Parameterization of vertical diffusion and the atmospheric boundary layer height determination in the EMEP model
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Abstract

A new vertical diffusion scheme, called Grisogono, has been implemented in the Unified EMEP (European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme) model. It is shown based on Large Eddy Simulation (LES) that the Grisogono method performs better than the operational O'Brien's polynomial, especially in the stable conditions. In this work, the operational and proposed new parameterization for eddy diffusivity \( K(z) \) have been validated against observed daily surface nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), sulphur dioxide (SO\(_2\)) and sulphate (SO\(_4^{2-}\)) concentrations at different EMEP stations during year 2001. Moderate improvement in the correlation coefficient and bias for NO\(_2\) and SO\(_2\) and slight improvement for sulphate is found for most of the analyzed stations with the Grisogono \( K(z) \) scheme, which is recommended for further application due to its scientific and technical advantages. Special emphasis is given to the representation of the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL) in order to capture vertical transport and dispersion of atmospheric air pollution. Two different ABL schemes are evaluated against radiosounding data in January and July 2001, and against data from the Cabauw tower, the Netherlands, in the same year. Based on validation of the ABL parameterizations, it is found that the EMEP model is able to reproduce spatial and temporal mixing height variability. Improvements are identified especially in stable conditions with the new ABL scheme based on the bulk Richardson number (\( R_i^B \)).

1 Introduction

Air quality models are nowadays recognized as an important tool for air quality assessment. Although measurements are the basis of air quality assessment, there are several advantages provided by models: high spatial and temporal resolution of simulated data, forecasting of the air quality as a result of changes in emissions or/and meteorological conditions and a better understanding of the physical processes that drive the transport of pollutants in the atmosphere. For nearly 30 years, the European
Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (EMEP) under the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), has been responsible for development of air quality modelling systems to support the design of environmental control strategies in Europe. The Unified EMEP model was developed and used to simulate transboundary transport of air pollution on European scale. Recently, special applications of the model have been developed at higher resolutions, and coupled with different meteorological drivers: EMEP4UK (e.g. Vieno et al., 2009a, b) and EMEP4HR (Jeričević et al., 2007; Kraljević et al., 2008). Development of the EMEP model includes detailed meteorological effects that become progressively more important on the finer spatial scale, such as turbulence and convection generated by a complex terrain. As a first step of the EMEP model development on a finer horizontal scale, turbulence parameterizations; particularly vertical diffusion scheme $K(z)$; needs to be tested.

In previous studies it has already been shown that parameterizations of $K(z)$ have significant impacts on simulated chemical concentrations (e.g. Nowacki et al., 1996; Biswas and Rao, 2000; Olivie et al., 2004). Different parameterizations for $K(z)$, depending on stability in the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL), have been proposed (e.g. O’Brien, 1970; Deardorf, 1972; Louis, 1979; Holtslag and Moeng, 1991; Holtslag and Boville, 1993; Grisogono, 1995). O’Brien (1970) suggested a simple parameterization $K(z)$ scheme used in many air quality models ranging from simple 1-D models (e.g. Lee and Larsen, 1997) towards application as in complex chemical models e.g. Comprehensive Air Quality Model with Extensions (CAMx, http://www.camx.com/; ENVIRON, 1998; Zhang et al., 2004), as well as in the EMEP model (Fagerli and Eliassen, 2002). In CAMx there are few $K(z)$ parameterization schemes, with the O’Brien scheme as one of the options. Presently, in the EMEP the O’Brien scheme is used for the convective boundary layer (CBL), while in the stable boundary layer (SBL) conditions $K(z)$ based on Monin – Obukhov (M-O; Monin and Obukhov, 1954) similarity theory is applied. There are many studies which show that the surface-layer formulations based on the M-O theory are often not applicable in the statically stable conditions (e.g. Mahrt, 1999; Pahlow et al., 2001; Poulos and Burns, 2003; Mauritsen et al., 2007; Griso-
A new proposed scheme, called Grisogono, is implemented in the model and it is not based on the M-O similarity theory. The Grisogono scheme uses a linear-exponentially decaying profile, generalizing the O’Brien third-order polynomial $K(z)$ (Grisogono and Oerlemans, 2001 and 2002). It has already been shown, based on Large Eddy Simulation (LES) and experimental data sets that the Grisogono method performs better than the O’Brien’s polynomial, especially in the stable conditions (Jeričević and Večenaj, 2009a).

Special emphasis is given on the ability of the ABL scheme to capture vertical transport and dispersion of the atmospheric air pollution. Significant influence of the ABL height ($H$) on surface nitrogen oxide ($\text{NO}_x$) and particulate matter (PM) concentrations is found in urban and suburban areas e.g. Schafer et al. (2006), while Athanassiadis et al. (2002) show that an accurate $H$ determination is needed to properly simulate pollutant levels with the grid-based photochemical models. Furthermore, $H$ is explicitly included in the both EMEP $K(z)$ parameterizations therefore it is important to evaluate EMEP model ability to simulate spatial and temporal variability of $H$. The operational (e.g. Jakobsen et al., 1995; Seibert et al., 2000) and the new ABL scheme based on the bulk Richardson number ($R_i_B$) are evaluated. The $R_i_B$ method is the standard and widely used approach to derive $H$ from numerical weather prediction (NWP) models, as well as from radiosounding data (e.g. Mahrt, 1981; Troen and Mahrt, 1986; Sørensen et al., 1996; Fay et al., 1997; Seibert et al., 2000; Zilitinkevich and Calanca, 2000; Zilitinkevich and Baklanov, 2002; Gryning and Batchvarova, 2002; Jeričević and Grisogono, 2006).

