 occurs as short peaks in concentration levels from a few hours to some days. Due to the 16 underestimation seen at stations during September, the uncertainty of this number is large and 17 the increase is possibly too small. For $PM_{2,5}$ concentration, the increase is six percent, and the 18 model shows better agreement with station observations. The biggest difference in percent 19 increase is seen over Scandinavia and Scotland, however these regions are among the cleanest 20 in Europe, also with the added sulphur caused by the Holuhraun emissions. A lot of the 21 sulphur is also deposited out over these regions by frequent precipitation. The areas that show increase in days with over 25 μ g/m² PM_{2.5} concentrations are already polluted. Even with 22 23 high emissions from the volcanic fissure at Holuhraun, the increase in pollution levels over 24 Europe is relatively small, with only transient episodes associated with high increases in SO₂ 25 concentration.

26 Acknowledgements

27 Most of the work done for this paper is funded by the Norwegian ash project financed by the 28 Norwegian Ministry of Transport and Communications and AVINOR. Model and support is 29 also appreciated trough the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the 30 Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (No: ECE/ENV/2001/003). The observations 31 made available trough the EEA UTD database are 32 (http://fme.discomap.eea.europa.eu/fmedatastreaming/AirQuality/AirQualityUTDExport.fmw

) and the MACC project (MACC III project number 633080) obtained with the much
 appreciated help of Álvaro Valdebenito. Wenche Aas and Paul Eckhardt for provision of
 recent measurements of wet deposition measurements in Northern Norway, included in the
 EBAS database. This work has also received support from the Research Council of Norway
 (Programme for Supercomputing) trough CPU time granted at the super computers at NTNU
 in Trondheim.

1 References

- Barsotti, Sara. "100 Days of Gas Release at Holuhraun." Vedur.is, 11 Dec. 2014. Web. 8 Apr.
 2015.
- 4 Berge, E., Bartnicki, J., Olendrzynski, K. & Tsyro, S. (1999): Long-term trends in emissions
- and transboundary transport of acidifying air pollution in Europe. J. Environ. Manage., 57, 31
 50.
- Brenot, H., Theys, N., Clarisse, L., van Geffen, J., van Gent, J., van Roozendael, M., van der
 A, R., Hurtmans, D., Coheur, P., Clerbaux, C., Valks, P., Hedelt, P., Prata, F., Rasson, O.,
 Sievers, K. & Zehner, C. (2014): Support to Aviation Control Service (SACS): an online
 service for near-real-time satellite monitoring of volcanic plumes. Nat. Hazard Earth Sys., 14,
 1099-1123.
- 12 Bukowiecki, N., Zieger, P., Weingartner, E., Jurányi, Z., Gysel, M., Neininger, B., Schneider,
- 13 B., Hueglin, C., Ulrich, A., Wicher, A., Henne, S., Brunner, D., Kaegi, R., Schwikowski, M.,
- 14 Tobler, L., Wienhold, F. G., Engel, I., Buchmann, B., Peter, T. & Baltensperger, U. (2011):
- 15 Ground-based and airborne in-situ measurements of the Eyjafjallajökull volcanic aerosol
- 16 plume in Switzerland in spring 2010. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 10011-10030.
- 17 EMEP MSC-W (2015): Transboundary acidification, eutrophication and ground level ozone
- 18 in Europe 2013. EMEP Status Report 1/2015
- Gettelman, A., Schmidt, A. & Kristjansson, J. E. (2015): Icelandic volcanic emissions and
 climate. Nat. Geosci, 8, 243-243.
- 21 Gíslason, S.R., Stefánsdóttir, G., Pfeffer, M.A., Barsotti, S., Jóhannsson, Th., Galeczka, I.,
- 22 Bali, E., Sigmarsson, O., Stefánsson, A., Keller, N.S., Sigurdsson, Á., Bergsson, B., Galle, B.,
- 23 Jacobo, V.C., Arellano, S., Aiuppa, A., Jónasdóttir, E.B., Eiríksdóttir, E.S., Jakobsson, S.,
- 24 Guðfinnsson, G.H., Halldórsson, S.A., Gunnarsson, H., Haddadi, B., Jónsdóttir, I.,
- 25 Thordarson, Th., Riishuus, M., Högnadóttir, Th., Dürig, T., Pedersen, G.B.M., Höskuldsson,
- 26 Á., Gudmundsson, M.T. (2015) Environmental pressure from the 2014-15 eruption of
- 27 Bárðarbunga volcano, Iceland. Geochem. Persp. Let. 1, 84-93.
- 28 Grattan, J., Durand, M. & Taylor, S. (2003): Illness and elevated Human Mortality in Europe
- 29 Coincident with the Laki Fissure eruption. Vocanic Degassing: Geol. Soc, SP 213. The
- 30 Geological Society of London , pp. 410-414.

