Boundary layer observations, ensembles, and their use in improving greenhouse gas flux inversions: Result from the ACT-America mission
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Background

• The atmospheric boundary layer (ABL) is a big deal for greenhouse gas and air quality studies.
  • Wind speed and mixing depth (ventilation factor) determines mole fraction enhancements:
    • \( \Delta C = \frac{F_C L}{z_i M} \), where \( \Delta C \) is the mole fraction enhancement, \( F_C \) is the flux of C, \( L \) is the advection distance, \( z_i \) is the mixing depth, and \( M \) is the wind speed.
  • ABL wind direction drives plume location.
  • ABL clouds / venting into the free troposphere / large-scale subsidence determines ABL residence time.
• Atmospheric simulations of the ABL have errors – bias and random.
An example...

• How do WRF ABL winds and ABL depth compare to rawinsonde measurements of the same properties in the US midcontinent?
An example...

• How do WRF ABL winds and ABL depth compare to rawinsonde measurements of the same properties in the US midcontinent?
• OK, WRF isn’t one model...let’s ask this of a WRF ensemble.
Evaluation of WRF-Chem CO$_2$ simulations in the upper Midwest, summer

Evaluation of *mid-afternoon* CO$_2$, ABL depth, and ABL winds.

Blue are tower-based CO$_2$ observation points (PSU, NOAA).

Red are rawinsonde stations (NOAA).

Boxes show the model domains (interior at 10 km).

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model number</th>
<th>Reanalysis</th>
<th>LSM scheme</th>
<th>PBL scheme</th>
<th>Cumulus scheme</th>
<th>Microphysics schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Grill-3D</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>No CP</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>FNL</td>
<td>Thermal dif.</td>
<td>MYNN</td>
<td>Kain-Fritsch</td>
<td>WSM 5-class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensemble varies the:
- boundary and initial conditions (2),
- land surface model (3),
- boundary layer parameterization (3),
- cumulus convection parameterization (3),
- cloud microphysics parameterization (2).

No within-domain meteorological data assimilation.

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
Random errors are significant for all model configurations.

Afternoon conditions, daily comparison.

ABL wind (a) RMSE ~ 3 m/s.

ABL wind direction (b) RMSE ~ 50 degrees.

ABL depth (c) RMSE ~ 700 m. (YSU-RUC consistently high).

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
Nearly all ensemble members overestimate boundary layer wind speeds.

Most ensemble members overestimate boundary layer height.

MYNN with thermal diffusion LSM appears to minimize both biases.

YSU-RUC appears to maximize biases.

No cumulus parameterization increases biases.

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
Biases have spatial structure and some locations are always biased. You can find model members with small mean ABL depth bias in these locations. But mean ABL wind speed is always too high. Ensemble-mean, mean ABL wind speed bias changes sign with longitude.

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
ABL CO₂ simulations are sensitive to nearly all physical processes in WRF, and the variability is substantial.

RMSD = root mean square deviation in midday ABL CO₂ when varying a given model parameterization

- Land Surface Model (LSM)
- Planetary Boundary Layer (PBL)
- Cumulus Parameterization (CP)
- global meteorological Reanalysis (Rea)
- Cloud Microphysics (MP)

Diaz-Isaac et al, ACP, 2018
Background

• The source of error are complex.
  • All ensemble elements matter (Diaz-Isaac et al, 2018).
  • Incoming solar radiation at surface is biased, improved land cover data doesn’t fix urban ABL problems, urban surface fluxes (energy and momentum) have large errors (Sarmiento et al, 2017).
  • Model ensembles are often biased (sometimes all members) (Diaz-Isaac et al, 2018; Sarmiento et al, 2017).
What to do?

• Jim Wilczak. “Wheel of pain”
  • Coupled system
  • Hard to isolate one component

• Pop culture reference.
  • https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x4blt6l
What can we do to improve our modeling systems?

• *Fix.*
  • Improve the model physics.

• *Kick.*
  • Use data assimilation to push the model around.

• *Quantify with calibrated ensembles.*
  • Make model ensembles that have minimal bias, and whose spread is a fair measure of model uncertainty.
What can we do to improve our modeling systems?

- **Fix.**
  - Improve the model physics.

- **Kick.**
  - Use data assimilation to push the model around.

- **Quantify with calibrated ensembles.**
  - Make model ensembles that have minimal bias, and whose spread is a fair measure of model uncertainty.

- **What do all of these approaches have in common?**
What can we do to improve our modeling systems?

• *Fix.*
  • Improve the ABL model physics.

• *Kick.*
  • Use data assimilation to push the ABL model around.