In this work, prior to application in the EMEP model, evaluation of the $K(z)$ schemes on LES data is provided. Following, operational version of the EMEP model, and version with new parameterization schemes (i.e. $K(z)$ and ABL schemes) are verified by comparing one full year of modelled data against the corresponding set of measurements from different EMEP stations in Europe. Based on that validation, uncertainties (both in the measurements and in the model) are established. Pronounced differences between performances of the two model versions and impacts on simulated concen-
trations are investigated and recommendations for future work are provided. This paper gives the basis for further development and improvement of the EMEP model by e.g. improving parameterizations of the vertical diffusion and the boundary layer representation. This study has been conducted within the EMEP4HR project which main purpose is to develop and test an operative framework for environmental control of air pollution problems in a broader region of Croatia. Previous efforts addressing to the same issue are described in Klaić (1990, 1995) and Beširević (1998).

2 Methods

2.1 The EMEP model description

The Unified EMEP model (http://www.emep.int/) was developed at the Norwegian Meteorological Institute under the EMEP programme. The Unified EMEP model is a development of earlier EMEP models (Berge and Jakobsen, 1998 and Jonson et al., 1998, and fully documented in Simpson et al., 2003 and Fagerli et al., 2004). The model has been extensively validated against measurements (Fagerli et al., 2003, 2007; Simpson et al., 2006a, b, 2007; Jonson et al., 2006; Tsyro et al., 2007; Fagerli and Aas, 2008). It simulates atmospheric transport and deposition of acidifying and eutrophying compounds, as well as photo-oxidants and particulate matter over Europe. The model domain covers Europe and the Atlantic Ocean with the grid size 50 km x 50 km while in the vertical there are 20 terrain influenced layers reaching up to 100 hPa. The Unified EMEP models uses 3-hourly meteorological data from PARallel Limited Area Model with Polar Stereographic map projection (PARLAM-PS), which is a dedicated version of the High Resolution Limited Area Model (HIRLAM) model for use within the EMEP. In this work the Unified EMEP model version rv2_6_1 was used.
2.2 LES data

In this work data from DATABASE64 (Esau and Zilitinkevich, 2006) have been used in order to illustrate performance of two different $K(z)$ schemes in stable atmospheric conditions. Full comprehensive evaluation of numerous LES runs have been provided in Jeričević and Večenaj (2009) including a wide range of neutral and stably stratified cases.

2.3 Measurements

Different data sets have been used here to evaluate EMEP model performance: (i) observed daily surface concentrations of NO$_2$, SO$_2$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ at different EMEP stations in Europe during year 2001 (Fig. 1), (ii) radiosounding measurements from various European cities in January and July 2001 (Table 1) and (iii) wind and temperature profiles from the Cabauw tower, the Netherlands, also in year 2001.

The selected pollutants are the most important acidifying and eutrophying pollutants contributing to the air pollution. Furthermore, oxides of nitrogen are among the most important molecules in the atmospheric chemistry, while SO$_2$ is a predominant anthropogenic sulphur-containing air pollutant. Sulphate is a secondary pollutant, oxidant of SO$_2$, which is contributing to acid rain formation. Since atmospheric lifetimes of SO$_2$, NO$_2$ are 1 to 3 days and their oxidation products lifetime is generally even longer (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998) they are subjected to the atmospheric transport and mixing processes, and therefore suitable for validation of vertical diffusion scheme efficiency. Furthermore, NO$_2$, SO$_2$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ are monitored on the majority of EMEP stations providing a good spatial and time resolution of observations.

2.3.1 Measurements from the EMEP stations

For the particular purpose of model evaluation in this study measurements at the EMEP stations (http://www.emep.int/) have been used. They are well documented, quality
controlled and they mostly represent background conditions over a larger area. In order to obtain data that are characteristic for long-range transport, it is important that station is representative of the EMEP grid square averages. It should be emphasised that the recommendation for the EMEP site not to be influenced by local pollution implies that their location is chosen to ensure representativeness of the minimum concentration in the grid, not the grid average. Also measurements are not of equal quality on all stations and to some extent it may be explained by different measurement method (e.g. Fagerli et al., 2003).

Analyzed stations within the EMEP domain are shown in Fig. 1. Most of the stations are below 300 m (blue dots). Nevertheless, many stations in the Central European area are located between 600 m and 1000 m, while in the Alps area stations are often above 1000 m. Note that the station of Jungfraujoch (CH01) in Switzerland is above 3000 m and Chopok (SK02) in Slovakia is above 2000 m. Mountain stations are not very well represented in models with the coarse horizontal resolution, having too low altitude in the model and consequently surface concentrations are too high compared to measurements. The orography misrepresentation is a known modelling problem (e.g. Žagar and Rakovec, 1999; Ivatek Šahdan and Tudor, 2004) which is a result of orography averaging due to insufficient horizontal resolution in models.