- 1 Ialongo, I., Hakkarainen, J., Kivi, R., Anttila, P., Krotkov, N. A., Yang, K., Li, C., Tukiainen
- 2 S., Hassinen, S. & Tamminen, J. (2015): Validation of satellite SO2 observations in northern
- 3 Finland during the Icelandic Holuhraun fissure eruption. Atmos. Meas. Tech., 8, 2279-2289
- Levelt, P.F., van den Oord, G.H.J., Dobber, M.R., Ma'lkki, A., Visser, H., de Vries, J.,
 Stammes, P., Lundell, J., and Saari H. (2006), The Ozone Monitoring Instrument, IEEE
 Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., 44(5), 1093–1101, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2006.872333.
- 7 Kuenen, J. J. P., Visschedijk, A. J. H., Jozwicka, M. & Denier van der Gon, H.A.C. (2014)
- 8 TNO-MACC_II emission inventory; a multi-year (2003-2009) consistent high-resolution
- 9 European emission inventory for air quality modelling. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 10963-10 10976.
- 11 Moxnes, E. D., Kristiansen, N. I., Stohl, A., Clarisse, L., Durant, A., Weber, K. & Vogel, A.
- 12 (2014) Separation of ash and sulphur dioxide during the 2011 Grimsvötn eruption. J. Geophy.
- 13 Res-Atmos, 119, 7477-7501.
- 14 Oberhuber, J. M., Herzog, M., Graf, H. & Schwanke, K. (1998): Volcanic plume simulation
- 15 on large scales. J. Volcanol. Geoth Res, 87, 29 53.
- Rodgers, C. D. (2000): Inverse Methods for Atmospheric Sounding: Theory and Practice.
 World Sci. Singapore.
- 18 Schmidt, A., Ostro, B., Carslaw, K. S., Wilson, M., Thordarson, T., Mann, G. W. &
- 19 Simmons, A.J. (2011): Excess mortality in Europe following a future Laki-style Icelandic
- 20 eruption.PNAS, 108, 15710-15715.
- 21 Schmidt, A., Leadbetter, S., Theys, N., Carboni, E., Witham, C.S., Stevenson, J.A., Birch,
- 22 C.E, Thordarson, T., Turnock, S., Barsotti, S., Delaney, L., Feng, W., Grainger, R.G., Hort,
- 23 M.C., Höskuldsson, Á., Ialongo, I., Ilyinskaya, E., Jóhannsson, T., Kenny, P., Mather, T.A.,
- 24 Richards, N.A.D., and Shepherd, J. (2015), Satellite detection, long-range transport, and air
- 25 quality impacts of volcanic sulphur dioxide from the 2014–2015 flood lava eruption at
- 26 Bárðarbunga (Iceland), J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 120, doi:10.1002/2015JD023638.
- Sears, T. M., Thomas, G. E., Carboni, E., A Smith, A. J., & Grainger, R. G. (2013). SO2 as a
 possible proxy for volcanic ash in aviation hazard avoidance. Journal of Geophysical
 Research: Atmospheres, 118(11), 5698-5709.

