Impact of the vertical mixing induced by low-level jets on boundary layer ozone concentration

Xiao-Ming Hu [a,*], Petra M. Klein [a,b], Ming Xue [a,b], Fuqing Zhang [c], David C. Doughty [c], Renate Forkel [d], Everette Joseph [e], Jose D. Fuentes [c]

[a] Center for Analysis and Prediction of Storms, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA
[b] School of Meteorology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA
[c] Department of Meteorology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
[d] Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT), Institut für Meteorologie und Klimaforschung, Atmosphärische Umweltforschung (IMK-IFU), Kreuzeckbahnstr. 19, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany
[e] Department of Physics and Astronomy, Howard University, Washington, DC, USA

HIGHLIGHTS

► The nocturnal O_3 maxima occurred concurrently at multiple sites along the corridor.
► The residual layer (RL) is leaky in the presence of a strong low-level jet (LLJ).
► The role of LLJ-induced vertical mixing on boundary layer O_3 is identified.
► Mixed-layer O_3 concentration on the next day is reduced as a result of a leaky RL.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

After sunset, a stable boundary layer (SBL) develops close to the ground, while the upper region of the daytime mixed layer becomes the residual layer (RL). Mixing between the SBL and RL is often quite limited and the RL is thought to be a reservoir for daytime mixed-layer pollutants under such conditions. However, ozone (O_3) profiles observed in Maryland, U.S. suggest that the RL is not always a reservoir of O_3 in that region. Nocturnal low-level jets (LLJs) and/or other mechanisms are speculated to enhance vertical mixing between the SBL and RL, which influences the vertical O_3 redistribution. Nocturnal surface O_3 maxima, an RL with reduced O_3 levels, and a concurrent strong LLJ were observed in Maryland on the night of August 9–10, 2010. Surface O_3 measurements in the region and three-dimensional air quality simulations suggest that horizontal advection cannot explain the nocturnal O_3 maxima and concurrent decrease of O_3 levels within the RL. A sensitivity study with a single column (1D) chemistry model was performed to investigate the role of LLJs in generating turbulent mixing within the nighttime boundary layer and to identify related impacts on O_3 concentrations at night and on the following day. The strong shear associated with the LLJ enhanced turbulent mixing and weakened the decoupling of the RL and SBL substantially. Ozone was actively mixed down from the RL to the surface, causing secondary nocturnal surface O_3 maxima. Near the surface, O_3 was efficiently removed by chemical reactions and dry deposition, which resulted in lower O_3 peak values on the next day.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Following the traditional picture of the diurnal evolution of the atmospheric boundary layer, radiational cooling after sunset results in the development of a stable boundary layer (SBL) near the surface that is typically quite shallow. Above the SBL is a residual layer (RL) with characteristics similar to those of the previous day's mixed layer (Stull, 1988). In the absence of strong disturbances, mixing and dispersion of pollutants between the RL and SBL become limited, and within the RL the concentration of pollutants remains at similar levels as in the mixed layer before its decay, which is why the RL is often viewed as a reservoir of pollutants (Stull, 1988). The pollutants trapped within the RL from the previous day can be entrained downward into the re-developing mixed

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: yuanfangcan@gmail.com (X.-M. Hu).

layer on the following day. In places such as the northeastern United States, such downward mixing of ozone (O_3) and its precursors is shown to contribute substantially to ground-level O_3 buildup in the morning in addition to chemical production (Zhang et al., 1998; Zhang and Rao, 1999). The downward transport of the RL O_3 in the morning also contributes to the maximum O_3 levels observed near the surface during daytime (Neu et al., 1994; Aneja et al., 2000; Yorks et al., 2009; Morris et al., 2010; Tong et al., 2011). Accurate information regarding the RL O_3 is thus critical for correctly simulating the daytime O_3 near the surface (Herwehe et al., 2011). Due to its relative inaccessibility, the actual detection of the properties of the RL at high temporal and spatial scales has been limited in the past. Recent field experiments (e.g., Balsley et al., 2008) showed that the classical view of a quiescent RL may have been oversimplified. Sporadic turbulence exists at night, weakening the decoupling between the RL and SBL, and the vertical mixing in the nighttime boundary layer may be significant, even compared to that in the daytime convective boundary layer (Poulos et al., 2002; Tjernström et al., 2009). Enhanced nighttime turbulence may be triggered by mesoscale motions such as low-level jets (LLJs), Kelvin–Helmholtz instabilities, gravity waves, wake vortices, and density currents (Sun et al., 2002, 2004; Salmond and McKendry, 2005; Fritts et al., 2009). Such intense turbulence can affect the vertical structure of the nighttime boundary layer and vertical distribution of pollutants. The view of the quiescent RL as a reservoir of pollutants may be challenged under such conditions. Recent observations (Hu et al., 2012) have suggested that the RL is leaky at times, i.e., active vertical exchange of air exists between the RL and the SBL. As a result, the O_3 levels in the RL may be highly variable and surface O_3 may not decrease as fast as anticipated based on the assumption of having a completely decoupled RL and SBL. In some cases, there are even secondary nighttime O_3 maxima reported, which were typically associated with periods of enhanced mixing (Corsmeier et al., 1997; Reitebuch et al., 2000; Salmond and McKendry, 2002; Talbot et al., 2005; Hu et al., 2012). Therefore, it is important to further investigate the dynamics and mixing of nocturnal boundary layers to better understand the temporal variability, absolute levels, and deposition rates of surface layer O_3 concentrations.

