

Interactive comment on “The Impact of MISR-derived Injection Height Initialization on Wildfire and Volcanic Plume Dispersion in the HYSPLIT Model” by Charles J. Vernon et al.

Charles J. Vernon et al.

c.vernon1414@gmail.com

Received and published: 16 August 2018

Review of “The Impact of MISR-derived Injection Height Initialization on Wildfire and Volcanic Plume Dispersion in the HYSPLIT Model” by Vernon, Bolt, Canty, and Kahn for publication in Atmospheric Measurement Techniques.

The paper presents a series of case studies of simulated transport of plumes from three volcanic and three wildfire events. For each case the NOAA HYSPLIT trajectory model is used to simulate the plume dispersion. Two different configurations of the model are presented in each case, a “nominal” case in which plume injections are handled in a default prescriptive way similar to the HYSPLIT operational configurations, and a

C1

configuration in which the plume injection altitude is prescribed based on the satellite-derived plume height estimates from the MISR MINX product. For the cases of wildfires investigated the “nominal” case vertical profile of smoke injections is derived from an internal plume rise model that uses information of the observed fires. For the cases of volcanic eruptions the “nominal” case injection profiles are from the surface to the VAAC reported plume top. For both fires and volcanoes the alternative MINX-based approach specifies injections from the surface to the maximal observed plume height from the stereo-imagery. The results of the pairs of simulations show that, to varying degrees, you get a different estimated plume transport depending on which of the injection parameters are used. A qualitative comparison is made to MODIS imagery which generally shows a reasonable plume transport in either case. The implication of the study is that, where available, satellite imagery of plume height may be a useful method to prescribe aerosol injection altitudes for transport studies.

The paper is straightforward enough but would benefit from some clarification (see suggestions below), and I recommend publication after revisions.

We thank the reviewer for helpful comments.

I do take issue with the conclusion that “MINX can help improve simulated plume dispersion.” This is pretty weakly stated, and so a relatively benign conclusion, but on the other hand I don’t find much convincing in what is actually presented that leads me to reach that conclusion. I don’t think the MINX product would be worse than the nominal assumptions, and I can understand in principle why it should be better (somewhat more definitive than the VAAC reports, observationally based versus parameterized in the case of fires). I’m just not convinced it was shown to be the case. The significant differences that I see are mainly in the wildfire cases, and I would speculate here that the plume rise model is the culprit here and is the strongest case to make that MINX makes a positive impact. But since you cannot really quantitatively compare the simulated trajectory clouds to, e.g., AOD products it is a tough sell to me that it is clearly better.

C2

For the MINX-initialized smoke plumes, there are clear, qualitative differences that can matter, for example, in modeling downwind air quality effects. As we state in the paper, the data do not support a quantitative assessment because we cannot connect MODIS AOD with HYSPLIT aerosol mass quantitatively. For the volcanoes, many around the world are not well-monitored suborbitally at all – the cases we picked happen to be among the best-monitored volcanoes from the ground. We have modified the text to emphasize these points.

Some clarifications would be very useful. Regarding MINX, and mainly in Sections 1.2 and 2.1, it is not at all clear what the wind speeds being diagnosed in MINX means. Do you mean that the time to derive the full set of observations of the same point from all nine cameras allows enough of a time differential to determine the wind speed of the plume? Is this what is meant by “proper motion of plume elements?” What is that time difference? And how does the diagnosed wind relate to the zero-wind and wind-corrected plume heights shown? Are you bringing in wind from a meteorological analysis to make the wind-corrected plume height determination? Also, both red and blue bands are stated to be used in the height determination, but I have no idea how these are used together, or which one is definitive, or even how different they are.

1) It takes 7 minutes for all nine cameras of MISR to observe a scene. The user views the series of nine images in an animation to identify the wind direction, which is input to MINX; wind direction could be calculated directly from the apparent motion, but in practice, user determination of the wind direction reduces uncertainty. With this input, the wind speed is calculated by MINX. This is what is meant by “the proper motion elements”. 2) The zero-wind plume heights are based solely on the parallax relationship between the plume and the ground, assuming no proper motion of the plume. The wind-corrected plume heights are calculated by MINX, taking into account the wind speed and direction to correct the zero-wind heights. 3) The red and blue bands are analyzed separately in the height determination. There are wind-corrected height results for both the blue and red band. The differences in results come from

C3

the differences in spatial resolution and in contrast with the surface. The blue band can be used to observe less optically thick plumes but has poorer resolution (~500 m), whereas the red band offers higher spatial resolution (~275 m), and is favored in the current study because the plumes were all optically thick enough to be observed by this band. This is all explained in detail in Nelson et al. (2013), and we have modified the current text to emphasize these points.