- Sigmundsson, F., Hooper, A., Hreinsdottir, S., Vogfjord, K. S., Ofeigsson, B. G., Heimsson,
 E. R., Dumont, S., Parks, M., Spaans, K., Gudmindsson, G. B., Drouin, V., Arnadottir, T.,
 Jonsdottir, K., Gudmundsson, M. T., Hognadottir, T., Fridriksdottir, H. M., Hensch, M.,
 Einarsson, P., Magnusson, E., Samsonov, S., Brandsdottir, B., White, R. S., Agustdottir, T.,
 Greenfield, T., Green, R. G., Hjartardottir, A. R., Pedersen, R., Bennet, R. A., Geirsson, H.,
- 6 La Femina, P. C., Bjornsson, H., Palsson, F., Sturkell, E., Bean, C. J., Mollhoff, M., Braiden,
- 7 A. K. & Eibl, E.P.S. (2015): Segmented lateral dyke growth in a rifting event at Barðarbunga
- 8 volcanic system, Iceland. Nature, 517, 191-195.
- 9 Simpson, D., Benedictow, A., Berge, H., Bergstrøm, R., Emberson, L. D., FagerliI, H.,
- 10 Flechard, C. R., Hayman, G. D., Gauss, M., Jonson, J. E., Jenkin, M. E., Nyiri, A., Richter,
- 11 C., Semeena, V. S., Tsyro, S., Tuovinen, J., Valdebenito, A. & Wind, P. (2012): The EMEP
- MSC-W chemical transport model: technical description. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 7825-7865.
- 14 Theys, N., I. De Smedt, J. van Gent, T. Danckaert, T. Wang, F. Hendrick, T. Stavrakou, S.
- 15 Bauduin, L. Clarisse, C. Li, N. Krotkov, H. Yu, H. Brenot, and M. Van Roozendael (2015),
- 16 Sulphur dioxide vertical column DOAS retrievals from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument:
- 17 Global observations and comparison to ground-based and satellite data. J. Geophys. Res.
- 18 Atmos., 120, 2470–2491. doi: 10.1002/2014JD022657.
- Thomas, H. E., & Prata, A. J. (2011). Sulphur dioxide as a volcanic ash proxy during the
 April–May 2010 eruption of Eyjafjallajökull Volcano, Iceland. Atmospheric Chemistry and
 Physics, 11(14), 6871-6880.
- Thordarson, T. & Self, S. (1993): The Laki (Skaftar Fires) and Gri-msvötn eruptions in 17831785. B. Volcanol., 55, 233-263.
- 24 Thordarson, T. & Self, S. (2003): Atmospheric and environmental effects of the 1783-1784
- Laki eruption: A review and reassessment., J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 108, AAC 7-1-AAC 726 29.
- Thordarson, T. & Hartley, M. (2015): Atmospheric sulphur loading by the ongoing
 Nornahraun eruption, North Iceland. , EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts 17,
 10708.
- 30 Tørseth, K., Aas, W., Breivik, K., Fjæraa, A. M., Fiebig, M., Hjellbrekke, A. G., Lund Myhre,
- 31 C., Solberg, S., and Yttri, K. E.: Introduction to the European Monitoring and Evaluation

Programme (EMEP) and observed atmospheric composition change during 1972–2009,
 Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 5447-5481, doi:10.5194/acp-12-5447-2012, 2012.

3 Yang, K., Krotkov, N. A., Krueger, A. J., Carn, S. A., Bhartia, P. K. & Levelt, P.F. (2007): 4 Retrieval of large volcanic SO2 columns from the Aura Ozone Monitoring Instrument: 5 J. 112, Comparison and limitations. Geophys. Res. Atmos., D24S43, 6 doi:10.1029/2007JD008825.

- 7 WHO (2005): Air quality guidelines. Global update 2005. Particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen
- 8 dioxide and sulphur dioxide, URL
- 9 http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/outdoorair_aqg/en/, World Health
- 10 Organisation, European Centre for Environment and Health Bonn Office, ISBN 92 890 2192

	Model run name Holuhraun layer into which Holuhraun flux SO2 was injected in the model simulation					
	bas_hol	0 - 3 km	750 kg/s			
	low_hol	0 - 1 km	750 kg/s			
	high_hol	3 - 5 km	750 kg/s			
	no_hol		0			
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						