List of all EMEP stations with more details about measuring programme and available data can be found at: http://tarantula.nilu.no/projects/ccc/network/index.html. Number of used stations varied from element to element i.e. the measured daily SO$_2$ was available at 68 stations, NO$_2$ at 43 stations and SO$_4^{2-}$ at 58 stations.

2.3.2 Measurements from the radiosounding stations

Radiosoundings are often used in order to operationally determine and verify $H$ values (e.g. Seibert et al., 2000). Nevertheless, these measurements are usually only taken twice a day at 00:00 and 12:00 UTC and consequently, the soundings can only be used as an overall reference. The data possesses reasonably good spatial distribution over Europe and they are commonly available and quality controlled. In this work, the
evaluation was performed using data obtained from 24 different measuring stations in Europe (Table 1) during January and July in 2001.

### 2.3.3 Cabauw measurements

Cabauw tower is located in the western part of the Netherlands (51°58′ N, 4°56′ E) with the flat surroundings e.g. van Ulden and Wieringa (1995). Temperature and wind averages are computed over 10-min intervals. Wind speed and wind direction are measured at six levels: 10, 20, 40, 80, 140 and 200 m while temperature is measured at one additional level, i.e. on 1.5 m. Pressure is measured at 1.5 m height only. In order to derive potential temperature needed for the $R_i B$, hydrostatic balance is assumed. Pressure on upper levels is integrated from the surface pressure at 1.5 m using the trapezoidal rule. The Cabauw observations have been used in other studies to validate land surface parameterization schemes e.g. Beljaars and Bosveld (1997), Chen et al. (1997) and Ek and Holtslag (2005).

 Measurements from the Cabauw tower have a high resolution in time and their vertical distribution is dense enough to reconstruct physical processes in the surface layer (occasionally even higher) thus providing the possibility to investigate and analyze the ABL structure near the surface in more details than with “standard” measurements.

### 2.4 Description of $K(z)$ parameterization schemes

In the EMEP model $K(z)$ is initially calculated from the surface to the top of the domain with the local scheme proposed by Blackadar (1979):

$$K(z) = K_{\text{min}} + 1.1 \frac{R_i C - R_i l^2}{R_i C} \left| \frac{\partial \overline{V}}{\partial z} \right|, \quad (1)$$

where $l$ is a mixing length and $K_{\text{min}}$ is the background value 0.001 m$^2$ s$^{-1}$, $\left| \frac{\partial \overline{V}}{\partial z} \right|$ is the absolute value of wind shear in the vertical, $R_i$ is the gradient Richardson number.
defined as:

\[ Ri = \frac{g \partial \theta_v / \partial z}{\theta_v (\partial \vec{V} / \partial z)^2} \]  

(2)

where \( \theta_v \) is a virtual potential temperature, and \( Ri_C \) is the critical Richardson number calculated from McNider and Pielke (1981) equation:

\[ Ri_C = A (\Delta z)^B, \]  

(3)

where \( A=0.115, B=0.175 \) and \( \Delta z \) is the model layer thickness. Final \( Ri_C \) value is:

\[ Ri_C = \text{MAX} \left( 0.25, 0.115(\Delta z)^{0.175} \right), \]  

obviously with the \( \Delta z \rightarrow 0 \) the \( Ri_C \rightarrow 0.25 \).

In the unstable ABL, \( K(z) \) is recalculated with the O’Brien scheme:

\[ K(z) = K_H + \left[ (z - H)^2 / (\Delta z)^2 \right] \times \left\{ K_{H_S} - K_H + (z - H_S) \left[ \partial K_{H_S} / \partial z + 2(K_{H_S} - K_H) / \Delta z \right] \right\} \]  

(4)

where \( K_H \) is a \( K(z) \) value at the top of the ABL, i.e. \( K(z=H) \) and \( K_{H_S} \) is a \( K(z) \) value at the top of the surface-layer \( (H_S) \). It is assumed that \( \partial K_H / \partial z=0 \), and \( \Delta z=H - H_S \). From the M-O similarity theory for the surface layer (e.g. Stull, 1988):

\[ K_{H_S} = \frac{u_* \cdot k \cdot H_S}{\Phi \left( \frac{z}{L} \right)} \]  

(5)

where \( k \) is the von Karman constant, \( k\approx0.41, u_* \) is a frictional velocity and \( \Phi \) is an universal function. Universal functions \( \Phi \) used in the EMEP are those recommended by Garratt (1992) in unstable case:

\[ \Phi = \left( 1 - 16 \frac{Z}{L} \right)^{-1/2}, \]  

(6a)

and in stable case:

\[ \Phi = 1 + 5 \frac{Z}{L} \]  

(6b)
The Obukhov length \( L \), is given by the near-surface turbulent fluxes of momentum, \( \tau \), and heat, \( Q_h \), which are taken from the NWP PARLAM-PS model:

\[
L = \frac{\theta_s \cdot u_*^2}{k \cdot g \cdot \theta_*},
\]

\[
- u_* \theta_* = \frac{Q_h}{C_p \rho},
\]

\[
\frac{\tau}{\rho} = u_*^2,
\]

where \( \theta_s \) is a surface potential temperature, \( \theta_* \) is a potential temperature scale, \( g \) is acceleration of gravity, \( C_p \) is a specific heat capacity at constant pressure and \( \rho \) is air density.