In Beltsville, Maryland (MD), nighttime vertical O_3 profiles have been measured during the summertime since 2004 (Yorks et al., 2009; Hu et al., 2012). Beltsville is located between Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, MD, in the middle of the Mid-Atlantic urban corridor of the United States. Heavy emissions of O_3 precursors and favorable meteorological conditions frequently lead to extreme O_3 events in this area (Ryan et al., 1998). Within the RL, O_3 levels at the Beltsville site at times resemble those found in the free troposphere with concentrations that are significantly lower than those in the previous day's atmospheric mixed layer. Ozone in the RL inherited from the daytime mixed layer appears to be readily mixed down to the surface, contributing to elevated O_3 at night (Hu et al., 2012). Previous studies have shown that LLJs occur frequently in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States during the period between 1900–0600 h local time (LT), with peak winds ranging from 8 to 23 m s^{-1} (Ryan, 2004; Zhang et al., 2006). Such strong LLJs may cause the RL to become leaky (Banta et al., 2007). Thus, the LLJs are hypothesized to contribute to the formation of leaky RL and nighttime surface O_3 maxima in the Mid-Atlantic region.

In the current study, the impacts of an LLJ observed in the Beltsville area on surface O_3 and vertical O_3 profiles are investigated in detail using different numerical modeling approaches. Initially, a three-dimensional model is employed to examine the spatial extent of the LLJ and to diagnose its role in modulating boundary layer O_3. A single column model is then applied to isolate the impacts of the LLJ on boundary layer mixing, nocturnal O_3 dispersion,

and O_3 built-up on the subsequent day. This study, for the first time, provides direct modeling evidence that LLJs induce substantial turbulence and reduce the RL O_3 significantly; as a result, the O_3 level in the daytime boundary layer on the following day is lowered.

2. Methods

During summer 2010, a research field campaign (Hu et al., 2012) was conducted at Howard University's Atmospheric Research Site in Beltsville, MD (39.06°N, 76.88°W). The meteorological variables and mixing ratios of chemical species (O_3, NO, NO_2, CO, SO_2) were measured at 5 m above ground level (AGL). The mixing ratios of chemical species were recorded every second. During several intensive observation periods, balloon-borne meteorological and O_3 sondes were used to obtain vertical profiles of temperature, humidity, wind speed and direction, and O_3. On the night of August 9–10, 2010, a secondary O_3 maximum and a concurrent LLJ were observed at this research site. This event will be the focus of the current study. In addition to the night of August 9–10, O_3 sondes were also launched in the afternoon of August 9, which provided the unique opportunity during the field campaign to investigate the O_3 variation from the daytime convective boundary layer to the nighttime boundary layer. LLJs commonly occur in the Mid-Atlantic region (Zhang et al., 2006). This case study demonstrates potential impacts of the frequently occurring phenomenon of nocturnal LLJs on boundary layer O_3.

Three-dimensional (3D) air quality simulations, using the Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry (WRF/ Chem, Grell et al., 2005), for the 2010 summer campaign were applied in Hu et al. (2012) to investigate regional transport of O_3 and illustrate certain caveats in 3D air quality simulations. As part of the current study, output from these WRF/Chem simulations along with hourly O_3 data recorded at the AIRNow sites in the region were first used to examine the spatial extent and the potential causes of elevated nocturnal surface O_3 concentrations during the night of August 9–10, 2010. Details about the model set-up and domains of the WRF/Chem simulations can be found in Hu et al. (2012).

To further investigate the impacts of the strong LLJ observed on the night of August 9–10, 2010 near the Beltsville site on the vertical distribution of O_3, a single column photochemical model CACHE (Forkel et al., 2006) is employed in this study. In the vertical direction, 40 model layers extend from the surface to the 2.64-km height, with a vertical grid spacing of 1 m for the lowest layer and 500 m for the uppermost layer; such a setup appears to adequately capture the boundary layer structure during both nighttime and daytime. The multi-layered photochemical model solves the following system of equations:

$$\frac{\partial \chi_{i,j}}{\partial t} = E_{i,j} + D_{i,j} + C_{i,j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left(K \frac{\partial \chi_{i,j}}{\partial z_j}\right) \tag{1}$$

where subscripts i and j denote the ith chemical species and the jth model layer, respectively, with χ being the concentration of a chemical species. Terms E, D and C are the rates of change due to emissions, dry deposition, and chemical reactions, respectively. The estimation method of emissions of volatile organic compounds, E, was updated to use the formula of Guenther et al. (2006). The dry deposition, D, is treated using the methods of Wesely (1989) and Gao et al. (1993). The chemical reaction rate, C, is computed using the Regional Atmospheric Chemistry Mechanism (RACM) gasphase mechanism (Stockwell et al., 1997). The atmospheric turbulent transport term, i.e., the last term of (1), is parameterized using a first-order closure scheme. The eddy diffusivity K is described

using a mixing-length approach, in which K is expressed as a function of mixing length l, the vertical wind shear S, and the stability function $f(Ri)$:

$$K = l^2 S f(Ri) \qquad (2)$$

This first-order parameterization is widely applied in operational numerical weather prediction (NWP) and climate models (Beare et al., 2006; Cuxart et al., 2006). The stability function f is parameterized using the Richardson number Ri; a larger/smaller Ri leads to a smaller/larger value of the stability function. The Richardson number Ri, a dynamic stability parameter, represents the ratio of thermally to mechanically produced turbulence in a defined air layer.