1 Table 1. Overview of model runs and the Holuhraun emission height assumptions and flux.

Table 2. Emissions, depositions and concentrations for the 28 European Union member states, Norway and Switzerland for the three months (September, October, November). Emissions and depositions are total over the three month period, concentrations are the mean over the period for the 31 countries. Numbers in brackets are the contribution from Iceland, for emission and deposition, the number represents the sum over Iceland. For concentration, the number represents the average over Iceland.

	no_hol	bas_hol	low_hol	high_hol	bas_hol/no_hol
Emissions SO ₂	1 257	1 257	1 257	1 257	1
[kilotons]	(18)	(5 980)	(5 980)	(5 980)	(5.68)
SO _X Wet deposition	1 043	1 382	1 285	1 465	1.32
[kilotons]	(11)	(1 122)	(1 491)	(472)	(2.37)
SO _X Dry deposition	481	529	524	526	1.10
[kilotons]	(4)	(151)	(409)	(8)	(1.40)
Mean SO ₂ surface conc.	1.39	1.58	1.56	1.56	1.13
$[\mu g/m^3]$	(0.59)	(38.95)	(105.91)	(1.81)	(66.17)
Mean PM _{2.5} surface conc.	5.86	6.20	6.09	6.28	1.06
$[\mu g/m^3]$	(0.82)	(2.50)	(3.13)	(1.12)	(3.06)



Figure 1. SO₂ column density for a) the satellite swaths on 24 September, b) corresponding model data for the basic simulation from 24 September, and c) model bas_hol data with averaging kernel applied from satellite data. The red box indicates the area where the satellite statistics in fig.2 are done.

- 7
- 8
- ~
- 9
- 10
- 11



2

Figure 2. a) Daily time series of satellite observed area coverage (blue triangles) in percent of the total area of the domain used for the statistics (30 W - 15 E and 45 - 70 N, see fig 1). Green triangles show the percent of the area where satellite derived SO₂ is above 0.4 DU. b) Daily time series of mass burdens from satellite data (black dots) and from model control run (red dots) with averaging kernel applied, accumulated in consistent area. c) Shows the same as b) but over a smaller area just south of 61.15 degrees north.

9



Figure 3. Distribution of mass burden derived from the 61 daily values (see fig 2) for the 3 three model simulations, one for each of the three kernel weighted and the satellite data, in the 4 area where satellite derived SO_2 exceeds 0.4 DU. The boxes shown represent the 25^{th} 5 percentile, the median, and the 75th percentile values, lower whiskers the minimum value and 6 upper whiskers the maximum value. 7



1

2 Figure 4. Left: Time Series from 20 to 26 September 2014 for two stations, GB0613A in 3 Manchester of SO₂ (top) and PM_{2.5} (below) and SO₂ FR23181 in Saint-Nazaire. The red line shows the measured ground concentrations, the grey line represents the modelled ground 4 5 concentration with bas_hol. By subtracting the ground concentrations from the no_hol 6 simulation the concentration due to volcanic eruption for the bas_hol, low_hol and high_hol 7 calculated and are shown in the blue, green and pink line respectively. Right: Ground 8 concentration due to the volcanic eruption from bas_hol, corresponding to the blue line in the 9 time series, for the time of the maximum observed concentration. The red dot on the map 10 marks the position of the station.



- 2 Figure 5. The same as Figure 1, but from 20 to 26 October 2014 for three different stations
- 3 GB0735A Grangemouth in Scotland, DEHE060 Kellerwald and DEHB005 Bremerhaven in
- 4 Germany, all SO₂.



4

- 2 Figure 6: The same as the two previous figures but from 29 October to 4 November 2014 for
- 3 NO0088A Oslo, Norway and PL0050A in Sopot Poland, both SO₂.





6 represent the same as the three plots above.



Figure 8. Total deposition of SO_X (wet and dry) over Europe from September to November
for no_hol (a) and bas_hol (b) simulations and the percent increase due to the Holuhraun
emissions (c). d) Shows the same as c) but zoomed into Norway and Northern Europe.



Figure 9. Show the same as Figure 8, but with average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration over the three months.



2 Figure 10. a) Days with exceedances of $PM_{2.5}$ over September trough November for the

3 bas_hol model simulation. b) The increase in days from no_hol to bas_hol.