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Role of convection in redistributing formaldehyde to the upper troposphere over North America and the North Atlantic during the summer 2004 INTEX campaign


Measurements of formaldehyde (CH$_2$O) from a tunable diode laser absorption spectrometer (TDLAS) were acquired onboard the NASA DC-8 aircraft during the summer 2004 INTEX-NA campaign to test our understanding of convection and CH$_2$O production mechanisms in the upper troposphere (UT, 6–12 km) over continental North America and the North Atlantic Ocean. The present study utilizes these TDLAS measurements and results from a box model to (1) establish sets of conditions by which to distinguish “background” UT CH$_2$O levels from those perturbed by convection and other causes; (2) quantify the CH$_2$O precursor budgets for both air mass types; (3) quantify the fraction of time that the UT CH$_2$O measurements over North America and North Atlantic are perturbed during the summer of 2004; (4) provide estimates for the fraction of time that such perturbed CH$_2$O levels are caused by direct convection of boundary layer CH$_2$O and/or convection of CH$_2$O precursors; (5) assess the ability of box models to reproduce the CH$_2$O measurements; and (6) examine CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ relationships in the presence of enhanced NO. Multiple tracers were used to arrive at a set of UT CH$_2$O background and perturbed air mass periods, and 46% of the TDLAS measurements fell within the latter category. In general, production of CH$_2$O from CH$_4$ was found to be the dominant source term, even in perturbed air masses. This was followed by production from methyl hydroperoxide, methanol, PAN-type compounds, and ketones, in descending order of their contribution. At least 70% to 73% of the elevated UT observations were caused by enhanced production from CH$_2$O precursors rather than direct transport of CH$_2$O from the boundary layer. In the presence of elevated NO, there was a definite trend in the CH$_2$O measurement–model discrepancy, and this was highly correlated with HO$_2$ measurement–model discrepancies in the UT.

1. Introduction

[2] The companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] discusses the role and importance of formaldehyde (CH$_2$O) throughout the troposphere. That paper also provides an overview of CH$_2$O measurements and modeling approaches employed, the modeling constraints, and measurement–model comparisons during the Intercontinental Transport Experiment-North America (INTEX-NA). As described in the overview paper by Singh et al. [2006], the INTEX-NA study was carried out during the summer of 2004 (1 July to 15 August 2004) over North America and the Atlantic Ocean on the NASA DC-8 airplane. The present study utilizes the results presented by Fried et al. [2008] to further examine the role of convection in transporting CH$_2$O and its precursors to the upper troposphere (UT, defined here as pressure altitudes extending from 6 to 12 km) during the summer of 2004.

[3] There is a growing body of evidence that photolysis of additional HO$_x$ (OH + HO$_2$) precursors, such as CH$_2$O, H$_2$O$_2$, and CH$_3$OOH (methyl hydroperoxide, MHP) are more important in producing HO$_x$ radicals and ultimately O$_3$ in the upper troposphere than previously thought. These precursors are thought to be transported from lower altitudes [Wennberg et al., 1998; Jaegle et al., 1997; Prather and Jacob, 1997; Brune et al., 1998; Jaegle et al., 1998a, 1998b, 2000; Falloon et al., 2000; Müller and Brasseur, 1999; Cohan et al., 1999; Ravetta et al., 2001; Wang and Prinn, 2000; Crawford et al., 1999]. These studies revealed the importance of deep tropical convection, as well as deep convection from the continental boundary layer on upper tropospheric HO$_x$ levels. As O$_3$ production in the UT is almost directly proportional to the HO$_x$ mixing ratio [Jaegle et al., 1998a; Müller and Brasseur, 1999], a comprehensive knowledge of upper tropospheric HO$_x$ sources is thus essential for understanding UT O$_3$.

[4] Although UT measurements of CH$_2$O, H$_2$O$_2$, and MHP have recently been acquired and examined over the Mediterranean basin during the MINOS study [Kormann et al., 2003; Leelieveld et al., 2002] and over central Europe and the Mediterranean basin during the UTOPIHAN study in the summer [Colomb et al., 2006; Stickler et al., 2006], there is a paucity of similar measurements and analyses over North America during summer months. These four papers clearly showed that continental convection of polluted boundary layer sources can significantly affect upper tropospheric HO$_x$ levels. While airborne measurements have been acquired for these same three gases over North America and over the North Atlantic Ocean on various platforms [Kleinman et al., 2005; Dasgupta et al., 2005; Fried et al., 2002; Lee et al., 1998; Nunnermacker et al., 2004; Wert et al., 2003, and references therein], these studies have not focused on UT chemistry and the role of convection; all the measurements were acquired below 7 km and more typically at much lower altitudes below ~4 km over urban areas. In fact, with the exception of the Jaegle et al. [2000] study during the SONEX campaign, to our knowledge, there are no comparable UT data to the European studies prior to the INTEX-NA campaign for CH$_2$O, H$_2$O$_2$, and CH$_3$OOH focusing on North America and the role of convective transport. Moreover, as the SONEX study primarily focused on the North Atlantic during the fall, there is only partial coverage over the continental United States and no coverage during the summer months when photochemical activity is high and deep convection from severe thunderstorm activity can be significant.

[5] This study is the last in a series of four papers, based upon observations and model results during the INTEX-NA study examining UT convection of CH$_2$O. The first paper by Millet et al. [2006], discussed CH$_2$O distributions over North America and implications for satellite retrievals. The second paper by Snow et al. [2007] showed the importance of convection in transporting the aforementioned gases to the UT and compared and contrasted these results with two other airborne campaigns. The third paper by Fried et al. [2008] discussed two airborne CH$_2$O instruments onboard the NASA DC-8 aircraft during INTEX-NA: a tunable diode laser absorption spectrometer (TDLAS) from the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), and an automated coil enzyme (CENZ) fluorometric method from the University of Rhode Island. That paper also presented an overview of the comparison between the two instruments, a description of the NASA Langley box model and the GEOS-Chem 3D global transport model [Millet et al., 2006], and an overview of the box model-TDLAS comparisons. The present study utilizes the TDLAS and box model results of the third paper by Fried et al. [2008] to (1) establish sets of conditions by which to distinguish “background” UT CH$_2$O levels from those perturbed by convection and other causes; (2) quantify the CH$_2$O precursor budgets for both air mass types; (3) quantify the fraction of time that the UT CH$_2$O measurements over North America and the North Atlantic are perturbed during the summer of 2004; (4) provide estimates for the fraction of time that such perturbed CH$_2$O levels are caused by direct convection of boundary layer CH$_2$O and/or convection of CH$_2$O precursors; (5) assess the ability of box models to reproduce the CH$_2$O measurements given initial conditions supplied by the measurement suite; and (6) examine CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ relationships in the presence of enhanced NO.