Two simulations are conducted with the single column model. In the control simulation, a calm condition (no LLJ) is considered while in a sensitivity simulation an LLJ is included. The simulations are initialized at 1400 local time (LT) on August 9, 2010, and run for 34 h. The initial concentrations of O_3 and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) come from field observations while the initial concentrations of other species come from the WRF/Chem simulation conducted in Hu et al. (2012). The shortwave radiation is constrained by the observed values. The simulated mixing ratio of NO_x in the boundary layer is nudged to the observed values at 5 m AGL every half-hour. Advection is not considered in the single column model. The boundary layer advection pathway in Maryland changed during the daytime of August 10, 2010 (Hu et al., 2012). Thus bias of the simulated mixed layer O_3 on August 10 by the single column model is expected. However, the goal of the single column model simulations is to isolate the impact of the vertical mixing induced by an LLJ on boundary layer O_3 by examining the difference between the control and the sensitivity simulations.

3. Observations and three-dimensional WRF/Chem simulations

The measured O_3, NO_x and the corresponding meteorological variables on August 9–10, 2010 at the Beltsville research site, 5 m AGL, are shown in Fig. 1. Due to the diurnal cycle of photochemical production, O_3 maxima typically occur in the afternoon in the continental atmospheric boundary layer. During summer nights, NO_x mixing ratios are ~7 ppbv and NO titration and dry deposition usually result in continuously decreasing O_3 concentrations near the surface in Beltsville (Hu et al., 2012). During our study period, however, a secondary O_3 maximum was recorded on the night of August 9–10, 2010; O_3 mixing ratios between 0000 and 0300 LT were elevated by ~15 ppbv. By 0700 and 0800 LT, the O_3 mixing ratio decreased to ~10 ppbv due to NO titration and dry deposition. The secondary O_3 maximum was accompanied by a decrease of the NO_x mixing ratio and increase of temperature. Southwesterly winds (~2 m s^{-1}) were maintained during the period of 0000–0500 LT, suggesting that a similar footprint and air mass persisted during this period. These factors suggest that the secondary O_3 maximum at the surface on the night of August 9–10, 2010 was due to downward mixing of RL O_3, as was also reported in Talbot et al. (2005) and Hu et al. (2012). Since the upper layers typically had higher O_3 mixing ratios, lower NO_x mixing ratios, and higher potential temperatures, one can conclude that vertical mixing between the SBL and RL persisted during the night, which led to an increase in surface O_3 and temperature, and a decrease in surface NO_x.

Similar secondary nocturnal O_3 maxima were also recorded at the majority of AIRNow sites (60% of 45 sites) along the Virginia-to-Connecticut corridor on the same night. Other AIRNow sites along this corridor also experienced elevated O_3 on this night, but an


Fig. 1. Observed (top to bottom) O_3, NO_x, wind vector, and temperature at Beltsville, Maryland on August 9–10, 2010.

isolated secondary O_3 maximum was not apparent. The concentration variations for ten exemplary sites are shown in Fig. 2. Fig. 3 illustrates the locations of those sites. These AIRNow sites are located across a wide region with different characteristics such as urban and rural land use types. Their upstream O_3 mixing ratios varied significantly according to the WRF/Chem simulation (Fig. 4), which can be explained by the different elevation of the monitoring sites (Fig. 3) and spatially variable precursor emission rates within the domain. Ozone was removed more efficiently by NO titration around anthropogenic emission sources such as big cities and traffic roads. Factors contributing to higher nighttime O_3 concentrations at elevated locations (e.g., in the Appalachian Mountains) included (1) a more explicit influence of O_3-richer air from the free troposphere, (2) lower anthropogenic emission rates, and (3) limited transport of NO into these regions. Despite the heterogeneous upstream O_3 mixing ratios, almost concurrent nocturnal secondary O_3 maxima were observed at the AIRNow sites along the Virginia-to-Connecticut corridor. Given the large variability in O_3 concentrations near each site, advection cannot explain these nearly simultaneous secondary maxima. The distance between the south–west (S. MARYND) and north–east (Mt Ninham) sites along the corridor is ~600 km. Even with a wind speed as high as 20 m s^{-1}, it would take more than 8 h for an air mass to travel across this distance. The secondary O_3 maximum at Mt Ninham would be expected to occur several hours later than at the S. MARYND site if they were due to advection of an O_3-richer air mass, which was clearly not observed. Given the difficulties in reproducing the structure of the nocturnal boundary layer and nighttime chemistry, the simulated vertical profile of chemical species can be biased (Zhang et al., 2009; Herwehe et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2012). Thus, the results from the WRF/Chem simulations should not be over

Fig. 2. Time series of observed O$_3$ mixing ratios on Aug. 9–10, 2010 at 10 AIRNow sites. The locations of these sites are marked in Fig. 3. The nighttime secondary O$_3$ maxima are confined in the time window between 2300 local time (LT), Aug. 9 and 0700 LT, Aug. 10, which are marked by the dashed lines.

interpreted. It can be noted, however, that the general O$_3$ patterns remain similar throughout the entire period from 0000 LT to 0400 LT (Figure not shown), which is another indication that advection did not play a crucial role in the formation of the nighttime secondary O$_3$ maxima. The small variations in the onset times of the secondary O$_3$ maxima among the ten sites (Fig. 2) do not show any systematic trends related to the position of the site along the SW-NE corridor. They can likely be explained by the local characteristics of each site (e.g., urban vs. rural and different elevation), which


Fig. 3. Terrain height of the study area. Locations of the AIRNow sites are marked.