I'm also curious, and this is not clearly stated that I can see, but is the “maximum” height of the MINX observation of the plume truly representative of the injection altitude? In thick plumes I imagine there could be significant plume rise from radiative heating in the aerosol layer, and so the plume may continue to rise above the true injection altitude. On the other hand, diabatic heating the plume rise is probably not part of the HYSPLIT simulations, so maybe the intent is to capture as best as possible the short term plume rise and represent in the injection term. Please say something to explain this line of thought.

In this study and within HYSPLIT, injection height is treated as a source parameter. Using MINX, the injection height is derived in the immediate vicinity of the source, and is used to initialize the model. Once the particles are injected into the model, processes such as subsequent plume rise within the aerosol layer are handled by the model and meteorological data.

Related: page 6, line 3: it is probably fair to say that MINX retrievals are definitively *not* available for events where MISR has no coverage. Suggest you rephrase this sentence.

Done.

Regarding the HYSPLIT configuration, mainly sections 1.3 and 2.2, it is also not clear what configuration is used here, although I infer it is either the Eulerian or hybrid method as opposed to the Lagrangian configuration. It might just be better up front to also state the particular configuration, such as what the output grid spacing is (and why is

C4

it shown in hexagons?) and the relevant processes in *this* study. (I see later that the wildfire outputs are 0.25 degree grid, but have no idea why the output grid differs for each volcanic simulation. What does this have to do with WMO documentation?) It seems that at least particle settling is considered, given the information on particle size distributions, but are other dry and wet removal processes considered?

The Eulerian, hybrid, and Lagrangian configurations do not describe specific configurations within this study. They describe the model as a whole and the different methods HYSPLIT uses at different points within a simulation. For example, the Lagrangian approach is used for advection and diffusion calculations while the Eulerian approach is used to compute pollutant air concentrations on a three-dimensional fixed grid (<https://www.arl.noaa.gov/hysplit/hysplit/>). The hexagons are for clarity in the figures since hexagons could be more clearly meshed than squares in close proximity. The output grids for wildfires were determined based on the resolution of the meteorological data and the pros and cons of output resolution, simulation run time, and sufficient detail to accomplish the goals of this study. For volcanic eruptions, each VAAC has different model configurations and different output grids so we made the grids the same as the VAAC. Wet and dry deposition are both parameterized within the model.

I gather the wildfire emissions vary in time throughout the run based on the BlueSky model. Can you expand a bit more on the plume rise model mechanism? Suggest you strike reference to HYSPLIT "MESSAGE" file, which means nothing to me. It's a model output.

In the text, we already explain how in the MINX run we account to a limited extent for emission variation (because the satellite data provides a snapshot only), and how the nominal run handles emission variation. We include the HYSPLIT Message because some readers are likely be experienced HYSPLIT users, for whom the message files have meaning.

C5

Are the volcanic emissions a single pulse, or distributed over some time?

They are distributed over time. This is covered in the text.

I think the clarity could be improved by consolidating the MINX descriptions (Section 1.2 and 2.1) and the HYSPLIT descriptions (1.3 and 2.2) into a single subsection for each. I would organize the paper this way: 1) Introduction - first paragraph that is there presently, and then a second paragraph that describes what the study is actually going to show 2) Methods section that describes the tools used 2.1) modeling tools that consolidates the HYSPLIT description 2.2) satellite tools that consolidates the MODIS/MISR/MINX stuff 2.3) Injection parameters that explains the two approaches used to specific injections 3) results (Section 2.3 in current probably belongs in here)

We agree that there are many possible ways to organize this paper. However, it is unclear to us that the suggested revision would satisfy all readers more than the current organization.

4) conclusions

Page 24, line 16: should reference Figure 9 Page 24, line 19: capitalize "Figure" Page 25, line 5: capitalize "Figure"

Done.

The figures are generally quite dense throughout the paper, although Figures 1 and 3 (and similar later) are relatively clear. Figure 4 is impossible to read even blown up on my monitor; I think the source figure is just of poor quality. The supplementary material is copious, but not clearly referenced in the main text. Supplemental Figure 1 is referenced a couple of times, and there is mention of the daily snapshots for the case studies, although the figures are not enumerated in the supplemental section at all. I did not see where in the text the 15 pages of height/wind speed profile plots were referenced.

The resolution of the figures has been increased. Journals currently favor including the

C6

underlying data in Supplemental Material, and we have followed this approach. The supplemental figures are now numbered, and the height/wind plots are provided as supplemental in this spirit, as they represent the exact figures used for the injection heights in the text.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-123, 2018.