

# Ozone Absorption Cross Sections Laboratory Measurements

James B. Burkholder

Chemical Sciences Division Earth System Research Laboratory NOAA



Ozone Cross Section Workshop II Geneva, March 2010

# **Outline and Objective**

Stimulate Discussion of Laboratory Measurements Is there a need for new studies? Workshop Mandates "New" measurement Preliminary Work at NOAA Implications for further studies

# Mandates

- (1) Review available database of spectral ozone measurements in the Huggins bands
- (2) Evaluate their uncertainties (including temperature dependence)
- (3) Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements
- (4) Prepare written summary

Mandates (1) and (2): Evaluate database (Huggins) and Uncertainties

BP and DBM data posted on ACSO web page ! Avoids confusion (outsiders) over the BP data No BP room temperature currently posted ?

Mandates (1) and (2): Evaluate database (Huggins) and Uncertainties

Orphal, J., "A critical review of the absorption cross-sections of O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> in the 240-790 nm region", ESA Tech. Note MO-TN-ESA-GO-0302, 2002.
Orphal, J., "A critical review of the absorption cross-sections of O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> in the ultraviolet and visible", J. Photochem. Photobio. A: Chemistry, 157, 185-209, 2003.

## Key Issues Identified for Laboratory Measurements

Absolute Cross Sections	Resolution	Wavelength Calibration
Dynamic Range	Wavelength Range	
Temperature Dep. (200 K or lower)	Fitting (Extrap. or Inter.)	

## Absolute Cross Sections: 1 – 2 %

- (1) Absolute pressure measurements and chemical titration methods
- (2) A number of measurements at specific wavelengths
- (3) A number of spectrum measurements, some absolute and some scaled to recommended values

#### Resolution: Several Issues

- (1) Comparing data sets with different resolutions (Molina and Molina report 1 nm data)
- (2) Applications have different resolution requirements.
- (3) Calibration with specific instruments preferred but not always possible.

Wavelength Calibration: Some discrepancies among data sets

Mandates (1) and (2): Evaluate database (Huggins) and Uncertainties

Key Issues Identified for Laboratory Measurements			
Absolute Cross Sections	Resolution	Wavelength Calibration	
Dynamic Range	Wavelength Range		
Temperature Dep. (200 K or lower)	Fitting (Extrap. or Inter.)		

Dynamic Range: O<sub>3</sub> cross sections of interest cover 7 orders of magnitude !

- (1) Lab instruments are not capable of accurate measurements over entire range simultaneously
- (2) Measurements made at specific wavelengths or over narrower wavelength regions

## Temperature Dependence:

- (1) Some T-dep observed at all wavelengths
- (2) Large T-dep in valleys of Huggins bands
- (3) Limited low-temperature data sets
   DBM, > 218 K
   BP and Bogumil et al., > 203 K
- (4) Spread in T-dep cross sections significant, 5 10%
- Fitting: Need to extrapolate or interpolate to full range of desired temperatures
  - (1) Laboratory measurements are typically limited to 4 or less specific temperatures (>203 K)
  - (2)  $O_3$  cross sections are, usually, a smoothly varying function of temperature (Good News)
  - (3) What function works best? Should extrapolations be trusted?



Many laboratory studies available !

Some good, some better!

JPL and IUPAC evaluations are not focused on retrieval applications: *More directed towards modeling applications* 

Data taken from Mainz database: http://www.atmosphere.mpg.de/enid/2295

## NEW CROSS SECTION MEASUREMENT

Mandate (1): Review available laboratory data

Environ. Sci. Technol. 2009, 43, 7831-7836

# A Sensitive and Versatile Detector for Atmospheric $NO_2$ and $NO_X$ Based on Blue Diode Laser Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy

HENDRIK FUCHS,<sup>†,‡,§</sup> WILLIAM P. DUBÉ,<sup>†,‡</sup> BRIAN M. LERNER,<sup>†,‡</sup> NICHOLAS L. WAGNER,<sup>†</sup> ERIC J. WILLIAMS,<sup>†,‡</sup> AND STEVEN S. BROWN<sup>\*,†</sup>