Fig. 4. Spatial distribution of O$_3$ at 0200 local time (LT) on August 10, 2010 simulated by the WRF/Chem model. The observed O$_3$ values at the AIRNow sites are indicated by shaded circles.

resulted in different nocturnal O$_3$-depletion rates, vertical O$_3$ distributions, and turbulent mixing at each site.

Boundary layer structures on August 9–10, 2010 are clearly illustrated by the measured vertical profiles of O$_3$ (Fig. 5a). During daytime, elevated O$_3$ mixing ratios due to photochemical production are confined in the mixed layer, which is the lower ∼1.7 km AGL. The O$_3$ mixing ratio in the daytime mixed layer on August 9, 2010 was as high as 100 ppbv (Fig. 5a). During nighttime, strong vertical gradients of O$_3$ mixing ratios develop in the stable boundary layer (∼600 m AGL) due to efficient O$_3$ removal by NO titration and dry deposition near the surface. If the stable boundary layer developing near the surface is decoupled form the RL, we would expect to observe low O$_3$ concentrations close to the surface, but concentrations inside the RL would remain close to the values observed within the previous day mixed layer (∼100 ppbv in the studied case). However, O$_3$ concentrations decreased throughout the RL (0.8–1.7 km AGL) on the night of August 9–10, 2010 to as low as 50–60 ppbv, which more closely resemble the values in the free troposphere. The decrease of the RL O$_3$ concentrations by nearly a factor of 2 compared to the previous day mixed-layer values, confirms that active dispersion of RL O$_3$ persisted on this night. At the same time, a strong LLJ over the Beltsville research site was

Fig. 5. Observed vertical profiles of (a) O$_3$ and (b) wind speed at Beltsville, Maryland on August 9–10, 2010.

recorded during the study period. The wind speed exceeded 15 m s^{-1} at 500 m AGL at 0252 LT on August 10 (Fig. 5b). Along the western, mountainous side of the Virginia-to-Connecticut corridor, strong radiative cooling near the ground results in lower nighttime temperatures than on the eastern side. Such a horizontal temperature gradient, caused by the terrain effects (Fig. 3), can induce a southwesterly thermal wind in the nocturnal boundary layer (Ryan, 2004), and contribute to the formation of the nighttime LLJ. The meridional variation of the Coriolis parameter could also accelerate the northward-blowing LLJ (Wexler, 1961; Zhong et al., 1996). The results from WRF/Chem simulations reported in Hu et al. (2012) also showed that a persistent low-level jet formed east of the Appalachian Mountains over the Virginia-to-Connecticut corridor (Fig. 6). Compared with the observed wind profiles, the maximum LLJ wind speed was however significantly


Fig. 7. Simulated and observed vertical profiles of wind speed at Beltsville, Maryland on the night of August 9–10, 2010.

underestimated by WRF (Fig. 7). Beltsville and all the sites experiencing secondary O$_3$ maximum shown in Fig. 2 are located in the corridor affected by the LLJ. As it was already discussed, neither the observations nor the model results indicate that advection of O$_3$ triggered the secondary, nighttime O$_3$ maxima. Instead, it is hypothesized that the LLJ induced strong turbulence, which weakened the decoupling between the SBL and RL and triggered enhanced mixing of O$_3$ from the RL to the ground, causing the observed increase in surface O$_3$. To prove this hypothesis, a one-dimensional modeling study was conducted that allowed us to isolate the role of the LLJ.

4. Impact of LLJ-induced vertical mixing in one-dimensional simulations

The 3D WRF/Chem simulation predicted that an LLJ formed and persisted throughout the early morning hours. However, it significantly underestimated the strength of the LLJ (Fig. 7), which meant that the WRF/Chem model would not accurately reproduce the vertical mixing in the NBL. However, even if the simulation had correctly reproduced the LLJ strength, it would still be difficult to identify the contribution of the LLJ in moderating the vertical O$_3$ distribution because the interplay of several processes (e.g., vertical mixing and horizontal advection) cannot be easily separated in 3D simulations. Therefore, simulations are conducted in this study using a single-column model to examine the impact of LLJ-induced vertical mixing on August 10, 2010. The environmental wind profile is manually set up in the model using the observed wind profile as guidance. Two simulations are conducted; the control simulation has a calm condition while a sensitivity experiment has an LLJ profile between 0000 LT and 0600 LT of day 2; the latter is otherwise the same as the control simulation. The maximum wind speed (WSP) of the LLJ at 440 m AGL is set as 20 m s^{-1}. The single column model does not consider directional wind shear. Instead, the maximum WSP of the LLJ is set at a higher value than the observation to account for the effect of directional shear-induced turbulence.

The simulations with the single column model captured the meteorological conditions (e.g., temperature and relative humidity) reasonably well (Fig. 8). In the sensitivity simulation, the impacts of LLJ-induced vertical mixing on meteorological conditions near the surface are successfully captured. An abrupt increase of temperature and decrease of relative humidity near the surface are reproduced at the onset of the LLJ, i.e., 0000 LT on August 10, 2010.


Fig. 6. (top to bottom) Wind field at ∼370 m AGL at 2300 LT on August 9, 0100 LT, and 0400 LT on August 10, 2010 simulated by WRF/Chem.

Fig. 8. Observed and simulated time series of (a) temperature and (b) relative humidity near the surface.

Fig. 10. Profiles of simulated O_3 mixing ratio from (a) the control simulation and (b) sensitivity simulation.