The new proposed scheme is a linear-exponential method where the O'Brien third-order polynomial \( K(z) \) is generalized into a linear-exponential function (Grisogono and Oerlemans, 2002):

\[
K(z) = (K_{\text{max}} e^{1/2}/h)z \exp \left[-0.5(z/h)^2\right],
\]

where \( h \) is the height of \( K_{\text{max}} \). Comparing the O'Brien, Eq. (4), and the Grisogono, Eq. (10), one can notice that one of the advantages of Eq. (10) in respect to Eq. (4) is that it needs only two input parameters, \( K_{\text{max}} \) and \( h \). Those parameters are evaluated from the following equations:

\[
K_{\text{max}} = C(K) H u_*
\]

\[
h = H/C(h)
\]

where \( C(K)=0.1 \) and \( C(h)=3 \) are empirical constants, estimated based on the LES data (Jeričević and Večenaj, 2009a). Both methods, the O'Brien and Grisogono, are 9606
non-local approaches and mainly depend on position and intensity of $K_{\text{max}}$. In the Grisogono approach value of $K_{\text{max}}$ explicitly includes $u_*$ and $H$, utilized from the meteorological driver and its accuracy is constrained with the NWP model performance. On the other hand the O’Brien scheme represents $K(z)$ as a polynomial function that depends on parameters: $K_H$, $K_{H_S}$, $H$, $H_S$. Note that these parameters e.g. $H_S$ are not easy to resolve and describe especially in statically stable conditions (e.g. Zilitinkevich and Calanca, 2000; Jeričević and Grisogono, 2006; Mahrt, 2007).

2.5 Description of methods for the ABL calculation

Boundary layer height is an important parameter, which limits the modelled vertical extent of turbulent mixing in the atmosphere starting from the surface. The operational method for the calculation of $H$ in the EMEP model determines $H$ from the NWP PARLAM-PS output (Jakobsen et al., 1995). In stable conditions $H$ is calculated as the height where $K(z)<1\text{ m}^2\text{ s}^{-1}$, with $K(z)$ profiles calculated with the local Blackadar method Eq. (1) and vertically linearly smoothed over few adjacent layers. In unstable conditions hourly $Q_h$ is distributed vertically via dry adiabatic adjustment and $H$ is the height of the corresponding adiabatic layer. Finally, $H$ is determined from: $H=\text{MAX}(H_{\text{stable}}, H_{\text{unstable}})$.

The proposed $Ri_B$ method is based on the assumption that continuous turbulence vanishes beyond $Ri_{BC}$, some previously defined critical value of $Ri_B$. The height at which $Ri_B$ reaches $Ri_{BC}$, is considered as $H$. It is defined as:

$$ Ri_B = \frac{g(z_j - z_1)}{\bar{\theta}} \frac{\theta_j - \theta_1}{(\Delta u_j)^2 + (\Delta v_j)^2}, \quad j = 2, \ldots, 20 $$

are the model levels.

$$ (\Delta u_j)^2 = (u_j - u_s)^2 = (u_j - 0)^2 = u_j^2 $$

$$ (\Delta v_j)^2 = (v_j - v_s)^2 = (v_j - 0)^2 = v_j^2 $$
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Here $\theta_1$ is the potential temperature at the lowest model level, $z_1$, and $\bar{\theta}$ is the average potential temperature between levels 1 and $j$. $H$ is the height of the level where $Ri_{BC}$ is reached, and $Ri_{BC} = 0.25$ was used. However, the supposed existence of $Ri_{BC}$ recently receives criticism (Zilitinkevich and Baklanov, 2002; Jeričević and Grisogono, 2006; Mauritsen et al., 2007; Zilitinkevich et al., 2008; Grisogono and Belušić, 2008) and development of higher order $K(z)$ schemes is a subject of current and future research. Main advantages of this method over the operational approach are that $Ri_B$ includes two major turbulence generators in the atmosphere: thermal and mechanical sources of turbulence, represents an integral atmospheric properties and it is applicable in stable and unstable conditions. The Eq. 13 describes the $H$ as an integral property that relates surface processes to upper processes in the ABL and thus embeds non-local effects. The main weakness of the operational ABL method in stable conditions is dependence on vertically integrated $K(z)$ calculated with the Blackadar approach (Eq. 1). In unstable conditions its accuracy depends on surface parameters from the NWP model e.g. $Q_h$ and vertical distribution via dry adiabatic adjustment while effects of the mean wind shear is not included.

3 Results

3.1 $K(z)$ evaluation based on LES data

Prior to incorporation of a new turbulence parameterization schemes into a complex chemical model it is recommended to make an evaluation based on measurements and/or LES data. In Fig. 2 vertical profiles of mechanical eddy diffusivity, $K_m$, calculated with the O’Brien (Eq. 4), and the Grisogono (Eq. 10) scheme applied at the LES data are represented. Two stability classes from the numerous LES simulations were used: nocturnal (Fig. 2a) and long lived stable class (Fig. 2b). Nocturnal boundary layers develop in a neutral atmosphere while heat is lost at the surface. These boundary layers occur during night-time over land with near-neutral residual layer from daytime
convective boundary layer and the surface is radioactively cooling. Case with stronger stability, i.e. long-lived stable class, has surface cooling with background stratification. It can be found at high latitudes over land during wintertime. In both stable cases better agreement of the Grisogono scheme is evident, while O'Brien underestimated the LES data. The unstable conditions were not simulated in the LES, however both schemes were incorporated in the EMEP model and evaluated during July 2001 against observed surface NO$_2$ concentrations and lower underestimation, i.e. higher surface concentrations, was found with the Grisogono scheme. More evaluation results can be found in Jeričević and Večenaj (2009).