2. Modeled Temporal Dependence for Different Injection Scenarios in the UT

[6] Understanding the cause of elevated CH$_2$O in the UT (4th goal above) is of more than academic interest, as can be seen by the model runs of Figures 1 and 2. The Langley model was run forward in a time-dependent mode with chemical evolution of all species allowed after being initialized with median conditions observed from 8.5 to 9.5 km during INTEX-NA. The figures show resulting time-dependent CH$_2$O mixing ratios calculated from this “base” box model run (black curve) and for additional model runs assuming various injection scenarios of NO$_x$, CH$_3$O$_2$ and its precursors starting at 12 noon (day 0.5). The initialization conditions for these perturbed runs are kept identical to those for the base run other than the injected species themselves. The blue curves in Figures 1 and 2 show results for direct injection of median observed continental boundary layer CH$_2$O (2065 pptv). The dashed red curves show the results for injection of a suite of CH$_2$O precursors (CH$_4$, MHP, CH$_3$OH, Acetone, and PAN) also based on median
boundary layer mixing ratios, while the solid red curves show results for simultaneous injection of both CH$_2$O and its precursors. The lower panel in each figure shows the results normalized to the base model run. Figure 1 shows simulations that assume an initial NO$_x$ mixing ratio of 345 pptv (obtained from median observed NO of 250 pptv and a steady state calculation of NO$_2$). Figure 2 shows results for the identical injection scenarios described in Figure 1, but with an additional initial NO$_x$ injection source from lightning assumed here to equal 1 ppbv. In all cases, the model allows for photochemical decay of NO$_x$ and the CH$_2$O precursor species. The companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] discusses the importance of nitric oxide (NO) from sources such as lightning in accelerating the production of CH$_2$O in the UT. This can be seen by comparing the precursor-only curves (dashed red lines) for the median and enhanced NO$_x$ scenarios in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. One-half day after initialization (corresponding to 1 day in the plots), the CH$_2$O is photochemically enhanced by 60% and 90% for the median and enhanced NO$_x$ scenarios, respectively. Such enhanced NO accelerates the reaction of methylperoxy radicals (CH$_3$O$_2$), and more generally RO$_2$ radicals, in forming CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ in the process (Figure 3). As can be seen, the base case yields an initial CH$_2$O mixing ratio of 195 pptv in both figures and this rapidly decays with each diurnal cycle to mixing ratios ~75 pptv in 1 week. The direct injection of boundary layer CH$_2$O decays to the base case ~1 day after the initial injection for both NO$_x$ scenarios, after which it decays identically with the base case. By contrast, injection of CH$_2$O precursors, either with CH$_2$O or precursors alone yields elevated CH$_2$O for up to one week in all cases. The injection of CH$_2$O with precursors approaches injection of CH$_2$O precursors alone after ~1 day in both NO$_x$ scenarios. The effects of the additional NO$_x$ on the CH$_2$O plus precursor case is not realized until ~1 day downstream of the convective event, whereupon the elevated NO$_x$ curve starts to diverge from the background NO$_x$ case. After 1 week the elevation relative to the base case is ~20% for the median NO$_x$ simulations and 40% for the elevated NO$_x$ simulations. Thus understanding the exact mechanism responsible for elevated CH$_2$O in the UT is important for understanding its integrated influence and the extent of that influence downwind of convection. The base case plots in both NO$_x$ scenarios also indicate that background CH$_2$O in the UT over North America and the Atlantic Ocean should reside in the range between 75 pptv and 195 pptv range for air masses up to one week old. Comparisons of these expectations with measurements will be presented in a later section. Throughout the rest of this paper all NO mixing ratios refer to calculations derived from measurements of NO$_2$ [Bertram et al., 2007] assuming photostationary state. Although direct measurements of NO
were available, NO$_2$-derived values generally provided more precise values [Ren et al., 2008].

3. Measurement Box Model Comparisons for CH$_2$O in the UT

3.1. Time Periods When Sampled Air Experienced Deep Convection and/or Lightning

The clear versus nonclear analysis in the companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] does not capture the many instances during INTEX-NA where convection affected UT CH$_2$O mixing ratios during cloud-free conditions. Fuelberg et al. [2007] developed a methodology based upon a comparison of meteorological trajectory analysis with both Global Forecast System (GFS) modeled fields and data from the National Lightning Detection Network (NLDN) to identify convectively perturbed time periods. They produced estimates of when the sampled air mass had previously experienced deep convection or experienced lightning originating within 1.5$^\circ$/176 latitude/longitude grid boxes. Although this procedure does not consider small scale processes such as turbulence that are not handled adequately by the GFS model, it does capture pollution events vertically lofted by processes that are resolvable by the GFS model. In the UT, 78% of the cloud encounters identified by Fried et al. [2008], when time coincident TDLAS measurements and box models were available and where measurements of MHP were available for model input, experienced convective influence according to the Fuelberg et al. [2007] analysis. As convection is predominately a subgrid process, convective parameterization (CP) is needed to implicitly include its effects. The GFS CP [Global and Weather Modeling Branch, 2003] is a simplified version of the widely used Arakawa-Schubert scheme [Arakawa and Schubert, 1974], which produces a convective quantitative precipitation forecast (QPF) as a by-product. Qualitative comparisons of the convective QPF with both lightning data from the NLDN and GOES satellite imagery indicate that our CP approach is appropriate for INTEX-NA. However, we recognize that the inherent constraints of both the CP approach [Arakawa and Schubert, 1974] and of the kinematic trajectories [Fuelberg et al., 1996; Stohl et al., 1995] results in generous spatial and temporal convective thresholds, which likely results in an overestimate of convective influence during INTEX-NA. Nevertheless, the remainder of this paper relies heavily on the Fuelberg et al. [2007] meteorological methodology as an indicator of convection.

The companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] discussed the importance of MHP measurements in constraining box model calculations, particularly during fresh convection in the UT where model calculations of MHP do not accurately capture the observations. Throughout the rest of this paper all UT CH$_2$O model values and measurement–model comparisons refer to time periods where MHP measurements are used in constraining the box model ($N = 1188$), unless explicitly stated otherwise. This includes MHP measurements at their limits of detection (LODs) where convective influence on MHP is not an issue.

3.2. UT Measurement/Model Ratios

The companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] discussed comparisons between TDLAS measurements and box model CH$_2$O values throughout the troposphere. As in that paper, all data here are from the 1-minute merged data set without segregation for ascending or descending flight legs. Of the 1188 comparisons points in the UT, 56% of the data fall within the combined random uncertainty estimates with 18% and 26% showing positive and negative outliers,
respectively. When systematic uncertainty estimates are considered, which encompasses uncertainties in the rate constants employed in the box model calculations, 62% of the UT comparisons fall within the combined systematic limits. Figure 4 displays UT measurement/box model ratios as a function of time since convection and time since first lightning encounter within 1.5° latitude/longitude grid boxes from the Fuelberg et al. [2007] analysis. Of the convective and lightning-influenced points, the largest ratios are associated with such perturbations within 1 hour of sampling. It is entirely possible that these points reflect convection of unmeasured CH$_2$O precursors with or without direct convection of boundary layer CH$_2$O; as Figure 1 shows these two effects become indistinguishable after ~1 day following the perturbation. However, large ratios also appear at other times, including those without convective or lightning influence (gray points in the center). Clearly other factors must be operative here as well as for many of the smaller ratios. In fact, only 32% of the UT outliers (ratios outside of the combined random uncertainty estimates) are influenced by convection and/or lightning within the past 6 hours and 58% of the UT nonoutliers experienced convection and/or lightning within the past 6 hours. Thus with the exception of the largest outliers associated with very recent perturbations from convection and/or lightning, UT air masses impacted by these perturbations generally are not well correlated with the CH$_2$O measurement—model agreement. This likely reflects the fact that we generally have accurate measurements of the convected precursors that are used in the model, and hence the box model is able to capture perturbations to the CH$_2$O production. This of course requires model constraint using measurements of MHP. For example, during fresh convection (sampling within ~6 hours of the convective event) the median UT measurement/model ratio was 1.04 where the model was constrained by MHP measurements. This compares to a median ratio of 1.63 where modeled MHP values were used for the same comparison points. Here MHP was calculated from methane and other organics. It is also possible that some of the convected air, indicated by the meteorological analysis, was transported from midaltitudes, where in all likelihood there is minimal elevation in CH$_2$O and/or its precursors. Furthermore, it is also possible that fresh convection in many cases may be transported with air that is well-aged since time of emission, and depending upon the particular CH$_2$O source(s) that are present, the box model may or may not faithfully capture such observations. Lastly, as no trajectory model is perfect, as was previously discussed, one can encounter errors in the exact placement of convection, and these increase with time since convec-

