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Sources Contributing to Particulate Carbon

- Source can be divided into a contemporary or fossil fraction
- Contemporary or biogenic carbon source include
  - Fires, SOC from vegetation, cooking, pollen, and others
- Fossil or “old” carbon arises from burning of fossil fuels
- A large fraction of ambient particulate carbon is secondary organic carbon (SOC) formed from emitted organic gases
Radiocarbon ($^{14}$C) Distinguishing Between Contemporary and Fossil Carbon

- **Fraction Contemporary C**
  - 80-100% - rural sites
  - 70-80% - near urban sites
  - 50% - urban sites
  - 60-75% in industrial Midwest

- Similar fraction contemporary carbon in winter and summer
Sources of Organic Aerosol (OA)
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Gas Phase Emissions

Secondary Organic Aerosol

Primary Organic Aerosol

Carnegie Mellon

Center for Atmospheric Particle Studies
**Summertime Fraction of SOA in Fossil and Contemporary Carbon**

- Assumes all winter organic carbon is primary
  - Underestimates the summer secondary particulate carbon
- Assumes that a similar mix of sources contribute to the particulate carbon in the summer and winter.
  - Impact on estimate is unknown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary TC</th>
<th>Secondary OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biogenic</td>
<td>36% (6.4)</td>
<td>41% (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil</td>
<td>23% (10)</td>
<td>36% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laboratory and field study have shown evidence for large contributions of SOA from biomass emissions. Aging of VOCs from biomass burning rapidly creates a lot of SOA, doubling the organic carbon concentrations. Current state of the art modeling estimates little to no SOA from biomass burning.
Contribution of Fires to Particulate Carbon

- Wildfire
- Agricultural Fire
- Prescribed Fire
- Residential Wood Burning
Emissions from Different Fire Types

- Wildfire and wildland fire use, “Natural fires”, are the largest sources of smoke, especially in the western United States accounting for >80% of the acres burned.
Prescribed Fire in the Grand Canyon

Winter smoke from a prescribed fire trapped below the Grand Canyon rim

Satellite detects of fires March 7-12, 2005

Fire Detected by GOES-10 Mar 7, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOIL</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amm NO3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amm SO4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Mass</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 11, 2005
2005 Agricultural Fires

- IMPROVE (110 Sites)
- EPA PROTOCOL (8 Sites)
- 2005 Agriculture Fires
Smoke Management Needs for Air Quality Regulations

- Develop an unambiguous routine and cost effective methodology for apportioning primary and secondary carbonaceous compounds in PM2.5 RETROSPECTIVELY to prescribed, wildfire, agricultural fire, and residential wood burning activities
  - Daily contributions needed for Haze Rule to properly estimate natural contribution and contribution to worst 20% haze days
  - Annual and daily contributions needed for PM2.5 and PM10 NAAQS
  - Long term data needed to assess successes of smoke management policies
- Similar needs for ozone and reactive nitrogen deposition issues
Apportionment Methods

- Chemical transport models CTM)
  - Subject to large errors in inputs
    - Current CTM model simulations estimate little to no smoke SOA
    - Results are unconstrained by measured data

- Receptor Models
  - Chemical Mass Balance
    - Can’t apportion secondary aerosols
  - Factor Analysis e.g. Positive Matrix Factorization (PMF)
    - Non-unique source factors

PMF modeling appears to have combined SOC from vegetation in with fire
Hybrid Source Apportionment Model
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Smoke Apportion: Hybrid Receptor Modeling

Primary Smoke Marker Species
IMPROVE Data
Source Oriented Transport Model + Fire Types

Hybrid Receptor Model
Source Profiles

Mobile Source, Other Sources, Other SOC sources, Primary & Sec Smoke

Wild Fire, Prescribed Fire, Agricultural Fire
Developing a Retrospective Smoke Apportionment System

- Source apportionment system to estimate the contribution of primary and secondary smoke from different types of fire
  - Primary Smoke
    - Cheap and easy smoke markers species (Levoglucosan) measurements methods applicable in routine monitoring programs
    - Smoke source profiles for wildland fuel types
  - Secondary Smoke and Smoke Types
    - Hybrid source apportionment model - Statistical model for integrating deterministic modeling results and measured data
The FLAME Experiment

- USDA Forest Service Fire Science Lab at Missoula
- Characterization of primary smoke emissions
  - Hundreds of burns
  - Fuel components and complexes
  - NW, SW, and SE fuel emphasis
  - Chemistry, optical properties, hygroscopicity
Levoglucosan vs. OC

- Levoglucosan is unique to fire and stable in the atmosphere
- Stable ratio’s for different fuel types
- In a lab fire levoglucosan is a very good smoke marker species