The simulated time series of O_3 mixing ratios near the surface are shown in Fig. 9a. At the onset of the LLJ (0000 LT), O_3 mixing ratios near the surface increased by ∼18 ppbv in the sensitivity simulation. At the same time, surface temperature increased (Fig. 8). These results are consistent with the observed secondary O_3 maximum shown in Fig. 1. The surface O_3 was nearly depleted on the calm night in the control simulation due to dry deposition and NO titration, while it was elevated in the sensitivity simulation with the LLJ (Fig. 9a). Such difference of the surface O_3 caused by LLJs was also reported in previous studies (Banta et al., 2007). These results therefore confirm the hypothesis that the LLJ played an important role in downward mixing of O_3 during the night of August 9–10, 2010.

The simulated vertical profiles of O_3 are shown in Fig. 10. The LLJ played an important role in removing O_3 in the RL at night. According to the formula (2), elevated wind shear in the presence of the LLJ will cause an increase of the eddy diffusivity. As a result of the shear-enhanced turbulence, the temperature inversion weakened, Ri further decreased, which, according to (2), as a whole contributed to a substantial increase in eddy diffusivity in the presence of an LLJ. The enhanced vertical mixing played a critical

role in modulating the vertical redistribution of O_3 in the boundary layer. On a calm night, O_3 in the RL was mostly conserved while the RL O_3 was reduced by ∼25 ppbv at 0800 LT in the presence of the LLJ (Figs 9b and 10). LLJs have also been reported to induce mechanical turbulence that can vertically mix O_3 in the nocturnal boundary layer in other regions such as Texas (Tucker et al., 2010). The significant reduction of O_3 in the RL in both observations (Fig. 5a) and simulation (Fig. 10b) indicates that the RL may not be a reservoir of pollutants in the presence of strong LLJs. The simulated reduction of the RL O_3 from the daytime mixed layer by the sensitivity simulation (∼25 ppbv, Fig. 10b) was smaller than the observed reduction (∼40 ppbv, Fig. 5a). Such discrepancy may be due to the exclusion of advection processes in the single column model and/or model errors. Model errors in the treatments of vertical mixing in meteorological and air quality models are shown to lead to substantial bias of simulated profiles of meteorological and chemical variables (Hu et al., 2010, 2012; Nielsen-Gammon et al., 2010).

Due to the enhanced turbulence induced by the LLJ, more O_3 was transported to the surface, where it was subjected to NO titration and enhanced dry deposition. The dry deposition velocity was correlated to the friction velocity u_*, with larger u_* values leading to larger dry deposition velocities. Enhanced turbulent mixing in the presence of an LLJ resulted in an increase in u_*, and thus higher dry deposition rates. As a result, the LLJ affected the O_3 budget at night, which in turn affected the O_3 concentration in the daytime mixed layer on the following day. Fig. 10 shows that the mixed-layer O_3 at 1400 LT on the second day was reduced by ∼8 ppbv due to the influence of the LLJ compared to the control simulation without the LLJ. The simulated maximum surface O_3 on August 10, 2010 was reduced by ∼8 ppbv with the LLJ while the maximum 8-h running average O_3 was reduced by ∼6 ppbv (Fig. 9a). Compared with the observed O_3 profile at 13:54 LT on August 10 (∼80 ppbv in the mixed layer), the predicted O_3 in the mixed layer on the second day by the sensitivity simulation is higher by ∼10 ppbv. The discrepancy is likely due to the change of transport pathways during the daytime of August 10, 2010 (Hu et al., 2012), which is not considered in the single column model.

The time–height diagrams of simulated O_3 are shown in Fig. 11. Without the LLJ, the RL O_3 is mostly conserved (Fig. 11a). When the daytime mixed layer grows, the O_3-rich RL air is entrained into the mixed layer below, thereby contributing to the rapid increase in O_3 in the mixed layer in the morning. Such a scenario is described in Zhang and Rao (1999) and confirmed by other studies (Aneja et al., 2000; Yorks et al., 2009; Morris et al., 2010; Tong et al., 2011). However, in the presence of the LLJ, the RL O_3 is removed at night (Fig. 11b). In the following morning, entrainment contributes much less to the O_3 in the mixed layer (Fig. 11b), thus the increase of

Fig. 9. Time series of O_3 (a) near the surface and (b) at 1 km AGL (in the RL at night). Dots show observed O_3 near the surface (panel a) and observed O_3 at 1 km AGL by Ozonesondes (panel b).

Fig. 11. Time–height diagram of simulated O_3 mixing ratio from (a) the control simulation and (b) sensitivity simulation. The black line in the top panel indicates the top of the mixed boundary layer between 0730 and 1300 local time, which is diagnosed using the 1.5-theta-increase method (Hu et al., 2010). The 1.5-theta-increase method defines boundary layer top as the level at which the potential temperature first exceeds the minimum potential temperature within the boundary layer by 1.5 K.

surface O_3 is much slower comparing to the control simulation (Fig. 9a).