Figure 3. Production and destruction reactions for CH$_2$O in the troposphere. Destruction from NO$_3$ and the halogens are not shown nor is the production from organics with Cl. Production of CH$_2$O from higher organics, which in most cases proceed through the CH$_3$ radical, are lumped together. Stable species are shown in boxes while reactive transients are shown in circles.
tion. The case studies in section 7 will further elucidate various measurement–model behaviors for different convection scenarios.

4. Background and Perturbed CH$_2$O Levels in the UT

[10] As was pointed out previously, transport of CH$_2$O precursors can occur simultaneously with direct transport of CH$_2$O to the UT as well. These two effects become indistinguishable after $\sim$1 day following the convection, and as shown in Figure 1, behave like convection of CH$_2$O precursors only, which can yield significant perturbations out to 1 week or more. We thus provide estimates in this section for the percentage of time UT CH$_2$O perturbations are associated with precursors, without distinguishing if direct transport of CH$_2$O is simultaneously present.

[11] To accomplish this we first determine a set of background conditions for the UT over North America and the Atlantic Ocean during summer months. This is based upon a variety of tracers, both CH$_2$O precursors and anthropogenic pollution tracers. These tracers are listed in Table 1 along with threshold values, obtained from their respective UT mixing ratios at the 25 percentile level for all measurements during INTEX-NA (not restricted to geographic location or time periods when TDLAS measurements and/or box model results are present). In many cases not all the tracers were present in the data set due to the intermittent sampling of the appropriate measurement system. In this analysis we required that at least three of the ten tracers be present and those that were present all had to be less than or equal to their respective threshold values for an air mass to be characterized as “background.” Despite the fact that this 25% cutoff limit is somewhat arbitrary, it is important to note that many of the background tracer levels were in fact below their 10 percentile UT levels. This vetting process resulted in 81-aged clean background UT time periods, which are hereafter referred to as “background” time periods. Figure 5 displays the resulting CH$_2$O TDLAS measurements ($N = 60$), box model results ($N = 31$), CENZ measurements ($N = 11$), and GEOS-Chem three-dimensional model results ($N = 81$) for these UT time periods. As indicated by the inset, background air masses in the UT were sampled at various locations over North America and the Atlantic Ocean. The shaded region ($\sim$61 to 165 pptv) highlighted in Figure 5 captures most of the background measurements and model results for the 6–12 km UT range. Although the precise upper limit has an uncertainty of $\sim$15%, the present upper limit of 165 pptv captures 98% of the TDLAS measurements and 100% of the box model results and excludes some of the clear outlier points, which are primarily from the GEOS-Chem model;

Figure 4. TDLAS/Box model ratios for time coincident 1-minute merged data (all data where MHP used as a model constraint, including ascents and descents) as a function of time since convection and time since lightning in the UT from the Fuelberg et al. [2007] analysis. The gray points in the middle reflect ratios where there is no convective or lighting influence, NO (CI or LI), from this analysis. These points constitute 47% of the UT measurement–model comparisons. The largest ratio ($R = 20.8$) in this category is suspect since it is based upon TDLAS measurements comprising only 5% of the 1-minute comparison period.
of the GEOS-Chem model results lie outside the 165 pptv limit while only two CENZ measurements lie outside this limit. A distribution plot of all UT box model results reveals two distributions with the second distribution starting to dominate between 150 and 170 pptv, a range that is consistent with the background threshold value above. Furthermore, the background CH$_2$O levels of Figure 5 (−61 to 165 pptv) are consistent with the base run levels of Figures 1 and 2; in the absence of perturbations caused by convection and other causes, the time-dependent model calculations in these figures are close to the background levels of Figure 5 at the start of the calculation (195 pptv) and fall within the background range of Figure 5 after only ~6 hours of decay. Based upon the median measurements and box model values of Figure 5 (range: 47 to 61 pptv) the time-dependent calculations suggest a median air mass age of at least 7.5 days for these UT background air masses.

Figure 6 displays all the TDLAS, and CENZ measurements and box model results acquired in the 6–12 km UT range during INTEX-NA for all data in the database not parsed by location, nor restricted for time coincidence and/or the availability of MHP for model input. The (−61 to 165 pptv) background limits defined above are superimposed on these plots to emphasize in all three cases: (1) the large number of points falling within the background range (to be discussed) and (2) the large number of perturbed UT observations outside this range, the percentages for which are indicated in the plots for all three cases. Out of a total of 2906 TDLAS measurements of CH$_2$O in the UT, 46% lie outside the positive upper background limit. This compares to 42% and 38%, respectively, for the box model and CENZ measurements. The GEOS-Chem model results, which are not shown, indicate that 40% of the results fall outside the background limits. Taken together, all 4 data sets indicate that ~40% of the UT observations and/or model results for CH$_2$O reveal perturbations relative to background conditions (i.e., exceed the 165 pptv upper bound for background conditions). These perturbations include convectively influenced air both with and without biomass burning influence. Even though Figure 6 is not restricted for time coincidence, many of the perturbations appear to be common to all three data sets; the perturbations around 10.7 km, 10 km, 9.3 km, and 7 km are examples of this.

Averaged over the entire UT 6–12 km range, 70% of the perturbed elevated TDLAS measurements (TDLAS > 165 pptv, where MHP is used to constrain the box model) have elevated box model production rates associated with CH$_2$O precursor transport. Here we define elevated box
model production rates as those higher than the maximum background CH$_2$O production rates for the three UT altitude bins expressed in pptv sec$^{-1}$/C$_0$:

- 6–8 km: 0.028 pptv sec$^{-1}$/C$_0$
- 8–10 km: 0.022 pptv sec$^{-1}$/C$_0$
- 10–12 km: 0.027 pptv sec$^{-1}$/C$_0$

Expressing the production rates this way is necessary to account for the changing number density with altitude. Parsing the UT range into the three altitude bins, we find that 67%, 80%, and 53% of the elevated TDLAS measurements are associated with enhanced model production rates for respectively the 6–8 km, 8–10 km, and 10–12 km, altitude ranges. Since the box model does not simulate transport, model CH$_2$O production rates are unaffected by direct convection of CH$_2$O from lower altitudes.