3.2 Evaluation of the operational EMEP model performance in year 2001

The $r$ and $\text{BIAS} = \left( \frac{\text{Model} - \text{Observation}}{\text{Observation}} \right) \times 100\%$ are calculated between the observed daily surface NO$_2$, SO$_2$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ concentrations ($c(\text{NO}_2)$, $c(\text{SO}_2)$, $c(\text{SO}_4^{2-})$), and the corresponding modelled values calculated with the operational model set-up in year 2001 for different EMEP stations (Fig. 1). Evaluation show a good agreement with measurements and correlation coefficient $0.5 \leq r(\text{NO}_2) \leq 0.75$ is found on 56% stations, $0.5 \leq r(\text{SO}_2) \leq 0.77$ is on 43% stations, and $0.5 \leq r(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) \leq 0.87$ is on 86% stations. It should be pointed out that $r(\text{SO}_4^{2-})$ is the highest among all analyzed species with $r(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) > 0.7$ on 31% stations. Based on one year of data it is found that model underestimates measured $c(\text{NO}_2)$ with $\text{BIAS(\text{NO}_2)} \approx -20\%$. For the SO$_2$ generally an overestimation is found with the EMEP model on 71% stations with $\text{BIAS(\text{SO}_2)} \approx 30\%$, while model generally underestimates sulphate with $\text{BIAS(\text{SO}_4^{2-})} \approx -12\%$. Overestimation of SO$_2$ and underestimation of sulphate indicates that transformation processes should be intensified or precipitation and moisture are under predicted in the NWP model. The analyzed year was not exceptional regarding meteorological conditions and the EMEP model performance is in agreement with previous evaluation results (Fagerli et al., 2003).
3.3 Uncertainty in the measurements

Based on the operational EMEP model evaluation in year 2001, uncertainties in the measurements are identified. Discrepancies, with factor of 2 or more, between the model measurements are appointed on different stations which can be categorized as: (i) stations where peak events or episodes occurred in measurements influenced by local emission sources, and stations in the vicinity of large emission sources (shipping area in the North Sea) and (ii) mountain stations.

Changes in $r$ and BIAS values, obtained by varying two different $K(z)$ schemes in the model, are analyzed at all available stations in the EMEP domain (Figs. 6, 7, 8 and 9). Stations with the highest uncertainties were excluded from yearly $r$ and BIAS estimation (Fig. 10).

3.3.1 Episodes

Underestimation of NO$_2$ with BIAS$<-30\%$, is found at some stations in Ireland, Switzerland, Poland and Italy (not shown). For example, Payerne (CH02) in Switzerland is located near the motorway, and therefore the corresponding measured $c$(NO$_2$) had significantly higher values than the other EMEP stations in that region. An overestimation of NO$_2$ is found for Scandinavian stations, NO01, SE02 and DK08 located at the entrance to the Baltic Sea, where emissions from the shipping in the model are significant. In the EMEP summary report by Fagerli et al. (2003) the NO$_2$ time series from year 1990 to 2000 have been analyzed and a decrease in observations for station SE02 is evident with an annual average $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{1990}=2.19$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$ in year 1990 toward $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{2000}=1.51$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$ in year 2000. Corresponding modelled values are $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{1990}=2.89$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$, and $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{2000}=2.45$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$. Annual emissions of nitrogen oxides in the period 1996–2000 were mainly decreasing in the shipping area of Baltic countries (e.g. Bartnicki et al., 2002) which is reflected on the modelled annual concentrations. While in year 2001 observed annual average continued to decrease $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{2001}=1.47$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$, in the model $\bar{c}$(NO$_2$)$_{2001}=3.68$ µg(N)m$^{-3}$ with the
O’Brien, and $c(\text{NO}_2)_{2001}=4.60 \mu g(N)m^{-3}$ with the Grisogono method. Obviously more stable conditions were simulated than it was observed, and since Grisogono method was less diffusive than O’Brien in stable conditions, average daily surface concentrations were higher with the Grisogono approach. Few other stations in the shipping area also had notably high BIAS for $\text{SO}_2$, those are: DK03, DK05, DK08, EE11, IE02, GB07 and SE02. On the other hand results with the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ, http://www.cmaq-model.org/, Matthias et al., 2007) model, with $18\text{ km}\times18\text{ km}$ grid nested in $54\text{ km}\times54\text{ km}$ horizontal grid, exhibit underestimation of $c(\text{NO}_2)$ at the same station SE02 for January and July 2001. Generally, stations in the North Sea shipping area are probably overestimated with the EMEP model due to coarse model horizontal resolution but it might be due to other reasons e.g. emissions, meteorology, chemistry, etc.