Graph showing the relationship between levoglucosan and OC for different fuel types:

- **Branches**
  - Equation: $y = 0.044x \pm 0.004$
  - $R^2 = 0.80$

- **Straw**
  - Equation: $y = 0.031x \pm 0.003$
  - $R^2 = 0.80$

- **Needles**
  - Equation: $y = 0.026x \pm 0.003$
  - $R^2 = 0.70$

- **Grasses/Leaves**
  - Equation: $y = 0.021x \pm 0.001$
  - $R^2 = 0.79$
Hybrid Receptor Model
Incorporating Prior Source Attribution Estimates in Chemical Mass Balance Eq

\[ x_{ij}, y_{il} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} g_{ik} [f_{kj}, b_{kl}] + [e_{ij}, e_{y_{il}}] \]

- \( y_{il} = g_{ik} b_{kl} \pm e_{y_{il}} \) - Prior source contributions from the \( k^{\text{th}} \) source to the \( i^{\text{th}} \) measurement at the receptor.

- Multiplicative coefficients relating prior source attributions estimates, \( Y \) to \( G \)

- Positive Matrix Factorization (PMF):
  - Only the \( X \) and \( Y \) are known and the CMB equation is solved for the source contributions (\( G \)), source factors (\( F \)) and \( b \)
Incorporate CTM results into PMF optimization technique

\[ Q = \sum_j \sum_i \left( x_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{p} g_{ik} f_{kj} \right)^2 + \sum_k \sum_i \left( y_{ik} - \sum_{l=1}^{p} g_{ik} b_{lk} \right)^2 \]

- \( s_{ij} \) – uncertainty in the \( j^{th} \) species for measurement I
- \( y_{sk} \) - uncertainty of the \( k^{th} \) source type for CTM modeled period I
- It is assumed that \( y_{sk} \) are known within some constant \( \lambda \)
  - By modifying \( \lambda \) the relative weight of the measured and modeled data on the solution can be adjusted. Therefore \( \lambda \) can act as a tuning coefficient
- \( G, F \) and \( B \) are found by minimizing \( Q \) using the constrained weighted least square method in PMF
Hybrid Model – Trade-offs between reproducing the measured and modeled data
Testing the Hybrid Model using Synthetic Data

- True Source Contributions
- Prior Source Contribution estimate (CTM modeling results)
- Synthetic Measurements
Source Contributions: Truth vs. Prior Estimates

**Total Carbon**
- $y = 0.76x$
- $R^2 = 0.43$
- RMSE: 43% - 85%

**Fire**
- $y = 0.56x$
- $R^2 = 0.63$
- RMSE: 93% - 167%

**Mobile**
- $y = 0.98x$
- $R^2 = 0.24$
- RMSE: 53% - 131%

**Vegetation**
- $y = 0.84x$
- $R^2 = 0.31$
- RMSE: 66% - 70%

**Prior Estimates**
- Fire 25%
- Mobile 41%
- Veg SOC 14%
- Area 17%
- Point 3%
Hybrid - PMF Results

- **Truth**
  - Fire: 37%
  - Mobile: 13%
  - Veg SOC: 28%
  - Area: 19%
  - Point: 3%

- **Fire Apportionment**
  - Retrieved vs. Truth
  - Error vs. Model Weight

- **Prior Estimates**
  - Fire: 43%
  - Mobile: 17%
  - Veg SOC: 32%
  - Area: 67%

Legend:
- Green: Fire
- Blue: Mobile
- Dark Blue: Veg SOC
- Orange: Area
- Yellow: Point
Hybrid Model vs. Truth
Model and Observation have near equal weight

**Total Carbon**
- \( y = 0.87x \)
- R\(^2\) = 0.85

**Fire**
- \( y = 1.10x \)
- R\(^2\) = 0.90

**Mobile**
- \( y = 0.81x \)
- R\(^2\) = 0.41

**Vegetation**
- \( y = 0.90x \)
- R\(^2\) = 0.38

**Prior Estimates**
- Fire: 41%
- Mobile: 14%
- Veg SOC: 17%
- Area: 3%
- Point: 3%
Routine Data Needs for the Hybrid Receptor Model

- Measured aerosol data – IMPROVE monitoring network
- Smoke marker species – not routinely measured
- Prior smoke and other source attribution results
  - Will generate daily source attribution estimates for CIA using simply trajectory based CTM results
- Fire emissions tagged by source types
  - WRAP FETS is collecting the needed information to do this
Further Developments Needed

- Hybrid model capable of estimating contributions from different fire types
- Field studies to validate and further develop smoke marker species source profiles
- Further testing of the hybrid model on real data
- Blue Sky modeling framework is a logical place for implementing a hybrid receptor model