Wildfire Emission Factor Uncertainty and Modeled Atmospheric CO and O3

Rebecca Buchholz¹, Wenfu Tang¹, Christine Wiedinmyer², Louisa Emmons¹, Benjamin Gaubert¹, Forrest Lacey³, Mijeong Park¹, Rebecca Schwantes⁴, Simone Tilmes¹, and Helen Worden¹

¹National Center for Atmospheric Research, Atmospheric Chemistry Observations & Modeling Laboratory ²Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado ³National Center for Atmospheric Research ⁴Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences

November 21, 2022

Abstract

Wildfire emissions can vary substantially between different inventories due to the assumptions made in the emission creation process, including the defined vegetation type, fire detection, fuel loading, fraction of vegetation burned and emissions factors. Here, we focus on the uncertainty in emission factors and the resulting impact on modeled composition. We use the Community Atmosphere Model with chemistry (CAM-chem) to simulate 2014 atmospheric composition and focus on carbon monoxide (CO), a trace gas emitted from incomplete combustion and also produced from secondary oxidation of volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Fire is a major source of atmospheric CO and VOCs. Multiple simulations are compared, from an ensemble using four fire emission factor uncertainties. We compare model output and evaluate against CO observations from the Measurements of Pollution in the Troposphere (MOPITT) satellite-based instrument. For some regions, emission factor uncertainty spans the results found by using different inventories. Finally, we use modeled ozone (O3) to investigate how emission factor uncertainty lends a range of uncertainty influences the atmospheric oxidative environment. Overall, accounting for emission factor uncertainty lends a range of uncertainty to simulated results.

A31E-06: Wildfire Emission Factor Uncertainty and Modeled Atmospheric CO and O₃

<u>R. Buchholz</u>, W. Tang, C. Wiedinmyer, L. K. Emmons, B. Gaubert, F. Lacey, M. Park, R. Schwantes, S. Tilmes, H. Worden





December, 2021

Fire emissions impact air quality, weather and climate

Trace gases and aerosols emitted from fires degrade air quality: tropospheric ozone (O_3), $PM_{2.5}$

Fire aerosols change weather properties: clouds, precipitation

Two-way climate feedback

Large differences have been found between global inventories of emissions

• Quantify the role of uncertainty in fire emission factors



Creating global fire emissions



Artwork: Caparelli ArtNScience

Comparing carbon monoxide (CO) emissions globally, 2014



CO from four inventories:

- CMIP6 v1.2 Coupled Model Intercomprison Project (based on GFED4s)[2]
- FINN v1.5 Fire INventory from NCAR [3]
- **GFAS v1.2** Global Fire Assimilation System (ECMWF-CAMS) [4,5]
- QFED v2.5 Quick Fire Emissions Dataset (NASA/NCAR hybrid)[6]

CO emission factor uncertainties are used to create minimum and maximum emissions for the QFED inventory

• 6 simulations of CO-only changes



CO emissions in different regions



2014 emissions in the 14 GFED regions ([7] Giglio et al., 2006)

Different regions → different inventories have the highest fire CO emissions

NCAR | buchholz@ucar.edu

Volatile organic compounds (VOC) global emissions, 2014



- Species co-emitted with CO will impact the atmospheric oxidation capacity
- All QFED emissions, plus their respective emission factor uncertainties (all + or all -)
- 3 extra simulations



Exploring chemistry using a global model

- CESM2.0 full chemistry
- 0.92° ×1.25° horizontal resolution
- 32 level vertical resolution
- T1 Chemistry ([8] Emmons et al., 2020)
- Specified dynamics: MERRA2 nudged at 1%
- Emissions:
 - Biogenic MEGAN coupled to CLM
 - Anthropogenic CMIP6
 - Fire sensitivity studies, mainly look at QFED

CAM-chem surface CO, August 2014



CO (ppb)



High-performance computing support from Cheyenne (<u>doi:10.5065/D6RX99HX</u>) provided by NCAR's Computational and Information Systems Laboratory, sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

Simulated column CO seasonal averages: using QFED emissions

CO is produced by incomplete combustion

Large amounts of column CO over regions dominated by fire emissions or large sources of anthropogenic emissions



Seasonal uncertainty in column CO

Only including uncertainty in CO fire emission factors

Global: CO E.F uncert: 3.1%



Seasonal uncertainty in column CO

Including uncertainty in all fire emission factors

Global: CO E.F uncert: 3.1% All E.F uncert: 3.7%



9.9

8.8

7.7

6.6

5.5 . 4.4

3.3

2.2

1.1

0.0

Temporal evolution of uncertainty



- CMIP6 v1.2
- FINN v1.5
- GFAS v1.2
- QFED v2.5
 +/- CO uncert
- QFED v2.5 +/- all uncert

Outside the fire season, emission factor uncertainty bounds inventory differences.

Regional annual CO comparisons with Terra/MOPITT



UCAR

Surface layer ozone (O_3) from simulations with QFED

O₃ is created photochemically

Relationship to emissions is complex



Seasonal uncertainty in surface O₃

Only including uncertainty in CO fire emission factors

Global: CO E.F uncert: 0.3%



9.9

8.8

7.7

6.6

5.5%

4.4⁰

3.3

2.2

1.1

0.0

Seasonal uncertainty in surface O₃

Including uncertainty in all fire emission factors

Global: CO E.F uncert: 0.3% All E.F uncert: 1.6%



9.9

8.8

7.7

6.6

5.5 %

4.4⁰

3.3

2.2

1.1

0.0

Summary

Fire emission factor uncertainty can explain some differences between global inventories. Remaining differences are likely due to algorithm differences such as land cover used, fire detection and cloud handling.

CO emission factor uncertainty results in global average ~3.1% uncertainty in modeled column CO. All emission factor uncertainties adds an extra ~0.6%.

Most uncertainty in surface O_3 originates from all fire emission factor uncertainties, which contributes ~1.6% uncertainty globally.

Regional evaluation of modeling with global inventories is essential.





References

Emission Factors: [1] Akagi, S. K., et al. (2011), Atmos. Chem. Phys. 11, 4039-4027

CMIP6: **[2]** van Marle, M. J. E., et al., (2017), Geosci. Model Dev., 10, 3329-3357, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-3329-2017.

FINN: [3] Wiedinmyer, C., et al., (2011): Geosci. Model Dev., 4, 625-641, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-4-625-2011.

GFAS: **[4]** Kaiser, J. W., et al. (2012), 9, 527–554, Biogeosciences https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-527-2012. **[5]** Di Giuseppe, F., et al., (2018), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 5359–5370, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-5359-2018.

QFED: **[6]** Darmenov, A. & da Silva, A.(2015), NASA GMAO Technical Report, Vol. 38, 183 pp., available at: <u>https://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/pubs/docs/Darmenov796.pdf</u>

Region definitions: **[7]** Giglio, L., et al., (2006), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 957-974, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-957-2006</u>.

CAM-chem T1 Chemistry: **[8]** Emmons, L. K., et al., (2020). JAMES, 12, e2019MS001882, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001882.

Artwork on slide 3 by Caparelli ArtNScience



Extra: Creating emission bounds

How emission bounds are created using emission factor uncertainties





Created using emission factors compiled for FINN. Applied separately over four biomes.



