

# Nitrate radical initiated atmospheric particulate matter formation in forests:

#### Anthropogenically-triggered biogenic aerosol production

Juliane L. Fry, Associate Professor of Chemistry & Environmental Studies, Reed College, Portland, OR SEAS, Harvard University, 2. Mar 2018

### What's to come in this talk:

- Why do we think that NO<sub>3</sub> chemistry is an important contributor to secondary organic aerosol (SOA) formation?
- Two short stories about NO<sub>3</sub> + BVOC SOA formation:
  - Estimating SOA yields from NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene based on nighttime aircraft power plant plume transects during SENEX 2013
  - Resolving the mystery of  $\alpha$ -pinene's anomalously low NO<sub>3</sub> SOA yield with computational comparison of RO<sub>2</sub> fate from NO<sub>3</sub> +  $\alpha$ -pinene vs. NO<sub>3</sub> +  $\Delta$ -carene

# Global organic carbon budgets and biogenic SOA



#### Oxidation of isoprene & monoterpenes (C<sub>10</sub> BVOCs)



$$\begin{bmatrix} NO_2 + hv \longrightarrow NO + O \\ O + O_2 + M \longrightarrow O_3 + M \end{bmatrix}$$
$$NO_2 + O_3 \longrightarrow NO_3 + O_2$$
$$NO_3 + hv \longrightarrow NO_2 + O$$

 $*NO_3$  is rapidly photolyzed and thus active primarily at night

#### **BVOC lifetimes w.r.t. each oxidant**

BVOC	ОН	<b>O</b> <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>
isoprene	1.4 hr	1.3 day	48 min
α-pinene	2.7 hr	4.7 hr	5.4 min
β-pinene	1.9 hr	1.1 day	13 min
Δ-carene	1.6 hr	11 hr	3.7 min
limonene	51 min	1.9 hr	2.7 min

@ "typical" conc's: 12-h daytime avg [OH]: 2x10<sup>6</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 24 h avg [O<sub>3</sub>]: 7x10<sup>11</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 12 h nighttime avg [NO<sub>3</sub>]: 5x10<sup>8</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup> = 20 ppt (Atkinson & Arey, 2003)

#### Oxidation of isoprene & monoterpenes (C<sub>10</sub> BVOCs)



$$\begin{bmatrix} NO_2 + hv \longrightarrow NO + O \\ O + O_2 + M \longrightarrow O_3 + M \end{bmatrix}$$
$$NO_2 + O_3 \longrightarrow NO_3 + O_2$$
$$NO_3 + hv \longrightarrow NO_2 + O$$

 $*NO_3$  is rapidly photolyzed and thus active primarily at night

#### **BVOC lifetimes w.r.t. each oxidant**

BVOC	ОН	03	NO <sub>3</sub>
isoprene	1.4 hr	1.3 day	48 min
α-pinene	2.7 hr	4.7 hr	5.4 min
β-pinene	1.9 hr	1.1 day	13 min
Δ-carene	1.6 hr	11 hr	3.7 min
limonene	51 min	1.9 hr	2.7 min

@ "typical" conc's: 12-h daytime avg [OH]: 2x10<sup>6</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 24 h avg [O<sub>3</sub>]: 7x10<sup>11</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 12 h nighttime avg [NO<sub>3</sub>]: 5x10<sup>8</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup> = 20 ppt (Atkinson & Arey, 2003)

#### SOA from isoprene & monoterpenes (C<sub>10</sub> BVOCs)



 $\begin{bmatrix} NO_2 + hv \longrightarrow NO + O \\ O + O_2 + M \longrightarrow O_3 + M \end{bmatrix}$  $NO_2 + O_3 \longrightarrow NO_3 + O_2$  $NO_3 + hv \longrightarrow NO_2 + O$ 

 $*NO_3$  is rapidly photolyzed and thus active primarily at night

**BVOC lifetimes w.r.t. each oxidant** 

SOA yields (@ ~10 ug m<sup>-3</sup>)