In a second determination, we employ the convective products from Fuelberg et al. [2007]. In this approach, we deduce the fraction of the perturbed UT TDLAS measurements (measurements > 165 pptv) that show convective influence from the Fuelberg et al. [2007] analysis greater than a certain characteristic time since convection. This approach relies on the fact that after this characteristic time, direct convection of CH$_2$O from lower altitudes quickly decays to background levels due to the short CH$_2$O lifetime, as is shown by Figure 1. We determined this characteristic time using expressions (1) and (2) below. Expression (1), which is derived by Bertram et al. [2007], relates the UT mean mixing ratio for a species in fresh convective outflow at time zero ([CH$_2$O]$_{UT}$ at $t=0$) to the fraction ($f$) of the boundary layer air present in the fresh convection and the UT mixing ratio in the background air ([CH$_2$O]$_{UT}$) in accordance with:

$$[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{UT(\text{t=0})} = f[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{BL} + (1-f)[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{UT}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Using a value of $f = 0.20 \pm 0.1$, determined by Bertram et al. [2007], a median TDLAS measured value of 61 pptv for background air determined from Figure 5, a median TDLAS boundary value of 2065 pptv, we determine...
a value of $462 \pm 231 \text{ pptv}$ for $[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{\text{UT}}$ ($t=0$). During daylight hours, the time ($t$) for this fresh direct boundary layer CH$_2$O convection to decay to the background threshold value of 165 pptv ± $[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{\text{Bkg \, \text{Threshold}}}$ is determined by:

$$[\text{CH}_2\text{O}]_{\text{Bkg \, \text{Threshold}}} = (462 \pm 231) \exp(-t/\tau) \quad (2)$$

[16] Using a median midday UT CH$_2$O lifetime ($\tau$) of 1.5 hours we determine a characteristic time $t$ of 1.5 hours (range 0.5 to 2 hours) for the time it should take for the average fresh convective outflow in the UT to decay below the background threshold level. Perturbed UT CH$_2$O observations whose time since convection are greater than 1.5 hours can be ascribed to in situ production of CH$_2$O from its precursors. Of the TDLAS CH$_2$O observations (where there are measurements of MHP to constrain the box model, and where there is convective influence) in perturbed UT air, 73% fall in this category. This value is in reasonable agreement with the 70% value determined by elevated model production rates. This suggests that any potential errors due to overestimating the convective influence, as discussed previously, must be small. For the remaining 27% to 30% of the time, perturbed UT observations by TDLAS can be ascribed to direct CH$_2$O convection with or without convection of CH$_2$O precursors. At present there is no way to pull these two effects apart, and thus CH$_2$O precursors may be playing an even larger role in the UT. The one drawback of the present analysis is that it assumes a CH$_2$O lifetime of 1.5 hours, which is characteristic of midday. Convection at time periods later in the day or during the previous night would yield longer characteristic times with a consequent lower value for the precursor percentage. Fortunately the local sun time when most of the convection during INTEX-NA was sampled (for time coincident measurement and box model periods) was between 12 noon and 1 PM, and thus the error from this cause is small in most cases. This procedure is also not that sensitive to the precise background cutoff limit. If the true background cutoff limit for CH$_2$O is 100 pptv instead of 165 pptv, this would only change the precursor percentage determination from 73% to 74%. A 200 pptv cutoff limit changes this 72%. We also used the above procedure to determine the perturbation percentage due to precursors broken out for the three different altitude bins in the UT and this yields the following: 72% for 6–8 km, 72% for 8–10 km, and 80% for 10–12 km.

[17] As discussed in the companion paper by Fried et al. [2008], the meteorological analysis from Fuelberg et al. [2007] indicates that 2004 was a record breaking year for wildfire activity in northwest Canada and Alaska and these plumes were sampled by the DC-8 on numerous flights. Although this can perturb the chemistry of the UT, we are more interested in the present study in characterizing the more ubiquitous UT perturbations from convection. To accomplish this we use PAN, HCN, CH$_3$CN, and CO as tracers of fire plumes. Specifically, we have identified cases where these 4 tracers exceeded their UT 99th percentile values of PAN (951 pptv), HCN (755 pptv), CH$_3$CN (306 pptv), and CO (219 ppbv). For example, during the July 18 Alaskan fire plume intercept shown in Figure 5b of the companion paper by Fried et al. [2008] at 7 km, these 4 fire plume tracers attained values as high as 1574 pptv for PAN, 2740 pptv for HCN, 1318 pptv for CH$_3$CN, and 400 ppbv for CO. After removing the few UT points that are clearly affected by fire plumes, the above percentages for transport of CH$_2$O precursors are negligibly changed by less than 1% for all 3 altitude bins.

5. UT Budgets for Production of CH$_2$O During Background and Perturbed Periods

[18] An examination of Figure 6 immediately reveals that there are a significantly larger number of measurements and box model results that fall within the UT background limits than indicated by the strict 81 time periods discussed above. For example, as shown in Figure 5, there are 60 TDLAS measurements that satisfy the strict background limit, yet there are a total of 1579 UT TDLAS measurements with CH$_2$O levels less than the 165 pptv background limit. In the case of the box model and CENZ measurements, 1320 and 717 points, respectively, satisfy this criterion. In some cases there are not enough tracers available, while in other cases elevated longer-lived tracers are still present but the air mass is sufficiently well-aged to allow decay of CH$_2$O down to background levels. Rather than restrict our discussion of UT CH$_2$O budgets to a small number of air masses obeying the strict background limit (there are only 24 time coincident TDLAS and box model results in this category), we employ here a less rigorous surrogate definition for background and perturbed UT cases based upon modeled CH$_2$O levels. Air masses where the time coincident CH$_2$O mixing ratios for the box model results are equal to or below 165 pptv will henceforth be classified as background (49% of UT time coincident comparisons), regardless of the tracer levels in Table 1, and those where the model exceeds this limit are classified as perturbed (51% of UT time coincident comparisons).

[19] Table 2 compiles the mean, standard deviation, median, and number of time coincident TDLAS and box model results for the 6–8 km, 8–10 km, and 10–12 km pressure altitude bins in the UT for the background and perturbed air masses as defined above. In the 10–12 km range for the perturbed case, there were 27 additional time periods where the NO mixing ratios were all larger than 1000 pptv, the box model values were below the 165 pptv cutoff limit, and in most cases the measured CH$_2$O values were all above this limit. These 27 points were added to the original 42 perturbed comparison points, and account for the fact that the box model and observations diverge under high NOx conditions. This will be further discussed in section 6. Elevated NOx, which is caused by convection, lightning, and potentially stratospheric intrusions, enhances CH$_2$O production (see Figure 3). Only perturbed time periods in the 10–12 altitude bin were affected by this. Without this correction, the median point-by-point measurement/box model ratio (R) also shown in this table would be erroneously lowered from 1.3 to 1.2. Considering only NO mixing ratios greater than 1000 pptv in the 10–12 km perturbed bin, the median measurement/model ratio increases to 1.8. Table 2 also displays the NOx mixing ratios.

[20] Our background/perturbed segregation approach has ambiguities in cases (1) where the measurements are per-


Table 2. Statistics for Time Coincident CH2O TDLAS and Box Model Results for the Three Altitude Bins in the 6–12 km $P_{ut}$ Range (in km) for all Locations During INTEX-NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TDLAS</th>
<th>Box Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>156 ± 205</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>254 ± 202</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>131 ± 178</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>268 ± 208</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>154 ± 205</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>337 ± 212</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Background time periods (where Box model results are <165 pptv) are shown in the first row of each altitude bin while the perturbed time periods (where Model > 165 pptv) are highlighted in bold face in the second row of each altitude bin. All mixing ratios are in pptv, and the standard deviations are indicated with the averages. In the 10–12 km range, 27 additional points were added to the perturbed periods where NO mixing ratios > 1000 pptv (see text for a description of the rationale for this). This data set is based on the 1188 comparison points where MHP measurements are used in the model constraint. The term R represents the median point-by-point measurement/Box model ratio for the particular air mass. Also shown are the median NOx mixing ratios for each category from the steady state calculated NO and measurements of NOx. For reference, the median continuum boundary layer CH2O and NOx mixing ratios are 2065 and 278 pptv, respectively.