5. Conclusions and discussion

Profiles of O_3 and meteorological variables in both nighttime and daytime have been measured in summertime since 2006 in Beltsville, Maryland (Hu et al., 2012). The data sets provided a unique opportunity to investigate the pollutants in the residual layer (RL) and their contribution to the daytime boundary layer pollution. It is shown that the RL was at times not a reservoir of O_3 at night. A case study was conducted for August 9–10, 2010, when a strong LLJ and elevated surface O_3 were observed at night. During this night, the RL O_3 was 50–60 ppbv, which was much lower than the O_3 level in the mixed layer on the previous day ($\sim$100 ppbv). Thus, O_3 appeared to be mixed from the RL to the ground preventing the RL from acting like a reservoir. Simulation results from a single-column model containing O_3 chemistry confirm that the LLJ causes a nocturnal secondary O_3 maximum and a significant reduction of the RL O_3. The LLJ-induced strong turbulence transports O_3-rich RL air to the surface where O_3 is efficiently removed by chemical reactions and enhanced dry deposition. These processes impact the O_3 budget: the enhanced nocturnal vertical mixing reduces the increase in surface O_3 the following morning and, compared to the results of a control simulation with calm conditions, the maximum O_3 is $\sim$8 ppbv lower for the simulation containing an LLJ.

Salmond and McKendry (2002) found that secondary surface O_3 maximum due to enhanced nocturnal mixing rarely exceeded 50 ppbv. They concluded that the nocturnal secondary O_3 maximum is unlikely to be significant enough to affect human health. Our study shows that such nocturnal mixing may play an important role in modulating the O_3 levels in the daytime boundary layer on the following day; it may thus have a more important implication for public health than had been previously realized.

Ryan (2004) investigated the climatology of LLJs in Maryland, USA and found that the weather patterns favorable for the development of LLJs are normally also suitable for the occurrence of Mid-Atlantic high O_3 episodes. Thus, the influence of LLJs on the O_3 episodes can be hardly discerned from other factors that are conducive to O_3 accumulation. Due to the difficulty in

accurately reproducing LLJs and the interplay of several processes (e.g., vertical mixing and horizontal advection) in three dimensional air quality simulations, a previous study on this case (Hu et al., 2012) did not isolate the impact of LLJs on the vertical distribution of O_3. Using a single column chemistry model that allows for easier setup of sensitivity experiments in this study, the impact of LLJs on the boundary layer O_3 pertaining to stronger vertical mixing is isolated. The effects of horizontal long-range transport due to LLJs are not considered in this study. One implication of this study for long-range transport is: the pollutants in the RL may leak out during the horizontal transport due to enhanced vertical mixing, reducing the impact of urban plumes in downwind areas.

LLJs have been reported in many regions (Whiteman et al., 1997; Song et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2006); the LLJs in other regions (e.g., the Great Plains of the United States) may be much stronger and more extensive than those in the Mid-Atlantic region (Zhang et al., 2006). Thus, the impact of LLJs on the boundary layer O_3 may have important implications for air quality in many regions. Apart from LLJs, mesoscale motions such as Kelvin–Helmholtz instabilities, gravity waves, wake vortices, and density currents can also cause enhanced nighttime turbulence (Sun et al., 2002, 2004; Salmond and McKendry, 2005; Fritts et al., 2009), which may also make the RL leaky. In addition to O_3, nocturnal mixing events may have appreciable effects on the dispersion and budget of other species such as carbon dioxide and volatile organic compounds (Acevedo et al., 2006; Ganzeveld et al., 2008). In one-dimensional simulations for the boundary layer over a tropical forest using a single column chemistry-climate model, Ganzeveld et al. (2008) showed that unresolved nocturnal vertical mixing processes likely lead to a nocturnal accumulation of formaldehyde in the RL, which is later on entrained into the daytime convective boundary layer where it affects daytime photochemistry. Further investigations regarding such mixing processes and their impacts are warranted. Future field campaigns that aim at improving our understanding of atmospheric chemistry in the atmospheric boundary layer should include measurements of the chemical composition/transformation in combination with detailed measurements of turbulence inside the RL.

Although the current study focuses on demonstrating the importance of vertical mixing processes for vertical dispersion of boundary layer O_3, the contribution of other processes, including advection (Banta et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2007; Tucker et al., 2010), dry deposition (Lin and McElroy, 2010) and chemical reactions in different chemical regimes at different height above the ground (Brown et al., 2007), cannot be always ignored. To more accurately quantify their contributions, meteorological and air chemistry measurements throughout the atmospheric boundary layer (e.g., Kuang et al., 2011) are needed to further improve boundary-layer parameterizations, particularly for nighttime conditions, and to facilitate the development and evaluation of more sophisticated three-dimensional chemistry simulations.

References

Acevedo, O.C., Moraes, O.L.L., Degrazia, G.A., Medeiros, L.E., 2006. Intermittency and the exchange of scalars in the nocturnal surface layer. Boundary-layer Meteorology 119, 41–55.

Aneja, V.P., Mathur, R., Arya, S.P., Li, Y., Murray, G.C., Manuszak, T.L., 2000. Coupling the vertical distribution of ozone in the atmospheric boundary layer. Environmental Science & Technology 34, 2324–2329.

Balsley, B., Svensson, G., Tjernström, M., 2008. On the scale dependence of the gradient Richardson number in the residual layer. Boundary-layer Meteorology 127, 57–72.

Banta, R.M., Seniff, C.J., Nielsen-Gammon, J., Darby, L.S., Ryerson, T.B., Alvarez, R.J., Sandberg, S.P., Williams, E.J., Trainer, M., 2005. A bad air day in Houston. Bulletin of American Meteorological Society 86, 657–669.

Banta, R.M., Mahrt, L., Vickers, D., Sun, J., Balsley, B.B., Pichugina, Y.L., Williams, E.J., 2007. The very stable boundary layer on nights with weak low-level jets. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 64, 3068–3090.