• *Develop calibrated ensembles.*
  • Make model ensembles that have minimal bias, and whose spread is a fair measure of ABL model uncertainty.

• *What do all of these approaches have in common?*

• *They all require ABL observations.*
ABL observational efforts being presenting today...

- Ankur Desai – Long-term, ecosystem, point or small region, surface flux – ABL observations.
- Sunil Baidar – Long-term, urban system, surface flux - ABL observations.
- Me – Large-area, multi-season, airborne campaign, (surface flux) - ABL observations.
ACT-America ABL-relevant observations, models, and ongoing research
Overarching Goal

• The Atmospheric Carbon and Transport-America (ACT-America) mission will enable and demonstrate a new generation of atmospheric inversions for quantifying CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ sources and sinks at regional scales.

• These inverse flux estimates will be able to:
  • Evaluate and improve terrestrial carbon cycle models, and
  • Monitor carbon fluxes to support climate-change mitigation efforts.
Mission Goals

1. Quantify and reduce atmospheric transport uncertainties
2. Quantify and reduce uncertainties in prior CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ flux estimates
3. Evaluate the sensitivity of Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) column CO$_2$ measurements to regional variability in tropospheric CO$_2$

→ All aimed to be applied to atmospheric inversions that use our long-term atmospheric observing systems.
→ Concerned with bias, random error, and spatial structure of errors in all cases.
What’s unique about ACT for ABL studies?

• Five-campaign, four-season, east-of-the-Rockies record of:
  • ABL depth (lidar – continuous, about 50,000 km; in situ profiles, ~1,200)
  • Cloud top retrievals (lidar – continuous, probably ~100,000 km)
  • ABL winds (level legs – nearly 200,000 km)
  • Spanning 30-40 weather systems, with pre-frontal, frontal, and post-frontal flights
  • With coincident GHG and other trace gas and meteorological data

• A multi-element ABL-GHG-calibrated ensemble modeling system
  • Transport and GHG ensemble elements
  • Transport calibrated on ABL winds and depth
  • GHG calibrated on flux and mole fraction tower data
Five, six-week campaigns over 3 years, covering each season and summer twice. ~25 flights / campaign.

Each campaign: 2 weeks in each of 3 regions across US (MidAtlantic, MidWest, SouthCentral).

About 50% of the data in the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL).

1140 total flight hours. About 1,500 flasks and 1,000 vertical profiles. ~400,000 km of flight data.
Ongoing, anticipated and desired analyses

• Create a well-documented, quality-checked data base of ABL observations.

• Evaluate the ABL depth and winds in the models used for atmospheric GHG inversions.
  • Identify biases.
  • Identify less-biased transport models.
  • Improve inverse flux estimates by relying on the less-biased models.

• Use the ACT ABL depth and wind data to create better transport model ensembles. Apply these to atmospheric inversions.

• Develop improved ABL simulations to implement in atmospheric inversion systems.
A little about the observations

• Winds – multi-level, orthogonal-heading calibration legs flown on each aircraft during each campaign to remove biases.
  • Performance suggests biases less than 1 m s\(^{-1}\).
    • Data manuscript in prep with details on wind calibrations

• Lidar ABL depth and cloud top data.
  • Goddard’s Cloud Physics Lidar (CPL), first four flight campaigns.
  • Langley’s High Altitude Laser Observatory (HALO), for the last flight campaign.
  • Both retrieve cloud top and boundary layer top with high resolution and accuracy using lidar backscatter.
HALO wavelet-based ABL depth detection algorithm.

Similar for both CPL and HALO observations.

Collins, Nehrir, Kooi, Barton-Grimley, NASA LaRC

\( W_f(a, b) = \frac{1}{a} \int_{z_b}^{z_a} f(z) h(\frac{z - b}{a}) \, dz \)

Davis et al., 2000

Brook 2003

Scarino et al. 2004
Cloud Physics Lidar ABL depth example. 30 minutes of C130 data.

Pal et al, data set in prep

Small error here – can be corrected
Comparison with Potential Temperature in optimal conditions

- Potential temperature derived MLH = 1.228 km
- HALO derived MLH = 1.236 km
- Fair weather cu and well defined mixed layer…easy for lidar

Collins, Nehrir, Kooi, Barton-Grimley, NASA LaRC
- Potential temperature derived MLH = 0.972 km
- HALO derived MLH = 1.098 km
- Humidification at PBL top could confound lidar retrieval

Collins, Nehrir, Kooi, Barton-Grimley, NASA LaRC
Elevated aerosol layers likely cause the outliers. These cases have probably already been screened out.