During the perturbed (TDLAS > 165 pptv) relative to background box model results (28% of the UT time coincident comparisons) and (2) alternatively where the measurements fall in the background range while the model results are perturbed (35% of the comparisons). The first, as discussed above, tends to deemphasize the magnitude of the convective perturbations. Data in the second category, which includes data affected by uptake, would do the opposite. Despite these caveats this segregation approach provides a useful way to contrast CH2O production terms for perturbed and background air masses.

As shown in Table 2, the median TDLAS and box model mixing ratios are comparable for all cases with the exception of the perturbed 10–12 km bin. With the exception of this bin, the point-by-point TDLAS/Box Model ratios range between 0.72 and 0.96 and the differences (not shown, TDLAS–Box Model) range between −10 and −31 pptv. For the perturbed 10–12 km altitude case, the median point-by-point difference is slightly elevated (44 pptv) relative to the other cases (ratio = 1.34). Here the median NOx levels are significantly elevated (1391 pptv) relative to the other cases. This will be further discussed in section 6.

During the UTOPIHAN II campaign, Sticker et al. [2006] measured UT CH2O background mixing ratios in the range between ~25 pptv and 150 pptv at ~8 km during one flight on 19 July 2003. During a second flight on 16 July 2003 at ~8 km, identified by these authors as convectively influenced, the CH2O mixing ratios attained values as high as ~1000 pptv and averaged around 300 pptv. Both mixing ratios are similar in magnitude to those of the present study. Kormann et al. [2003] during the summer of 2001 MINOS campaign over the eastern Mediterranean also identified time periods where UT CH2O mixing ratios were reflective of the air mass origin. One air mass in particular on 16 August 2001 was identified as originating from the western Atlantic Ocean and produced mean background CH2O mixing ratios ranging between 114 and 281 pptv for the 6–12 km altitude range. Although somewhat higher than our background levels, the lower limit falls within the range of values observed in this study. During a second flight by Kormann et al. [2003] on 3 August 2001, where the air originated from Indian monsoon outflow, the mean UT CH2O levels ranged between 703 to 1276 pptv. Although this is considerably higher than the perturbed means shown in Table 2, such measurements are within the perturbed UT range (~88 to 1549 pptv not shown) observed in this study.

The enhanced NO with altitude in part reflects the fact that both perturbed and background air masses in the UT are in many cases influenced by lightning and the partitioning to NO from NO2 increases with altitude. Based upon the meteorological analysis from Fuelberg et al. [2007] employing 1.5° × 1.5° grid boxes, we find that for the UT data being considered (N = 1188), 90% of the perturbed air masses in the 10–12 km range have been influenced by...
lightning within the past 24 hours (median influence within past 2 hours before sampling) and this compares to 50% for background conditions (median influence within past 13 hours before sampling). Furthermore, such influence decreases with decreasing altitude. For the 6- to 8-km range, 53% and 27% of the perturbed and background air masses, respectively, have been influenced by lightning within the past 24 hours. The above observations with respect to OH and NO$_x$ also explain the fact that median ratios between perturbed and background production rates from methane are within a factor of 2 for all UT altitudes, whereas the methane mixing ratios are only negligibly changed between these two air mass types (background 1.774 ppmv, perturbed 1.791 ppmv in the 10–12 km region).

[26] It is instructive to compare the CH$_2$O production budgets of Figure 7 to those determined by Stickler et al. [2006] in the UT over central–western Europe and the northwestern Mediterranean region. During background and convectively influenced time periods between 6 and 7 km, Stickler et al. [2006] determined production percentages from CH$_4$ ranging between 26% to 40% and 29% to 44%, respectively. Ranges are presented for each air mass type due to differing assumptions. These percentages only reflect the percentages from the reaction between CH$_3$O$_2$ and NO arising from CH$_4$ decomposition. This background range is considerably lower than the present value of 50% for the 6–8 km altitude range, but the convectively influenced CH$_4$ production contribution spans the 44% value determined here. For the 10–11 km range, Stickler et al. [2006] determined production percentages from CH$_4$ of 35% to 53% and 31% to 47%, respectively, for background and convectively influenced air, and this is in reasonable accord with present values of 50% and 34% for corresponding air mass types in the 10–12 km range. The next highest contribution in the Stickler study is methanol followed by MHP for both background and perturbed air masses. This order is reversed in most cases in the present study, but the production percentages for these two species are generally similar in both studies. The UT production contributions from other species such as acetaldehyde, PAN, and acetone in the Stickler study were all minor compared to CH$_4$, methanol, and MHP, and this is similar to the present study.

[27] The Stickler et al. [2006] study comes to the same conclusion as the present study regarding the importance of the transport of CH$_2$O precursors to the UT and the enhanced photochemical activity from NO due to lightning. However, a comparison of the total CH$_2$O production rates between the two studies indicates significantly enhanced photochemical activity at the highest altitudes over Europe compared to North America. For example, the Stickler et al. [2006] study (10–11 km) reports CH$_2$O production rates of $3 \times 10^5$ and $1.2 \times 10^6$ molecules cm$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$ for background and convective air, respectively, and this compares to significantly smaller median values of $1.5 \times 10^5$ and $3.4 \times 10^5$ molecules cm$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$ for the 10–12 km range of the
present study. There are many potential reasons for this difference which need to be further investigated.

6. CH$_2$O Measurement–Model Ratios in the UT Versus NO and Relationship to HO$_2$ Ratios

As noted throughout this paper, the production rate for CH$_2$O is dramatically affected by NO, with the largest measurement–model differences occurring at the highest NO mixing ratios. The modeling study by Wang and Prinn [2000] reveals a doubling in the CH$_2$O production rate in the presence of lightning in the midtroposphere due to an enhancement in the reaction between CH$_3$O$_2$ and NO. To further investigate the correlation between CH$_2$O and NO in this study, Figure 8 plots the dependence of the (TDLAS/Box Model) ratio as a function of calculated NO for the 3 different altitude bins in the UT employing the same 1188 comparison points used throughout. Here we plot the binned median and average measurement/model ratios as a function of NO (median NO for the median ratio and average NO for the average ratio). Also shown are the individual ratio measurements.

Linear fits of the measurement/model ratios (shown by the dark solid lines) are given with altitude bin along with the $r^2$ correlation coefficients. The first binned point in the 10–12 km range was not included in this fit since there were only 3 points in this bin. All the other bins have at least 7 points with the exception of the highest bin in the 6–8 km range (N = 4). The fits appear curved here when plotting a linear fit on a semilog axis. The NO bin widths are 6–8 km, 10 pptv below 100 pptv and 100 or 200 pptv above this; 8–10 km, 50 or 100 pptv below 600 pptv and 200 pptv and greater above this; 10–12 km, 100 pptv below 800 pptv and greater than this above this level (the highest bin width extends from 2000 to 7000 pptv and contains 7 points, 5 of which yield ratios above 3.5).