BVOC	ОН	<b>O</b> <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>	ОН	<b>O</b> <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>
isoprene	1.4 hr	1.3 day	48 min	2% <sup>K</sup>	1% <sup>KL</sup>	10% <sup>N,R</sup>
α-pinene	2.7 hr	4.7 hr	5.4 min	8% <sup>E</sup>	10% <sup>s</sup>	0% <sup>F14</sup>
β-pinene	1.9 hr	1.1 day	13 min	3% <sup>G</sup>	20% <sup>vH</sup>	50% <sup>F09</sup>
Δ-carene	1.6 hr	11 hr	3.7 min	3% <sup>G</sup>	10% <sup>G,Y</sup>	50% <sup>F14</sup>
limonene	51 min	1.9 hr	2.7 min	9% <sup>G</sup>	40% <sup>L</sup>	40% <sup>F11</sup> 170% <sup>B</sup>

@ "typical" conc's: 12-h daytime avg [OH]: 2x10<sup>6</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>;
24 h avg [O<sub>3</sub>]: 7x10<sup>11</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 12 h nighttime avg [NO<sub>3</sub>]:
5x10<sup>8</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup> = 20 ppt (Atkinson & Arey, 2003)

<sup>K</sup>Kroll, EST 2006; <sup>E</sup>Eddingsaas ACP 2012; <sup>G</sup>Griffin JGR 1999; <sup>Y</sup>Yu JAC 1999; <sup>KL</sup>Kleindienst, GRL 2006; <sup>S</sup>Shilling, ACP 2008; <sup>vH</sup>von Hessberg, APC 2009; <sup>L</sup>Leungsakul ES&T 2009; <sup>N</sup>Ng et al, ACP 2008; <sup>R</sup>Rollins ACP 2009; <sup>F09</sup>Fry ACP 2009; <sup>F11</sup>Fry ACP 2011; <sup>F14</sup>Fry EST 2014; <sup>B</sup>Boyd et al., EST 2017

#### SOA from isoprene & monoterpenes (C<sub>10</sub> BVOCs)



**BVOC lifetimes w.r.t. each oxidant** 

SOA yields (@ ~10 ug m<sup>-3</sup>)

BVOC	ОН	03	NO <sub>3</sub>	ОН	<b>O</b> <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>
isoprene	1.4 hr	1.3 day	48 min	2% <sup>K</sup>	1% <sup>KL</sup>	10% <sup>N,R</sup>
α-pinene	2.7 hr	4.7 hr	5.4 min	8% <sup>E</sup>	10% <sup>s</sup>	<b>0%</b> <sup>F14</sup>
β-pinene	1.9 hr	1.1 day	13 min	3% <sup>G</sup>	20% <sup>vH</sup>	50% <sup>F09</sup>
Δ-carene	1.6 hr	11 hr	3.7 min	3% <sup>G</sup>	10% <sup>G,Y</sup>	50% <sup>F14</sup>
limonene	51 min	1.9 hr	2.7 min	9% <sup>G</sup>	40% <sup>L</sup>	40% <sup>F11</sup> 170% <sup>B</sup>

@ "typical" conc's: 12-h daytime avg [OH]: 2x10<sup>6</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>;
24 h avg [O<sub>3</sub>]: 7x10<sup>11</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup>; 12 h nighttime avg [NO<sub>3</sub>]:
5x10<sup>8</sup> #/cm<sup>3</sup> = 20 ppt (Atkinson & Arey, 2003)

<sup>K</sup>Kroll, EST 2006; <sup>E</sup>Eddingsaas ACP 2012; <sup>G</sup>Griffin JGR 1999; <sup>Y</sup>Yu JAC 1999; <sup>KL</sup>Kleindienst, GRL 2006; <sup>S</sup>Shilling, ACP 2008; <sup>vH</sup>von Hessberg, APC 2009; <sup>L</sup>Leungsakul ES&T 2009; <sup>N</sup>Ng et al, ACP 2008; <sup>R</sup>Rollins ACP 2009; <sup>F09</sup>Fry ACP 2009; <sup>F11</sup>Fry ACP 2011; <sup>F14</sup>Fry EST 2014; <sup>B</sup>Boyd et al., EST 2017