Beare, R.J., MacVean, M.K., Holtslag, A.A.M., Cuxart, J., Esau, I., Golaz, J.C., Jimenez, M.A., Khairoutdinov, M., Kosovic, B., Lewellen, D., Lund, T.S., Lundquist, J.K., McCabe, A., Moene, A.F., Noh, Y., Raasch, S., Sullivan, P., 2006. An intercomparison of large-eddy simulations of the stable boundary layer. Boundary-layer Meteorology 118 (2), 247–272.

Brown, S.S., Dube, W.P., Osthoff, H.D., Wolfe, D.E., Angevine, W.M., Ravishankara, A.R., 2007. High resolution vertical distributions of NO_3 and N_2O_5 through the nocturnal boundary layer. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 7, 139–149.

Corsmeier, U., Kalthoff, N., Kolle, O., Kotzian, M., Fiedler, F., 1997. Ozone concentration jump in the stable nocturnal boundary layer during a LLJ-event. Atmospheric Environment 31, 1977–1989.

Cuxart, J., Holtslag, A.A.M., Beare, R.J., Bazile, E., Beljaars, A., Cheng, A., Conangla, L., Ek, M., Freedman, F., Hamdi, R., Kerstein, A., Kitagawa, H., Lenderink, G., Lewellen, D., Mailhot, J., Mauritsen, T., Perov, V., Schayes, G., Steeneveld, G.J., Svensson, G., Taylor, P., Weng, W., Wunsch, S., Xu, K.M., 2006. Single-column model intercomparison for a stably stratified atmospheric boundary layer. Boundary-layer Meteorology 118, 273–303.

Forkel, R., Klemm, O., Graus, M., Rappenglück, B., Stockwell, W.R., Grabmer, W., Held, A., Hansel, A., Steinbrecher, R., 2006. Trace gas exchange and gas phase chemistry in a Norway spruce forest: a study with a coupled 1-dimensional canopy atmospheric chemistry emission model. Atmospheric Environment 40, 28–42.

Fritts, D.C., Wang, L., Werne, J., 2009. Gravity wave–fine structure interactions: a reservoir of small-scale and large-scale turbulence energy. Geophysical Research Letters 36, L19805. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009GL039501.

Gao, W., Wesely, M.L., Doskey, P.V., 1993. Numerical modeling of the turbulent diffusion and chemistry of NO_x, O_3, isoprene, and other reactive trace gases in and above a forest canopy. Journal of Geophysical Research 98 (D10), 18,339–18,353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/93JD01862.

Ganzeveld, L., Eerdekens, G., Feig, G., Fischer, H., Harder, H., Konigstedt, R., Kubistin, D., Martinez, M., Meixner, F.X., Scheeren, H.A., Sinha, V., Taraborrelli, D., Williams, J., de Arellano, J.V.G., Lelieveld, J., 2008. Surface and boundary layer exchanges of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides and ozone during the GABRIEL campaign. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 8, 6223–6243.

Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P.I., Geron, C., 2006. Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 6, 3181–3210.

Grell, G.A., Peckham, S.E., Schmitz, R., McKeen, S.A., Frost, G., Skamarock, W.C., Eder, B., 2005. Fully coupled online chemistry within the WRF model. Atmospheric Environment 39, 6957–6975.

Herwehe, J.A., Otte, T.L., Mathur, R., Rao, S.T., 2011. Diagnostic analysis of ozone concentrations simulated by two regional-scale air quality models. Atmospheric Environment 45 (33), 5957–5969.

Hu, X.-M., Nielsen-Gammon, J.W., Zhang, F., 2010. Evaluation of three planetary boundary layer schemes in the WRF model. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology 49, 1831–1844.

Hu, X.-M., Doughty, D.C., Sanchez, K.J., Joseph, E., Fuentes, J.D., 2012. Ozone variability in the atmospheric boundary layer in Maryland and its implications for vertical transport model. Atmospheric Environment 46, 354–364.

Kuang, S., Newchurch, M.J., Burris, J., Wang, L., Buckley, P., Johnson, S., Knupp, K., Huang, G., Phillips, D., 2011. Nocturnal ozone enhancement in the lower troposphere observed by lidar. Atmospheric Environment 45, 6078–6084.

Lin, J.T., McElroy, M.B., 2010. Impacts of boundary layer mixing on pollutant vertical profiles in the lower troposphere: implications to satellite remote sensing. Atmospheric Environment 44 (14), 1726–1739.

Morris, G.A., Ford, B., Rappenglück, B., Thompson, A.M., Mefferd, A., Ngan, F., Lefer, B., 2010. An evaluation of the interaction of morning residual layer and afternoon mixed layer ozone in Houston using ozonesonde data. Atmospheric Environment 44, 4024–4034.

Neu, U., Kunzle, T., Wanner, H., 1994. On the relation between ozone storage in the residual layer and the daily variation in near surface ozone concentration–a case study. Boundary-layer Meteorology 69, 221–247.

Nielsen-Gammon, J.W., Hu, X.-M., Zhang, F., Pleim, J.E., 2010. Evaluation of planetary boundary layer scheme sensitivities for the purpose of parameter estimation. Monthly Weather Review 138, 3400–3417.

Poulos, G.S., Blumen, W., Fritts, D.C., Lundquist, J.K., Sun, J., Burns, S.P., Nappo, C., Banta, R., Newsom, R., Cuxart, J., Terradellas, E., Balsley, B., Jensen, M., 2002. CASES-99: a comprehensive investigation of the stable nocturnal boundary layer. Bulletin of American Meteorological Society 83, 555–581.