Figure 8. Binned CH$_2$O measurement (TDLAS/Box model) ratio as a function of binned NO (from NO$_2$ measurements and photostationary state calculations) for three pressure altitudes in the UT. Calculations were only performed for time coincident TDLAS and box model results where MHP was used in the model constraint. The open black circles are binned median ratios versus binned median NO, the horizontal lines are the binned averaged ratios versus binned averaged NO with 1 standard deviation limit, and the light gray points are the individual ratios. The solid dark lines are linear fits of the binned median values for each altitude bin, and the results of these fits are shown with each altitude bin along with the $r^2$ correlation coefficients. The first binned point in the 10–12 km range was not included in this fit since there were only 3 points in this bin. All the other bins have at least 7 points with the exception of the highest bin in the 6–8 km range (N = 4). The fits appear curved here when plotting a linear fit on a semilog axis. The NO bin widths are 6–8 km, 10 pptv below 100 pptv and 100 or 200 pptv above this; 8–10 km, 50 or 100 pptv below 600 pptv and 200 pptv and greater above this; 10–12 km, 100 pptv below 800 pptv and greater than this above this level (the highest bin width extends from 2000 to 7000 pptv and contains 7 points, 5 of which yield ratios above 3.5).
correlation coefficient (0.67), which reveals an NO-dependent discrepancy. The 8–10 km bin shows intermediate behavior.

Such discrepancies in the UT imply one or a combination of the following: (1) reactions between CH$_3$O$_2$ and NO in the model that are too slow compared to reality; (2) additional reactions involving NO not in the box model that produce CH$_2$O; (3) additional unknown CH$_2$O hydrocarbon precursors present during convection and high NO; (4) low modeled OH values compared to actual mixing ratios; (5) modeled CH$_2$O sink terms that are too fast compared to reality; (6) heterogeneous formation of CH$_2$O from methanol in clouds [Tabazadeh et al., 2004]; and/or (7) evaporation of CH$_2$O from aerosols, cloud droplets, or cloud ice particles in our heated inlet. Each possibility will be discussed. It is important to first note, that depending upon the CH$_2$O precursor type, enhanced NO may not in all cases yield elevated CH$_2$O production. As shown in Figure 3, convection of methanol and MHP are not affected by NO for gas phase reactions, unless the back conversion of MHP to CH$_3$O$_2$ (CH$_3$OOH + OH → CH$_3$O$_2$ + HO$_2$) dominates the decomposition of MHP in producing CH$_2$O.

Measurement–model comparisons of HO$_2$ in the UT by Ren et al. [2008] during INTEX-NA show a very similar trend with NO above 8 km as our CH$_2$O comparisons in Figure 8. Constraining the HO$_2$ calculation using measured CH$_2$O values only reduces the HO$_2$ measurement/model discrepancy with NO above 8 km slightly from a value of ~3.8 to 3.0 at the highest NO values. Reconciling the HO$_2$ discrepancy by increasing CH$_2$O photolysis rates has been discounted by Ren et al. [2008]; these researchers point out that it is quite unlikely that the photolysis frequencies are in error by the required factors of 4 to 6. Such errors, moreover, would further exacerbate the CH$_2$O discrepancy unless simultaneously accompanied by substantial increases in CH$_2$O production rates. Although additional reactions between OH and methanol produce additional HO$_2$ and CH$_2$O, this channel is NO independent.

To examine the model deficit for both CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ as a function of NO, we plot in Figure 9 the relationship between the median fractional difference (measurement–model/measurement) for HO$_2$ versus CH$_2$O for NO binned values in the 8–12 km range. For most of the data, we employed an NO bin size of 100 pptv. As can be seen by the linear fit (solid line), the discrepancy for HO$_2$ is well correlated with that for CH$_2$O when binned by NO ($r^2 = 0.77$). It is interesting to note that the highest discrepancies for both CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ above 1000 pptv NO are also associated with the highest ultrafine condensation nuclei (UCN) values, aerosols with diameters as small as 3 nm. High UCN number densities generally reflect new particle formation. In the outflow of clouds, UCN values are
often elevated due to fresh sulfuric acid production from SO$_2$ outflow, which reacts with enhanced OH caused by the elevated NO. Therefore the apparent correlation in the discrepancies with UCN may be coincidental since the highest UCN values are also associated with the highest NO values from the above mechanism. In fact, it is difficult to find cases where NO levels are high and the UCN are less than their median UT values. Even at NO mixing ratios less than 1000 pptv, UCN and NO are still correlated, making it difficult to assign the prime contributor of the CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ discrepancies. However, a plot of the CH$_2$O discrepancy versus NO and colored by UCN (not shown) suggests that NO appears to be the more important factor. Section 8 will further explore one specific example where NO and UCN number densities are elevated.

7. Case Studies of UT Convection

[33] While the CH$_2$O measurements and box model relationships discussed give us an overview of UT CH$_2$O convective perturbations, this analysis does little to show our understanding and limitations during individual perturbation events. In this section we examine two different convective cases in the UT: one involving convection of a mixed anthropogenic and biogenic plume and a second involving convection of well aged air with recent large NO inputs. Both cases exemplify the CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ discrepancies with NO previously discussed.

[34] Figure 10 displays the first case over the Maine–New Brunswick border at 9.1 km on August 11, 2004 and reveals good CH$_2$O TDLAS box model agreement for two of the three large excursions. The shaded regions indicate when the DC-8 was sampling in nonclear regions (clouds, haze, and intermediate haze). At 12:20 and 12:21 the DC-8 was in clouds. The TDLAS and box model error bars are the random uncertainties at the 2$\sigma$ level and the dashed line in (a) indicates the pressure altitude using the right hand axis. The methanol (MeOH) data are based on measurements from the NASA Ames PANAK system with data interpolated between measurement points. All comparisons in this case use MHP as a model constraint. The peak numbers in the text refer to the following time periods: peak 1, 12:20–12:26; peak 2, 12:35–12:39; peak 3, 12:46–12:48.

Figure 10. (a, b) Convective outflow event on 11 August 2004. The shaded regions in (a) indicate when the DC-8 was sampling in nonclear regions (clouds, haze, and intermediate haze). At 12:20 and 12:21 the DC-8 was in clouds. The TDLAS and box model error bars are the random uncertainties at the 2$\sigma$ level and the dashed line in (a) indicates the pressure altitude using the right hand axis. The methanol (MeOH) data are based on measurements from the NASA Ames PANAK system with data interpolated between measurement points. All comparisons in this case use MHP as a model constraint. The peak numbers in the text refer to the following time periods: peak 1, 12:20–12:26; peak 2, 12:35–12:39; peak 3, 12:46–12:48.
7:15 AM (local time), the contact with the biosphere must have originated at least 12 hours prior to sampling. Analysis using FLEXPART [Stohl et al., 1998] indicates contact with the biosphere several days prior to sampling. Based upon the meteorological analysis by Fuelberg et al. [2007] and the NO\textsubscript{x}/HNO\textsubscript{3} ratios by Bertram et al. [2007], the convection and lightning influences were very recent in origin (0 to 10 hours for both). The ratio between heated to unheated condensation nuclei number densities (0.1 in all cases) indicated a well-aged nonrefractory plume. This ratio was measured with the same condensation nuclei instrument by heating the inlet to 300°C relative to an unheated inlet. High ratios indicate a large number density of refractory species, which are typically dominated by soot, fly ash and generally indicative of pollution. The benzene to toluene ratios also indicated a well aged plume of 22 to 35 hours old [Colomb et al., 2006]. Collectively, all the indicators above indicate a well aged mixed biogenic/anthropogenic plume with recent convection and lightning influences.