#### Regional modeling & organonitrate aerosol observations show NO<sub>3</sub> oxidation is an important source of SOA



Pye et al, ES&T 2015; Xu et al, ACP 2015

## Can diurnal patterns in AMS factors give clues about SOA sources?



**Short story #1:** Assess NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene SOA yield from aircraft measurements in regions of rapid NO<sub>3</sub> oxidation of isoprene: power plant plumes



#### Gorgas steam plant, Parrish, Alabama

#### SENEX 2013: 21 research flights





#### Aircraft plume transects



#### Screening plumes: Verify that aerosol increases were produced only by NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene

- (1) is all of the NO<sub>3</sub> reactivity in plumes due to reaction
   ✓ Based on observed isoprene: monoterpene ratio
  - and known rate constants, yes.
- (2) is all of the change in aerosol organic mass concentration during these plumes due to NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene reactions?
- (1) is all of the change in **aerosol nitrate mass concentration** due to NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene reactions?

(2) is all of the change in **aerosol organic mass concentration** during these plumes due to  $NO_3$  + isoprene reactions?



Org:NO<sub>3</sub> = 2.7  $\Rightarrow$  Would need 10 (!) more O's on this molecule to get Org:NO<sub>3</sub> to 5!  $\Rightarrow$  Or, co-condensing organics? Loss of NO<sub>3</sub> functional groups?

#### Screening plumes: Verify that aerosol increases were produced only by NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene

- (1) is all of the NO<sub>3</sub> reactivity in plumes due to reaction
   ✓ Based on observed
   ✓ isopreper monoterpane ratio
  - isoprene: monoterpene ratio and known rate constants, yes.
- (2) is all of the change in aerosol organic mass
   concentration during these plumes due to NO<sub>3</sub> +
   isoprene reactions?
   X Based on very high Org:NO<sub>3</sub> ratios and correlation with total aerosol
  - mass, likely other organics contribute
- (1) is all of the change in **aerosol nitrate mass concentration** due to  $NO_3$  + isoprene reactions?

#### (3) is all of the change in **aerosol nitrate mass concentration** due to $NO_3$ + isoprene reactions?



Previous studies report  $NO_2^+$ :NO<sup>+</sup> ratios for organic nitrates typically 2–3 times lower than for  $NH_4NO_3$  (Fry et al., 2009, 2011; Bruns et al., 2010; Farmer et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2012); this can be used to apportion organic (pRONO2) vs. inorganic ( $NH_4NO_3$ ) nitrate. **Conclusion: no sign of significant inorganic nitrate interference in plumes.** 

#### Screening plumes: Verify that aerosol increases were produced only by NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene

(1) is all of the NO<sub>3</sub> reactivity in plumes due to reaction
 ✓ Based on observed
 ✓ isoprene: monoterpene ratio

isoprene: monoterpene ratio and known rate constants, yes.

(2) is all of the change in aerosol organic mass
 concentration during these plumes due to NO<sub>3</sub> +
 isoprene reactions?
 X Based on absurd Org:NO<sub>3</sub> ratios and correlation with aerosol mass, likely

other organics contribute

#### (1) is all of the change in **aerosol nitrate mass** concentration due to $NO_3$ + isoprene reactions?

✓ Based on NO<sup>+</sup>:NO<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> ratios, all increase is organic nitrate (& pRONO<sub>2</sub> is separable)

So, we will calculate SOA mass yields as:

$$Y_{SOA,mass} = \frac{(pRONO2_{plume} \pm SD_{pRONO2plume}) - (pRONO2_{bkg} \pm SD_{pRONO2bkg})}{-[(isop_{plume} \pm SD_{isopplume}) - (isop_{bkg} \pm SD_{isopbkg})]} \times 3 \times \frac{329ppt}{\mu g \ m^{-3}}$$

3: nitrate mass + associated organics, assumed to be approximately double the nitrate mass. Requires ~4 additional oxygens: e.g. a tri-hydroperoxynitrate