Earth System Research Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO, and Cooperative Institute for Research in the Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO developed over the past decades. Nitric oxide (NO) is most commonly measured by its chemiluminescence (CLD) reaction in excess O<sub>3</sub> to produce electronically excited NO<sub>2</sub>. The method is readily extended to NO<sub>2</sub> using a heated molybdenum surface or a photolytic converter to convert some fraction of NO<sub>2</sub> to NO (2, 3). While CLD methods are available as both commercial and custom built, research grade instruments, they require toxic excess reagents (e.g., NO, O<sub>3</sub>) and vacuum systems. Furthermore, the indirect NO<sub>2</sub> detection may be subject to interference from conversion of compounds other than NO2 to NO in commercial instruments (4, 5), is less precise than the NO detection due to the requirement for subtraction of two signals, and requires careful calibration of the NO<sub>2</sub> conversion fraction. Direct detection methods for NO<sub>2</sub> via, for example, mid infrared tunable diode laser spectroscopy (TDLS) (e.g., ref 6) and laser induced fluorescence (LIF) (e.g., ref 7) have addressed concerns related to interference in the NO<sub>2</sub> to NO conversion process. During the past decade cavity ring-down spec-

#### T = 298 K

Cavity ring-down spectroscopy Relative measurement: 404 nm vs 532 nm Cross section at 532 nm well-established No details/No data reported Ozone measurements made as part of the instrument calibrations and tests

## NEW CROSS SECTION MEASUREMENT

Mandate (1): Review available laboratory data

Environ. Sci. Technol. 2009, 43, 7831-7836



## NEW CROSS SECTION MEASUREMENT

Wavelength (nm)

Mandate (1): Review available laboratory data

Environ. Sci. Technol. 2009, 43, 7831-7836



Possible to extend to other wavelengths

Possible to extend to other temperatures

Mandate (3): Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements

## NOAA "Test" Experiments

We have **NOT** determined absolute absorption cross section values

Cavity ring-down spectroscopy (310 – 350 nm) relative to Hg line (253.65 nm)

- High spectral resolution (~0.1 cm<sup>-1</sup>, ~0.001 nm)
- Accurate wavelength calibration
- Large dynamic range in Ozone cross sections
- Temperature range (200 298 K)

## **Initial focus:**

Relative measurements (Wavelength and Temperature)

Evaluation and Validation (?) of existing data sets

**NOAA Experimental Apparatus** 

Mandate (3): Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements



- Single wavelength measurement
- Accurate wavelength calibration

## **Preliminary NOAA Measurements**

Mandate (3): Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements

- Measurements at 310, 320, 330, 335, 340, 345 nm
- 0.1 nm step scan between 327 and 328.5 nm
- Temperature dep. at 320 nm (210 298 K)



## **Preliminary NOAA Measurements**

Mandate (3): Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements



## **Temperature Dependence Measurements**





\* Weak T-dep at 320 nm

\*

\* Good agreement among more reliable data sets

Precision of the individual measurements ?? NOAA: ~ 2-3%; limit ~ 1-2% (realistic) Largest spread at lowest T Measurements show ~4% spread at lowest temperature BP: strongest temperature dependence

CRDS measurements could improve precision of temperature dependence !

## What does it look like at another wavelength?





Stronger T-dep in longer wavelength valley

BP: Strongest T-dep Others: <u>5% spread</u>

## What does it look like at another wavelength?



# **Comments and Future Expert Team Activities**

Mandate (3): Initiate and coordinate new laboratory measurements

New Laboratory Studies are on-going

Efforts at NOAA Validation of existing data sets Relative measurements Target: Wavelength (310 – 420 nm) and Temperature (200 – 298 K)

Other Laboratories Other wavelength regions

Mandate (4): Prepare written summary

Considerations

- \* Provisions for future refinements
  - The perfect data set does not exist (?) and laboratory studies are on-going
- \* Clearly state NEEDS
  - If we want new lab measurements we should say what is needed
- \* Provide recommended data sets

## BLANK





Reasonable agreement (or is it ?) Molina and Molina (1986): 1 nm data Similar measurements: Burrows et al. Voigt et al. Bogumil et al.



Wavelength (nm)