Thus one would expect elevated UT measurements and box model results for CH\textsubscript{2}O, and given the age of the plume, these two results should agree. Figure 10 panel (a) shows the resulting comparison between CH\textsubscript{2}O measurements and box model results with random uncertainty limits (at the 2σ level) for both. The modeled NO profile is also shown. The CH\textsubscript{2}O measurements and model results are in reasonable agreement (with a few exceptions) for the first two peaks but the model underestimates the observations by 286 pptv for the 3rd peak (R(CH\textsubscript{2}O) = measurement/model = 1.7). Based upon the model production rates, MHP dominates CH\textsubscript{2}O production throughout Figure 10 (43 to 47% of the total CH\textsubscript{2}O production). This explains the reduced NO effect on CH\textsubscript{2}O for the 2nd peak (R(CH\textsubscript{2}O) = 1.1), even in the presence of NO = 1393 pptv. However, the last two points of the 2nd peak (at 12:37 and 12:39) and the two points during the 3rd peak (12:47 and 12:48) show both CH\textsubscript{2}O and HO\textsubscript{2} discrepancies (R(CH\textsubscript{2}O) = 1.3 to 1.7, R(HO\textsubscript{2}) = 2.8 to 3.9) for NO levels similar to the start of the 2nd peak. This contrasting behavior with NO and MHP perhaps suggests a different air mass with unknown precursors for some of the peaks. It is interesting to note that the relative enhancements in UCN (peak/UTC local background value/local background value) are very similar to those for measured CH\textsubscript{2}O for all three peaks, reinforcing our discussion above that CH\textsubscript{2}O enhancements may be related to similar cloud outflow processes as those responsible for the UCN formation. However, as the NO profiles are also similar in shape, these two effects cannot be separated. Clearly the varying behavior of Figure 10 points to gaps in our understanding.

Figure 11 shows a second case study. Measurements here were acquired at 10.7 km over South Carolina on 8 July 2004. This example shows convection of well aged air with recent large NO inputs from lightning. Back trajectories indicated the air passed over the south eastern United States but remained at altitude between 7 and 10.7 km over the past two days. As can be seen, UCN and NO were both significantly elevated at the start of this leg. Both peaked at
20:50 where the CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ displayed their greatest discrepancies (R(CH$_2$O) = 3.4, R(HO$_2$) = 16.0). Here MHP values were low enough (median = 44) that MHP exerted a small influence on CH$_2$O production and it made no difference whether or not measured or modeled MHP was employed in the CH$_2$O calculation. Thus one would expect an NO effect that is not moderated by MHP, as is the case. As the NO dropped, the CH$_2$O measurements came into agreement with the model, but the R(HO$_2$) values were still significantly greater than 1, even for NO values <1000 pptv. In contrast to the CH$_2$O profile, where the measurements declined by over 200 pptv while model values were relatively constant, the HO$_2$ measurement declined by ~2.6 pptv while the model increased by approximately this value. At the peak (20:50), many organic species were near their overall 10–12 km median values, with a few exceptions (propane and the butanes were 2 to 3 times their median values). Anthropogenic combustion tracers like CO, ethyne, and SO$_2$ were all less than their 10–12 km median values. At times around 20:50, the Fuelberg analysis indicated a time since convection of ~3 hours but lightning influence within 1 hour of sampling. Based on equation (2) (CH$_2$O lifetime = 1.5 hours) direct convection of CH$_2$O should not be important here.

8. Possible Causes of the UT CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ Discrepancies

[37] The two convective cases in the UT just examined show time periods where measurements of CH$_2$O are in agreement with model calculations and time periods where both CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ observations are significantly higher than box model calculations when NO is elevated. In this section we examine the 7 potential causes for this observation raised in section 6.

[38] During both case studies just discussed for the constant altitude portions of the measurement—model comparisons, changes in ambient temperatures and pressures were all less than 0.5% (0.8 K and 0.3 mb). Thus the variability of the measurement—model comparison during these flight legs implies that temperature and pressure related rate constant and photolysis frequency errors as well as branching ratio errors (potential cause #5) can be ruled out. Errors in any of these parameters would not yield measurement—model agreement during parts of the flight legs and disagreement during other parts. A full description of the box model and the modeling approach are included in the companion paper by Fried et al. [2008]. Photolysis rates are based on observed values, so enhancements and reductions in the radiation field due to cloud impacts is implicitly accounted for in the modeling calculations. Likewise, this logic also rules out errors in the rate constant for CH$_2$O + NO (potential cause #1) as well as additional reactions that produce CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ in the atmosphere involving NO which are not currently represented in box models (potential cause #2), unless heterogeneous production on aerosols, which is time coincident with the elevated NO becomes important. The 4th potential cause, significantly lower modeled OH mixing ratios than those measured can be ruled out; in the 1st case study modeled OH values were higher than measured. In the 2nd case study of Figure 11 the R(CH$_2$O) = 3.5 value at 20:50 using modeled OH only reduces to ~2.1 when employing measured OH. This leaves us with three possibilities for the observed discrepancies: unmeasured hydrocarbon precursors (potential cause #3), heterogeneous formation of CH$_2$O on aerosols and/or in clouds; and/or evaporation of CH$_2$O from aerosols, cloud droplets, and/or ice particles in our inlet (potential cause #7). In section 6 we discussed the possibility that in addition to elevated NO, elevated ultrafine condensation nuclei may also play some role in causing the observed CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ measurement—model discrepancies in the UT. However, both the surface area and volume of UCNs are orders of magnitude too low for heterogeneous reactions to be important here. Such reactions therefore would require surface areas such as those found in clouds. Heterogeneous processing of methanol to form CH$_2$O in certain clouds (potential cause #6) is one such possibility discussed by Tabazadeh et al. [2004]. These researchers presented evidence based upon Fourier Transform IR measurements to support the importance of this mechanism in clouds that have encountered biomass burning plumes. One possible mechanism postulated involved cloud uptake of NO$_2$ and the formation of HO$_2$, both of which are consistent with the observations of this study. These authors further raised the possibility of similar processes occurring on more pristine clouds (no biomass burning influence), as would be needed to explain the present observations; as discussed previously, biomass burning influence was not evident in the present discrepancies.