HALO ABL top compares very well with in situ soundings.
This isn’t brand new technology

BOREAS airborne lidar backscatter. Local standard time at top. Warm colors = more backscatter. Note horizontal scale is highly compressed.

Kiemle et al, 1997
Davis et al., 1997

Studies of ABL top structure, statistics, entrainment, relation to surface thermodynamic fluxes, link to water.

Multiple summer flights over central Canada

Classic daytime clear air convective boundary layer case.
IHOP: 7 June, 2002: Weak inversion, rapid morning ABL growth

Study of entrainment zone structure using ~6,000 km of lidar ABL observations.


“Extreme entrainment” situation...ML scaling violated.

Grabon et al., 2010, BLM
Kiemle et al., 2007

**IHOP 2002**

Airborne lidar observations of vertical velocity (NOAA) and water vapor (DLR).

Airborne eddy covariance flux profile measurement demonstration.

---

**Fig. 2.** Vertical cross sections of water vapor (colors) and vertical velocity (arrows) for the Falcon flight legs 3 and 4 oriented west-east at 37.4°N over southwestern Kansas. The aircraft flew (top) leg 3 from right (east) to left (west) and turned back at 102°W to (bottom) fly leg 4 on the same track. Top axis is longitude, bottom axis distance (km), and UTC time, 7 h ahead of LT. Maximum vertical wind velocities are ~4.2 m s⁻¹ in downward and 6.6 m s⁻¹ in upward directions. An arrow length corresponding to 150-m altitude difference is 7 m s⁻¹ in vertical velocity. The aspect ratio is about 1:7; that is, the cross sections are compressed horizontally by a factor of 7. It is evident that strong contributions to the flux emanate from the largest thermals.

Kiemle et al., 2007
This isn’t brand new technology


• But none of these past campaigns are as extensive in space and time as ACT, and none have the coincident density of in situ winds and GHG measurements.

• And it has been slow work getting the atmospheric modeling community to work with these data.
Beginnings of comprehensive model-data comparisons
CPL ABL depth maps

Subset of flight days with long, coherent ABL depth retrievals.

ABL depths in meters AGL.

Campbell et al, in prep.
WRF-CPL ABL depth differences

Model-data differences in km AGL.

Seasonal mean differences shown on each figure.

WRF-MYNN-Noah ABL depth appears to have a systematic low bias with respect to these data.

Campbell et al, in prep
First steps toward ABL wind evaluation

Penn State WRF baseline run: Random error (left) and bias (right), without (left set) and with (right set) nudging to ERA5. Barkley and Feng.
Work underway

- Protocol is under development for retrieval of atmospheric transport model column output, coincident with ACT lidar ABL depth retrievals and in situ sounding.
- Plan is to apply that protocol broadly – and conduct a multi-season, large-scale, weather-aware evaluation of the ABL properties (wind, depth) of the atmospheric transport models used for GHG inversion studies (and to perform coincident evaluation of their GHG fields).
- What follows depends in part on the findings, and the interest of the research community in improving trace-gas relevant ABL properties of atmospheric reanalyses.
WRF-based calibrated GHG ensemble modeling system

Figure 6. Flow chart of the summary of the ensemble evaluation and calibration processes.

Feng et al, 2019a, b
WRF-based GHG ensemble modeling system calibration

Left: Calibration of ABL winds and depth.

Below: Calibration of ABL CO₂ mole fraction.

Feng et al, 2019a

This calibration was done with rawinsonde data averaged over seasons and the entire continent. Regional, seasonal biases are likely to persist.

But this is an important beginning!
Ongoing, anticipated and desired analyses

• Create a well-documented, quality-checked data base of ABL observations.
• Evaluate the ABL depth and winds in the models used for atmospheric GHG inversions.
  • Identify biases.
  • Identify less-biased transport models.
  • Improve inverse flux estimates by relying on the less-biased models.
• Use the ACT ABL depth and wind data to create better transport model ensembles. Apply these to atmospheric inversions.
• Develop improved ABL simulations to implement in atmospheric inversion systems.

PLEASE JOIN THE EFFORT!
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Calibration data for the Penn State WRF GHG ensemble modeling system

Above: Rawinsonde stations and GHG mole fraction towers

Feng et al, 2019a

Below: CO₂ flux towers

Figure 1. (a) The simulation domain and locations of the observation. Shaded contour is terrain height in meters. Red triangles denote the locations of the NOAA CO₂ towers used in this work, and the names of the towers are marked. The information of these towers can be found in Table 1. White dots denote the locations of the NOAA rawinsonde stations. Note that we removed WGC and BAO from the model calibration procedure due to the local contamination. (b) The locations of the AmeriFlux towers. Information describing these towers can be found in Table S1.