Modeling subgrid scale variability in pollutant concentration due to heterogeneous urban emission

Myrto Valari¹ and Vlad Isakov²

¹NRC Post Doc at US Environmental Protection Agency ²US Environmental Protection Agency

Specificities of the modeling approach

- **Urban** air-quality: anthropogenically driven
- **Exposure** estimates: I km and below
- •Health impact: assess correlation with health outcomes



Conceptually

Concentrations



The model

•Force the CTM with local emission terms $\overline{E} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i * E_i$

$$E_i = \overline{E} + E'$$

with a_i some parameter of the subgrid distribution, such as landuse •Advection, diffusion, chemical transformations etc. act on the 'perturbation'

•CTM model 'local' concentrations \overline{C}_i along with $\overline{C} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i * C_i$



The downscaling approach here is **hybrid**:

Explicit: because direct downscaling towards 1km **Statistical**: because of emission allocation **Implicit**: because of the subgrid mixing term (not yet implemented)

Downscaling from 12km...



...to 4 and down to 1 km

Atlanta



Issues raised:

•Uncertainties in the input •Parameterization limitations •Unknown subgrid processes Model evaluation issues

Typical emission model (SMOKE) output (or CTM input)

All sources included NOx emissions (8a.m. LT)



Explicit:

Statistical:

add subgrid-scale informationcalculate grid distribution

Subgrid-areas or 'micro-environments':

I.On-roads
2.Residential (heating)
3.Commercial areas
4.Industrial areas
5.Recreational areas (parks, golf courses...)



Grid distributions: Ikm grid ratios





<u>Ikm grid area ratios %</u>

- •Roads: median at 2% with uniform distribution
- •Residential: narrow but relatively uniform
- •Commercial and Industrial: narrow and rare
- •Recreational: may be 0 or 100%



Source-specific Emissions at noon



•Subgrid emissions $E_i = N_i/A_i$ subject to speciation & temporal •Forcing terms E_i/\overline{E} express local deviations from averaged flux





Results for NOx: local emission forcing



Comparison between I and 4 km





Differences in **temporal** profiles



Differences **between counties**

De Kalb County



Differences **between pollutants**



In progress:

- •Implementation into CMAQ
- •Parameterization of the subgrid mixing Tmix
- •Evaluation (available measurements, local scale model)

Medium term conclusions:

High variability in forcing terms:

- •spatially between grid cells
- between counties
- •temporally
- between pollutants

Attenuation of resolution effects (similar results for I and 4 km)

Tips:

- •Low computational cost (selected grids, selected 'sectors')
- •Link between local concentrations and time activity
- •Concentrations 'ready to use' for exposure estimates