# Observed SOA yields are large; higher at longest plume ages

plume number	plume time (UTC)	SOA molar yield (fraction) [± SD]	so	DA mass yield (fraction) [± SD]	plume age from O <sub>3</sub> / NO <sub>2</sub> clock assuming S=1 (hours)	Likely NOx origin & altitude (m)
1	7/2/13 2:18	0.09 [0.05]		0.25 [0.14]	2.5	Greene County @ 540 m
2	7/2/13 2:20	0.07		0.21	1.5	ibid
3	7/2/13 2:21	0.12 [0.10]		0.32 [0.27]	1.5	ibid
4	7/2/13 3:03	0.13		0.36	1.5	Gaston @ 720 m
5	7/2/13 3:55	0.06 [0.07]		0.17 [0.20]	1.4	Miller / Gorgas @ 690 m
6	7/2/13 4:34	0.05 [0.02]		0.15 [0.07]	2	ibid
7	7/2/13 4:37	0.10 [0.11]		0.26 [0.31]	5.5	ibid
8	7/2/13 4:39	0.16 [0.10]		0.45 [0.26]	5.8	Miller / Gorgas @ 1120 m
9	7/2/13 5:04	0.28 [0.14]		0.77 [0.39]	6.3	Gaston @ 1280 m

Chamber-based SOA mass yield estimates: 12-14% (Ng et al., 2008; Rollins et al., 2009)

Plume age estimates based on  $O_3/NO_2$  ratio clock and model

=> What yield number should be used in models?

# What isoprene products are likely contributing to SOA?

Likely 1<sup>st</sup>-generation product: Based on ground contribution O:C elemental method (Pankow & Asher, ratio (excluding 2008) P<sub>vap</sub>, predicted C\*: NO₃): HOO 2.5 x 10<sup>4</sup> µg m<sup>-3</sup> 0.4 ONO<sub>2</sub> This suggests that 1<sup>st</sup> Possible 2<sup>nd</sup>-generation products: generation products cannot contribute, but 2<sup>nd</sup>-gen can HOO No oligomerization required 0.38 μg m<sup>-3</sup> 0.8 ONO<sub>2</sub> ONO<sub>2</sub> OOH Or: HOO OOH 0.20 μg m<sup>-3</sup> 1.2 ONO<sub>2</sub> OOH



#### Could NO<sub>3</sub>+isoprene products be a significant contributor to organic aerosol at the surface?



### Conclusions about NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene SOA yields

- NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene yields assessed from aircraft measurements increased with plume age, to as much as 10x (!) the typically assumed yield in models
- This reaction may contribute substantially to an identified organic aerosol factor comprising 40% of total OA at the surface (measured at the SOAS ground site in central Alabama)
- In warm, rapidly industrializing regions of the world where isoprene emissions are large and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are on the rise (e.g. parts of China, India), this SOA source may be increasing

# Plans for summer 2018 SAPHIR chamber $NO_3$ + isoprene SOA study

 Detailed investigation of NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene reaction mechanism under atmospheric conditions - Compare O<sub>3</sub> vs NO<sub>3</sub> - Compare initial RO<sub>2</sub> reactions: RO<sub>2</sub> vs. HO<sub>2</sub> – With/without seed aerosol, varying pH? 30 July – 26 August 2018 @ Jülich, Germany



Observation #1a: SOA mass yield for  $O_3$  + BVOC at varying [NO<sub>2</sub>] is suppressed by NO<sub>2</sub> **only** for  $\alpha$ -pinene



Draper et al., ACP 2015

#### Observation #1b: Product mass distributions measured by offline HPLC-ESI-MS differ at high m/z



Observation #2:  $\alpha$ -pinene vs.  $\Delta$ -carene SOA yield difference is **NOT** affected by RO<sub>2</sub> reaction partner, inorganic seed

L

	No.	Regime	SOA yield (AMS)	NO <sub>3</sub> :Org
+	6	NO <sub>3</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub>	3%	0.08
	14	RO <sub>2</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub> , seeded	1%	0.10
α-pinene	17	HO <sub>2</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub>	2%	0.17
_	11c	RO <sub>2</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub>	27%	0.09
I	13	NO <sub>3</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub>	35%	0.15
	16	$HO_2$ +RO <sub>2</sub> , seeded	37%	0.12
	18c	RO <sub>2</sub> +RO <sub>2</sub> , seeded	40%	0.06
	19	$HO_2$ +RO <sub>2</sub> , seeded	25%	0.14
-	22c	$RO_2 + RO_2$	104%	0.07
∆-carene	23	$HO_2 + RO_2$	<b>21%</b>	0.15

Preliminary yield data, analysis in progress. Collaboration with **Jimenez group** at CU Boulder. Kang et al., in preparation, 2018.