In Fig. 3 annual time series of the observed and modelled $c(\text{NO}_2)$ during year 2001 are represented for two selected stations: a) Westerland/Wenningstedt (DE01) with $r>0.7$ and b) Svratouch (CZ01) with $r\approx0.1$. Although the agreement between the modelled and the observed $c(\text{NO}_2)$ in other periods was good, the summer peaks at e.g. CZ01 were not captured by the model which led to lower values of $r$. Note that both applied $K(z)$ schemes had similar performance during the peak events.

Further, during the year peaks in $c(\text{SO}_2)$ and $c(\text{SO}_4^{-2})$ were also observed that were not captured in the model. In Fig. 4 time series of $c(\text{SO}_2)$ in year 2001 are shown for two selected stations: a) Ilmitz (AT02) with $r>0.75$ and b) Vorhegg (AT05) with $r=0.25$. Lower $r$ at AT05 is likely a consequence of discrepancies between the model and the observations during peaks events. For $\text{SO}_4^{-2}$ only few stations have lower $r$ values also with stronger local influence. Time series of $c(\text{SO}_4^{-2})$ are shown in Fig. 5 for a) Neuglobsow (DE07) with $r\approx0.8$ and b) Peyrusse Vielle (FR13) with $r\approx0.25$. 
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3.3.2 Mountain stations

As already mentioned in Sect. 2.3.1., mountain stations should be considered with care when used for validation of modelling results. Two stations with the highest altitude in the EMEP domain are used; CH01 and SK02. Annual average at CH01 calculated from observations is $\bar{c}(\text{NO}_2)=0.11 \, \mu g(N)m^{-3}$, while the corresponding model value is $\bar{c}(\text{NO}_2)=0.33 \, \mu g(N)m^{-3}$. Further at CH01 extremely low SO$_2$ values were observed with an average $\bar{c}(\text{SO}_2)=0.08 \, \mu g(S)m^{-3}$ while the model has $\bar{c}(\text{SO}_2)=0.27 \, \mu g(S)m^{-3}$ and the following BIAS(SO$_2$)>200% is found for this station. Low observed $\bar{c}(\text{SO}_2)$ on CH01 is expected since it is usually above the ABL height and therefore not affected by the surface SO$_2$ emission sources. The similar result is found for SK02.

3.3.3 Validation of the Grisogono $K(z)$ scheme

In order to find eventual improvements in the EMEP model performance with the change of $K(z)$ scheme, differences ($D$) between the old and the new $r$ and BIAS values are calculated. Differences are defined as:

$$D(X) = X(\text{Grisogono}) - X(\text{O'Brien}),$$

and relative differences ($RD$) as:

$$RD(X) = (X(\text{Grisogono}) - X(\text{O'Brien})) \times 100\% / X(\text{O'Brien}),$$

where parameter $X$ can be $r$ or the absolute value of BIAS, ABS (BIAS). For $X=r$, $D(r)>0$ and $RD(r)>0$ means that model performs better with the Grisogono $K(z)$ scheme, while for $X=$BIAS, $D($BIAS$)>0$ and $RD($BIAS$)>0$ denotes that the O'Brien scheme agrees better with the observations. Similarly $D\approx 0$ and $RD\approx 0$ denotes equally good performance of both schemes.

In order to quantify changes with the new $K(z)$ scheme, $RD(r)$ in percentage is given for NO$_2$ in Fig. 6a. The modelled absolute values and BIAS is very sensitive to the
balance between the different processes in the model. Therefore, a smaller BIAS between model and measurements does not necessarily mean that the new scheme is better than the old; it only means that average concentrations determined with the new scheme is closer to the average of the observed concentrations. However, the BIAS can give insight into the general effect of the new scheme on the modelled values. For instance, if the Grisogono parameterization is less diffusive in stable conditions (Jeričević and Večenaj, 2009a) this should lead to higher average concentrations in these cases. The temporal correlation coefficient, however, is a better measure for whether the new scheme provides a better physical description. Therefore, we focus on the changes in the correlation coefficient between model results and observations. Improvements in $r(\text{NO}_2)$ up to 30% with the Grisogono scheme are found on 51% stations (mainly at stations in Central Europe) while on 14% stations there was no change in $r$ with the change of $K(z)$ scheme, and on 35% stations $r(\text{NO}_2)$ is lower with the new scheme (Fig. 6a). Higher increase in $r(\text{SO}_2)$ up to 20–50% with the new $K(z)$ scheme is found on 54% stations (Fig. 6b), $r(\text{SO}_2)$ remained same on 22% stations, while on 24% stations smaller decrease was found. For $\text{SO}_2$ (Fig. 6b) improvement is found on more stations than for $\text{NO}_2$, except stations in Scotland and in the shipping area. There is a generally an increase in $r(\text{SO}_4^{2-})$ with the higher improvement around 45% and 20% on Slovakian stations SK02 and SK04 respectively (Fig. 6c). However, stations in the shipping and mountain area mainly did not exhibit improvements in $r$, except $r(\text{SO}_4^{2-})$ increased in mountain area with implementation of the new $K(z)$ scheme.