Reitebuch, O., Strassburger, A., Emeis, S., Kuttler, W., 2000. Nocturnal secondary ozone concentration maxima analysed by sodar observations and surface measurements. Atmospheric Environment 34, 4315–4329.

Ryan, W.F., Doddridge, B.G., Dickerson, R.R., Morales, R.M., Hallock, K.A., Roberts, P.T., Blumenthal, D.L., Anderson, J.A., 1998. Pollutant transport during a regional O_3 episode in the Mid-Atlantic states. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association 48, 786–797.

Ryan, W.F., 2004. The Low-level Jet in Maryland: Profiler Observations and Preliminary Climatology. In: A Report Prepared for the Maryland Department of the Environment.

Salmond, J.A., McKendry, I.G., 2002. Secondary ozone maxima in a very stable nocturnal boundary layer: observations from the Lower Fraser Valley, B.C. Atmospheric Environment 36, 5771–5782.

Salmond, J.A., McKendry, I.G., 2005. A review of turbulence in the very stable boundary layer and its implications for air quality. Progress in Physical Geography 29, 171–188.

Song, J., Liao, K., Coulter, R.L., Lesht, B.M., 2005. Climatology of the low-level jet at the Southern Great Plains atmospheric boundary layer experiments site. Journal of Applied Meteorology 44, 1593–1606.

Stockwell, W.R., Kirchner, F., Kuhn, M., Seefeld, S., 1997. A new mechanism for regional atmospheric chemistry modeling. Journal of Geophysical Research 102, 25 847–925 879.

Sun, J., Burns, S.P., Lenschow, D.H., Banta, R., Newsom, R., Coulter, R., Frasier, S., Ince, T., Nappo, C., Cuxart, J., Blumen, W., Lee, X., Hu, X.Z., 2002. Intermittent turbulence associated with a density current passage in the stable boundary layer. Boundary-layer Meteorology 105, 199–219.

Sun, J., Lenschow, D.H., Burns, S.P., Banta, R.M., Newsom, R.K., Coulter, R., Frasier, S., Ince, T., Nappo, C., Balsley, B.B., Jensen, M., Mahrt, L., Miller, D., Skelly, B., 2004. Atmospheric disturbances that generate intermittent turbulence in nocturnal boundary layers. Boundary-layer Meteorology 110, 255–279.

Stull, R.B., 1988. An Introduction to Boundary Layer Meteorology. Kluwer, Norwell, Mass.

Talbot, R., Mao, H., Sive, B., 2005. Diurnal characteristics of surface level O_3 and other important trace gases in New England. Journal of Geophysical Research 110, D09307. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005449.

Tjernström, M., Balsley, B.B., Svensson, G., Nappo, C.J., 2009. The effects of critical layers on residual layer turbulence. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 66, 468–480.

Tong, N.Y.O., Leung, D.Y.C., Liu, C.H., 2011. A review on ozone evolution and its relationship with boundary layer characteristics in urban environments. Water, Air, & Soil Pollution 214, 13–36.

Tucker, S.C., Banta, R.M., Langford, A.O., Senff, C.J., Brewer, W.A., Williams, E.J., Lerner, B.M., Osthoff, H.D., Hardesty, R.M., 2010. Relationships of coastal nocturnal boundary layer winds and turbulence to Houston ozone concentrations during TexAQS 2006. Journal of Geophysical Research 115, D10304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009JD013169.

Wesely, M.L., 1989. Parameterization of surface resistances to gaseous deposition in region-scale numerical models. Atmospheric Environment 23, 1293–1304.

Wexler, H., 1961. A boundary layer interpretation of the low-level jet. Tellus 13, 368–378.

Whiteman, C.D., Bian, X., Zhong, S., 1997. Low-level jet climatology from enhanced Rawinsonde observations at a site in the Southern Great Plains. Journal of Applied Meteorology 36, 1363–1376.

Yorks, J.E., Thompson, A.M., Joseph, E., Miller, S.K., 2009. The variability of free tropospheric ozone over Beltsville, Maryland (39N, 77W) in the summers 2004–2007. Atmospheric Environment 43, 1827–1838.

Zhang, D.-L., Zhang, S., Weaver, S.J., 2006. Low-level jets over the Mid-Atlantic states: warm-season climatology and a case study. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology 45, 194–209.

Zhang, F., Bei, N., Nielsen-Gammon, J.W., Li, G., Zhang, R., Stuart, A.L., Aksoy, A., 2007. Impacts of meteorological uncertainties on ozone pollution predictability estimated through meteorological and photochemical ensemble forecasts. Journal of Geophysical Research 230, D04304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007429.

Zhang, J., Rao, S.T., 1999. The role of vertical mixing in the temporal evolution of ground-level ozone concentrations. Journal of Applied Meteorology 38, 1674–1691.

Zhang, J., Rao, S.T., Daggupaty, S.M., 1998. Meteorological processes and ozone exceedances in the northeastern United States during the 12–16 July 1995 episode. Journal of Applied Meteorology 37, 776–789.

Zhang, Y., Dubey, M.K., Olsen, S.C., Zheng, J., Zhang, R., 2009. Comparisons of WRF/Chem simulations in Mexico City with ground-based RAMA measurements during the 2006-MILAGRO. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 9, 3777–3798.

Zhong, S., Fast, J.D., Bian, X., 1996. A case study of the Great Plains low-level jet using wind profiler network data and a high-resolution mesoscale model. Monthly Weather Review 124, 785–806.