Hyungu Kang ('15) Observation #3: NO<sub>3</sub> +  $\alpha$ -pinene under high [HO<sub>2</sub>] shows low yield of ROOH "termination" channel, high yield of pinonaldehyde

ONO<sub>2</sub>

+HO<sub>2</sub>

ONO<sub>2</sub>

 $+O_{2}$ 

ONO<sub>2</sub>

ONO<sub>2</sub>

~30% vield

(TOF-CIMS)

70% vield

(PTR-MS)

pinonaldehyde

=> Seems reasonable that this high-volatility favored channel would result in low SOA yield. But, why doesn't Δ-carene similarly yield primarily caronaldehyde and thus have low yield?

Tran Nguyen, Becky Schwantes, Paul Wennberg @ CIT Pawel Misztal & rest of the PTR-ToF-MS crew @ FIXCIT campaign

 $+NO_3$ 

### First attempts to calculate nitrooxy-RO<sub>2</sub> structures using Spartan





**Hypothesis:**  $\Delta$ -carene nitrato-RO<sub>2</sub> can rapidly auto-oxidize to yield low-volatility products... ... while in  $\alpha$ -pinene nitrato-RO<sub>2</sub>, no H-abstraction is possible, because of structural constraints

Could this be the reason for  $\alpha$ -pinene's anomalous behavior?

Katie Stellmach ('18) Upping the computational game with the COPENHEL supergroup: Calculating reaction barriers for each RO<sub>2</sub>'s options



#### 1. The rates for all accessible H-shift reactions are below 10<sup>-4</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for both monoterpenes.

=> The peroxy radicals thus have lifetimes long enough to undergo bimolecular reactions, which occur on a timescale of ~ 0.01 and 100s



Kristian Møller



Theo Kurtén



Henrik Kjaergaard

Upping the computational game with the COPENHEL supergroup: Calculating reaction barriers for each RO<sub>2</sub>'s options





Kristian Møller



Theo Kúrten



Henrik Kjaergaard

- 1. The rates for all accessible H-shift reactions are below 10<sup>-4</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for both monoterpenes.
- 2. However, the alkoxy-forming pathway is thermodynamically accessible for both monoterpenes.

=> What is the fate of these nitrooxy-alkoxy radicals (RO·) from  $\alpha$ -pinene and  $\Delta$ -carene?

# Calculated bond scission reaction barriers for alkoxy radicals

 $\alpha$ -pinene





Bond scission transition states

Calculated reaction barriers in kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> (zero-point corrected ωB97X-D/aug-cc-pVTZ electronic energy differences between the lowest-energy transition states and reactants)

Kurtén, et al., JPC Letters 2017.

#### Based on these different bond scission pathways, $\alpha$ pinene will produce primarily pinonaldehyde...



## ...while most $\Delta$ -carene will retain the nitrate group and may go on to later-generation H-shifts



### Conclusions on molecular structure and NO<sub>3</sub> + monoterpene SOA

 Different preferred alkoxy scission pathways may explain huge SOA yield difference between α-pinene and Δ-carene



• Unfortunately, this means one can't really lump monoterpenes in SOA mechanisms

## Thank you:

- Collaborators for the NO<sub>3</sub> + isoprene analysis @ NOAA ESRL Chemical Sciences Division & CU Boulder
- Collaborators for the NO<sub>3</sub> + α-pinene vs. Δ-carene calculations
   @ Uni Copenhagen and Uni Helsinki
   Want to talk more?
- JLF Funding:

Want to talk more? Julie Fry: <u>fry@reed.edu</u>

NOAA AC4 #NA13OAR4310070; EPA STAR Program #RD-83539901 Fulbright U.S. Scholar grant in the Netherlands

