#### How well can we generate, characterized, and predict black carbon soot particle optical properties?

LINDSAY RENBAUM-WOLFF, James Brogan, Yatish Parmar, Andrew Lee, Paul Davidovits - **BC** Timothy Onasch, Greg Magoon, Andrew Freedman, Rick Miake-Lye, Andrew Lambe, Leah Williams - **ARI** Taylor Helgestad, Christopher Cappa – **UC Davis** Al Fischer, Geoff Smith – **University of Georgia** Noopur Sharma, Janarjan Bhandari, Swarup China, Claudio Mazzoleni – **Mich Tech Univ** Arthur J. Sedlacek, Ernie Lewis – **Brookhaven National Laboratory** Eleanor Browne, Gabriel Isaacman-VanWertz, Jesse Kroll - **MIT** 







# Atmospheric Black Carbon

- Product of incomplete combustion
- Emissions as high as 8 TgC/yr
  - ~60% fossil fuel and biofuel consumption
  - ~40% open biomass burning
- Non-spherical shape that depends on chemical processing
- Absorbs light strongly; depends upon coating material
- IPCC Fifth Assessment Report direct RF for fossil fuel

BC= +0.40 W m<sup>-2</sup> (+0.05 to 0.80 W m<sup>-2</sup>)



### Particle mixing state

 In urban and rural environments, BC is found internally mixed to varying extents with organics (POA and SOA) and inorganics (SO<sub>4</sub> and NO<sub>3</sub>).



Alex Lee et al., 2015 - U. Toronto



Liu et al., 2015 - Mich. Tech. Univ.

### Radiative impact of internal mixing



#### California urban summer

- Mainly urban (traffic, etc.) sources with little/no biofuels
- Measurements lower than shell-core Mie theory

#### UK suburban winter

4

5

- Mixed sources including solid fuel burning
- Measurements match shellcore Mie theory

### BC4 experimental details

#### **Diffusion flame**



#### Flame generated nascent soot

Methane diffusion flame - 'mature' soot



- Fractal particles composed of ~30 nm spherules
- Variety of geometries, including more linear and compact

Janarjan Bhandari, Swarup China, Claudio Mazzoleni – Michigan Technical University

#### Mass Corrections Using SP2

Effects of Q<sup>+</sup> and Q<sup>++</sup>



- 250 nm, 2.4 fg Two Mass Peaks
   Q1 = 2.1 fg
   Q2 = 5.4 fg
   <m> = 2.80 fg
- 500 nm, 8.3 fg
  Single Valued
  Q1= Measured Mass

#### Acknowledge DOE ARM SP2

Arthur Sedlacek- Brookhaven National Laboratory

#### MAC

Mass Absorption Coefficient (Absorption Cross Section Per Unit Mass) Used With Soot Emission Inventories in GCMs to Calculate Radiative Forcing



 $\lambda = 630 \text{ nm}$ 

- MAC= 6.40 ± 0.22 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> (2σ precision)
- Total Uncertainty = ±10% (Accuracy + Precision)
- Literature

 $6.5\pm1.0~m^2~g^{\text{-1}}$  (Bond and Bergstrom, 2006)  $6.5\pm1.0~m^2~g^{\text{-1}}$  (Petzold and Schönlinner, 2004)

### Predictive optical theories



Mie theory

- assuming mass-equivalent sphere
- material density = 1.8 g cm-3
- RI (1.95, -0.79) (Bond and Bergstrom, 2006)

T-Matrix theory

- assuming constant size primary spherules, no overlap of spherules, and no necking
- exact results for a given geometry
- simulated representative aggregate geometries created with cluster-cluster (CC) and diffusion limited aggregation (DLA) methods

Mie theory does not match measurements well for both absorption and scattering!

### Derived complex Rl's



#### High Dimension Model Representation

- HDMR meta-model of T-matrix results
- One-, two-, and three-sigma confidence regions for refractive index based on the HDMR meta-model and MAC and SSA measurements

HDMR input parameter	Range
fractal prefactor, k <sub>o</sub>	0.68 - 1.50
fractal dimension, D <sub>f</sub>	1.60 - 2.01
real refractive index, n	1.56 – 2.34
imaginary refractive index, k	0.632 – 1.264
primary spherule radius, a	10 - 20 nm
density, <i>p</i>	1.6 - 1.9 g/cm <sup>3</sup>
mass, m	0.11 - 16 fg

#### Ångström Coefficient Determination



- $AAE = 1.25 \pm 0.24$
- Uncertainties reflect accuracies of absorption measurements
- Uncertainties in Number Density and Mass cause points to shift up and down in concert
- Fits are Weighted by Error Bars Essentially Pinned to CAPS Value at 630 nm

#### Impacts of coatings on optical properties



- ABS increases by ~1.8 and plateaus
- EXT (really SCAT) increases more rapidly than ABS and does not plateau

#### Predictive core-shell Mie Theory



Core-shell Mie theory

- over predicts EXT at small mass ratios ( < 0.7 )</li>
- over predicts ABS at small to medium mass ratios ( < 5 )</li>
- Adequately predicts EXT and ABS high mass ratios ( > 5 )

# Small mass ratios induce morphological changes which affect SCAT and ABS differently



# Conclusions

- Mie theory cannot predict both the scattering and absorption of nascent or uncoated soot particles
- Core-shell Mie theory over predicts the scattering and absorption for thinly coated soot particles, but appears to works well for thicker coatings
- Small amounts of SOA and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> mass condensation on fractal-like soot particles
  - Collapse the core soot structures for thin coatings, affecting the scattering more than absorption
  - Fill in interstitial regions initially, minimizing increases in crosssections, leading to lower initial absorption enhancements
- More appropriate models, such as T-matrix or DDA, may be required for 'freshly' emitted and thinly coated soot particles in atmospheric models
  - HDMR may help incorporate these complex calculations into process, regional, and global models

## Acknowledgements

#### DOE ASR funding – DOE ARM SP2

Participating Institution	Instrumentation
Boston College	PAM, SMPS, O3 monitor, CPCs, AMS
Aerodyne Research	MCPC, SP-AMS, CPMA
Massachusetts Institute Of Technology	CAPS-SSA (630), CPMA
University of California Davis	CRD, PAS (405, 532nm)
University of GA	Broadband PAS (8 λ's)
Michigan Technological University	SEM/TEM analysis
Brookhaven National Labs	SP2 soot photometer

BC4 study