Here, $RD(\text{BIAS})$ for NO$_2$, Fig. 7a, show that on 60% of analyzed stations BIAS(NO$_2$) is lowered $\approx 10\%$ with the new $K(z)$ scheme. Stations with $RD(\text{BIAS})>0$, i.e. increased BIAS(NO$_2$) with the Grisogono scheme, are mainly those with an improvement in correlation coefficient except at SE02, SE08, CH01 and DE08. Values of $RD(\text{BIAS})$ for SO$_2$ is represented in Fig. 7b, and mainly improvement is found with the new $K(z)$ scheme; on 50% stations BIAS(SO$_2$) is decreased, on 23% stations there is no change in BIAS(SO$_2$) values and on 26% stations there is an increase in BIAS(SO$_2$). For SO$_4^{2-}$ (see Fig. 7c) on nearly 64% stations lower BIAS with $D(\text{BIAS}) \approx -10\%$ is found with the
new scheme. Evidently $\text{SO}_4^{-2}$ had the most harmonized changes, at most of analyzed stations, with the change of $K(z)$ scheme. Spatial distribution of $D(r)$ and $D(\text{BIAS})$ for $\text{SO}_4^{-2}$ is shown in Fig. 8a and b, respectively. In Fig. 8a yellow dots represents higher correlation coefficients with the new scheme while in Fig. 8b green dots denotes stations where underestimation of measured sulphate daily surface concentrations are lower with the new $K(z)$ scheme. Obviously only few stations, with higher uncertainty in measurements, did not follow the common trend of improvement with the new $K(z)$ scheme.

In order to investigate seasonal variability of $K(z)$, represented with the two different schemes, the $\text{NO}_2$ is further analyzed. Yearly course of a) $r$ values, b) $\text{BIAS}$ values, c) RMSE and d) average monthly concentrations of $\text{NO}_2$ calculated between the measurements and modelled $c(\text{NO}_2)$ values with two $K(z)$ schemes, the Grisogono (blue line) and the O’Brien (red line) are represented in Fig. 9. All analyzed stations with $c(\text{NO}_2)$ measurements during year 2001 are taken into account. In Fig. 9a systematically higher $r$ values with the new $K(z)$ scheme are shown in both: stable conditions more characteristic during the colder part of the year, and unstable conditions during the warmer part of the year. According to $\text{BIAS}$ (Fig. 9b), in the warmer part of the year model underestimates $c(\text{NO}_2)$ with the both $K(z)$ schemes. Furthermore, RMSE in Fig. 9c is also the lowest during the summer time. The measured and modelled mean monthly $\text{NO}_2$ values in Fig. 9d show decrease of $c(\text{NO}_2)$ during the warmer part of the year. This drop in $c(\text{NO}_2)$ is caused by increased photolysis of $\text{NO}_2$ and more vigorous vertical mixing during the warmer period. Note the higher $c(\text{NO}_2)$ values with the new $K(z)$ scheme during the warmer part of the year, which shows that the new $K(z)$ scheme was less diffusive in more convective conditions than the operational scheme.

In Fig. 9d note that average monthly values with both schemes was similar during the colder part of the year, while the second peak in November was not captured with the model. Nevertheless $r$ is higher with the new scheme in winter stable conditions also.

Finally, $r$ and $\text{BIAS}$ are also calculated for all stations for the year 2001 between the measured and the modelled $c(\text{NO}_2)$, $c(\text{SO}_2)$ and $c(\text{SO}_4^{-2})$ values. In Fig. 10 yearly
scatter plots between measured and modelled daily surface concentrations are shown. For NO₂, \( r = 0.65 \) with the Grisogono, while \( r = 0.63 \) is achieved with the O’Brien method. BIAS is similar for NO₂, with the Grisogono method, BIAS = -18% and BIAS = -17% with the O’Brien method. The correlation coefficient \( r = 0.57 \) is found for SO₂ with the Grisogono while for the O’Brien method \( r = 0.55 \). According to the BIAS values the model generally overestimates SO₂ around 27% with the Grisogono and 30% with the O’Brien method. It should be pointed out that the stations with large overestimations i.e. mountain and stations under strong influence of shipping, are excluded from this analysis because they are not representative for the model grid-cell. For SO₄²⁻, result is similar for both methods; \( r \approx 0.61 \) and BIAS \approx -12%.

### 3.4 Verification of the boundary layer height representation in the EMEP model

In the EMEP model schemes for calculation of \( H \), the operational and the new ABL scheme based on \( Ri_B \) number are compared. Evaluation was performed on two data sets: (i) radiosoundings from 24 different measuring stations in Europe (Table 1) during January and July in year 2001 and (ii) on vertical temperature and wind measurements in year 2001 from the Cabauw tower.