[39] Of the two case studies presented, the total cloud surface area density was only appreciable for the 1st case study (Figure 10) around 12:20. Here the DC-8 was sampling in clouds with a total surface area density, S, of 0.0016 cm$^{-2}$ cm$^{-3}$ for cloud particles in the 0.3- to 1550-µm size range. Assuming that the cloud surface area size distribution here was equivalent to that in Tabazadeh et al. [2004] and that the Tabazadeh heterogeneous normalized rate constant in smoke/cloud plumes for reactions involving NO$_2$ (k$_{het}$ = 4.3 × 10$^{-13}$ cm$^3$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) was also appropriate for the pristine clouds of the present study, we estimate the magnitude of heterogeneous production of CH$_2$O from Tabazadeh et al. [2004]:

$$\text{[CH}_2\text{O]}_{\text{het}} = \text{[Processing Time]} \times [k_{\text{het}}] \times [S][\text{NO}_2][\text{CH}_3\text{OH}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

[40] The Fuelberg et al. [2007] convective analysis indicated that the air sampled at 12:20 was exposed to fresh convection for the past 21 hours, and IR satellite imagery coupled with back trajectories indicated that this air was in clouds for at least 8 hours prior to sampling. Assuming a surface area density of 0.0016 cm$^{-2}$ cm$^{-3}$ for the entire cloud exposure, a processing time of 8 hours, NO$_2$ and methanol mixing ratios of 315 pptv and 2741 pptv, respectively (measured at 12:20, an air number density M = 1.1 × 10$^{15}$ molecules cm$^{-3}$), we calculate a CH$_2$O mixing ratio of 184 pptv (23 pptv hr$^{-1}$) due to heterogeneous conversion of methanol with NO$_2$ in pristine clouds. Under this scenario, we should have observed a CH$_2$O measurement—model discrepancy of +184 pptv at 12:20, since the box model does not include this process. The actual measurement—model discrepancy at 12:20 was −110 pptv and averaged 51 ± 106 pptv for the entire nonclear period around 12:20. The largest discrepancies observed in Figure 10 occurred
at 12:47 and 12:48 (+277 pptv), ~6 hours transport time after the cloud exposure at 12:20. As this is ~4 CH$_2$O lifetimes, any heterogeneous cloud processing should have recovered by the time of sampling at 12:47 and 12:48. Given these facts, the heterogeneous conversion of methanol on pristine clouds to form CH$_2$O in the presence of elevated NO$_x$ in the UT is highly unlikely here.

[41] Considering the 7 highest NO points in the 10–12 km bin, we can also discount inlet evaporation of condensed phase CH$_2$O (potential cause #7) based upon a number of factors. Sampling for all 7 events occurred in clear air with low particle number densities and surface area densities and near zero liquid water contents (LWC). Based upon convection of boundary layer (BL) median CH$_2$O values of 2065 pptv to the 10–12 km range, we estimate a required LWC of at least 0.025 g m$^{-3}$ to yield the observed CH$_2$O values (median = 201 pptv) for the 7 events under consideration assuming that Henry's Law equilibrium is established in the BL and maintained at this value throughout the convection to the UT, whereupon the CH$_2$O laden droplets totally evaporate in our heated inlet. During INTEX-NA the droplet mean diameter for this LWC typically ranged between 4 and 7 $\mu$m in the 10–12 km range. As our rear-facing inlet should exclude particles larger than ~1 $\mu$m and more likely larger than 0.5 $\mu$m, it is unlikely that evaporation of liquid water droplets in our inlet should cause the observed discrepancy. In the case of ice formation, the retention of soluble gases like CH$_2$O in the frozen particle (estimated at ~50%, Barth et al. [2007]) should make this issue even less likely. However, this analysis does suggest that evaporation of BL-transported CH$_2$O from droplets/ice particles into the atmosphere in the UT may be an important atmospheric process not represented in current box models. Such processes, however, cannot explain the observed NO dependence for the 7 points in question.

[42] The final possibility for the observed NO discrepancies involves gas-phase reactions of unmeasured hydrocarbons, which most likely involve reactions of RO$_2$ radicals with NO. Steady state estimates, carried out to assess the magnitude of such hydrocarbons, revealed that a relatively long-lived hydrocarbon with the same reactivity as propane ($k_{OH} = 9.3 \times 10^{-13}$) would need to be present at mixing ratios of approximately 2 ppbv. Faster reacting alkenes with the same reactivity as ethene and isoprene ($k_{OH} = 6.6 \times 10^{-12}$ and $9.7 \times 10^{-11}$) would need to be present at much lower mixing ratios below 250 pptv to yield the observed discrepancies. A large number of undetected slower reacting hydrocarbons at very low mixing ratios could also explain the observed discrepancies.

9. Summary and Conclusions

[43] Measurements of CH$_2$O from a tunable diode laser absorption spectrometer (TDLAS) were acquired onboard the NASA DC-8 during the summer 2004 INTEX-NA campaign and employed to further test our understanding of hydrocarbon oxidation chemistry and convective transport in the upper troposphere (6–12 km) over continental North America and the North Atlantic Ocean. Various tracers were used to arrive at a set of 81 background air mass time periods in the UT, and this procedure resulted in a background CH$_2$O cutoff limit of 165 pptv. Approximately 40% of the collective UT CH$_2$O observations and/or model results of the present study in the UT exceed this limit. Box model results indicated that in general CH$_2$O production from CH$_4$ was found to be the dominant source term in the UT, even in perturbed air masses. This was followed by production from MHP (CH$_3$OOH), methanol, PAN type compounds, and ketones, in descending order of their contribution. However, a number of convection cases were also identified where MHP and/or methanol played the dominant role in producing UT CH$_2$O.

[44] Two different approaches indicated that at least 70% to 73% of the perturbed CH$_2$O observations (values > 165 pptv) in the UT by TDLAS were caused by enhanced production from CH$_2$O precursors, including enhancements from lightning-produced NO. A time-dependent box model indicates that such processes could affect UT radical and O$_3$ production for as long as one or more weeks. For the remaining 27% to 30% of the time our perturbed UT observations can be ascribed to convection of CH$_2$O precursors with or without direct CH$_2$O convection. At present there is no way to separate these two effects, and thus CH$_2$O precursors may be playing an even larger role in the UT.

[45] The median measurement/model ratio in the UT was 0.9 (0.5 to 1.5 at the 25% and 75% levels, respectively) when measurements of MHP were available to constrain the model ($N = 1188$). However, individual ratios exhibited a great deal of scatter. In the UT, 56% of the measurement–model comparisons were within the combined random uncertainties and 62% were within the combined systematic uncertainty limits. A further comparison revealed that both measured and modeled CH$_2$O were both significantly elevated in the UT when sampling in nonclear conditions due to convection of pollution. This increase was more than a factor of 2 in the 10–12 km range compared to clear conditions. Nevertheless, the median point-by-point measurement/model ratios were still in agreement during these conditions, indicating that the box model faithfully captures the observations during most of the convective perturbations throughout the UT and that CH$_2$O is not permanently removed from the gas phase during most cloud encounters here.

[46] The CH$_2$O UT measurement–model agreement was also studied as a function of NO. In the 10–12 km range there was a significant trend in this discrepancy, which was highly correlated with HO$_2$ discrepancy. A detailed analysis of various possibilities points to unmeasured hydrocarbon precursors as the most likely source. It is clear that more systematic studies of CH$_2$O and HO$_2$ measurement–model relationships in the UT are needed as a function of NO$_x$, particularly in and around clouds, and in the presence of high UCN number densities and high methanol mixing ratios. Systematic measurements are also needed where the cloud hydrometer types are well-characterized. Studying the behavior of CH$_2$O during freezing nucleation processes, for example, would be of particular interest. Such a process would act as an efficient mechanism in transporting boundary layer CH$_2$O to the UT. Based on the results of this study, it is clear that understanding radical chemistry in the UT requires reconciling CH$_2$O measurement–model discrepancies in addition to those for HO$_2$. This is particularly true since enhanced photochemical production of CH$_2$O in the UT in the presence of convection and lightning was shown...
to be prevalent over a large fraction of our observations over North America and the North Atlantic Ocean.
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