#### 3.4.1 Radiosounding data

For January and July in year 2001, \( r \) and BIAS values are calculated at available UTC times (Table 1) between \( H \) determined from the soundings (\( H_{\text{sond}} \)), and \( H \) calculated from the EMEP model (\( H_{\text{EMEP}} \)) with the operational scheme (\( H_{\text{old}} \)), and the \( Ri_B \) scheme (\( H_{\text{new}} \)). Values of \( H_{\text{sond}} \) are determined with the \( Ri_B \) scheme. Figure 11a shows correlation coefficients in January, and for most of the analyzed stations \( r \approx 0.5 \). Lower values of \( r \approx 0.3 \) are found at Torshavn, Legionowo, Practica di Mare and Izmir station (Table 1), and higher values \( r \approx 0.7 \) are found at: Stavanger, Herstmonceux, Uccle and Trappes. While \( H_{\text{new}} \) shows a slight improvement in \( r \), there is a considerable improvement in BIAS values, see Fig. 11b. The model underestimates \( H_{\text{sond}} \) with the old
scheme (BIAS≈−50%), while with the new ABL scheme the underestimation is significantly lower (BIAS≈−20%). Overestimations are found for Payerne and Meiningen, for two stations in the Alps area. Figure 11c shows average monthly $H$ which is calculated from soundings ($\bar{H}_{\text{sond}}$), with values $200\text{ m} < \bar{H}_{\text{sond}} < 600\text{ m}$. The highest $\bar{H}_{\text{sond}}$ are found for the stations located in the Southern Europe e.g. Madrid, La Coruna and Izmir. The only exception among northern stations is Torshavn with a somewhat higher $\bar{H}_{\text{sond}}$. On the other hand, the lowest $\bar{H}_{\text{sond}}$ in January are found for the stations in the Central Europe e.g. Prague, Vienna, Wroclaw and Milan, which is expected, because of long stable conditions during the winter, which occur over the continent and the corresponding $H$ are usually low. Average $H$ calculated from the model with the old ($\bar{H}_{\text{old}}$), and the new ($\bar{H}_{\text{new}}$), scheme generally underestimates $\bar{H}_{\text{sond}}$ (see Fig. 11c). Average monthly $H$ values for different stations are in range: $200\text{ m} < \bar{H}_{\text{old}} < 400\text{ m}$, while for the new method: $400\text{ m} < \bar{H}_{\text{new}} < 600\text{ m}$.

Figure 12 shows time series of $H$ in January for four selected locations; two with the higher $r$ Herstmonceux and Stavanger, Fig. 12a and b respectively, and two with the lower $r$ Torshavn and Legionowo, Fig. 12d and c, respectively. For Herstmonceux and Stavanger the agreement between $H_{\text{sond}}$ and $H_{\text{EMEP}}$ is good, especially with the new ABL scheme. Note a period of low $H_{\text{EMEP}}\approx 50\text{ m}$ (Fig. 12b, c and d), simulated in the model which occurred from 13 to 20 January 2001. Simulated lower values of $H_{\text{EMEP}}$ are connected with the high pressure system movement across the Northern Europe (not shown), starting from the Island at 13 January 2001 and moving across the Europe to its end position over Russia at 20 January 2001.

For that period at the stations Herstmonceux and Stavanger, $H_{\text{sond}}\approx H_{\text{EMEP}}$, and Torshaven and Legionowo are $H_{\text{sond}} - H_{\text{EMEP}}\approx 1000\text{ m}$ and $H_{\text{sond}} - H_{\text{EMEP}}\approx 500\text{ m}$, respectively. This disagreement between $H_{\text{sond}}$ and $H_{\text{EMEP}}$ at Torshaven and Legionowo during the stable conditions is the main cause for the corresponding lower $r$ values.

July 2001 over the continent was characterized with convective, unstable conditions during the day time, and strong near surface inversions during the night. Generally, in July $r$ is much higher for the both ABL methods, $r\approx 0.7$ (Fig. 13a) as compared
with $r \approx 0.5$ (Fig. 11a) in January. During the summer time both ABL methods perform equally well, however slightly better results according to $r$ are found with the old ABL scheme than with the operational ABL scheme employed in the EMEP model. According to BIAS, Fig. 13b, the model underestimates $H_{\text{sond}}$ with the similar magnitude with both ABL methods. Note spatial variation of BIAS in July. The lowest BIAS values are found in the Central European area where BIAS $\approx -20\%$, see Fig. 13b and the corresponding $H_{\text{sond}} \approx 800$ m; $H_{\text{EMEP}} = 700$ m, see Fig. 13c. In the Northern Europe BIAS $\approx -40\%$ and the corresponding $H_{\text{sond}} = 1000$ m; $H_{\text{EMEP}} = 600$ m. The underestimation is the highest in the Southern Europe with BIAS ranging from $-60\%$ to $-80\%$ where $H_{\text{sond}}$ obtain the highest values, $H_{\text{sond}} \approx 1200$ m.

Time series in July (Fig. 14) show diurnal variation of $H$ from the night-time low $H$ in the statically stable conditions toward high daily $H$ values in the convective unstable conditions. The model captures $H_{\text{sond}}$ daily variations and good agreement between $H_{\text{sond}}$ and $H_{\text{EMEP}}$ is found e.g. for Meiningen $r = 0.91$ and Madrid $r = 0.84$ with the new ABL scheme. Note that, at Lisbon and Torshavn, $H_{\text{sond}}$ are significantly higher than $H_{\text{EMEP}}$. The modelled $H_{\text{EMEP}}$ were almost constant in time and consequently corresponding lower $r$ and higher BIAS values were found at those stations. Note that BIAS at Lisbon is the highest among all analyzed stations. Lisbon station is located near the boundary of the model domain where the modelled results are dominated by weakly varying boundary conditions. Furthermore, the model was not able to reproduce variability shown in $H_{\text{sond}}$ both in January and July at Torshavn station located on the Faroe Islands in the Atlantic Ocean. The Faroe Islands are situated entirely within one grid cell in the model and the model was incapable to realistically represent $H$ in the complex coastal orography due to still relatively low model resolution.

### 3.4.2 The ABL height calculated from the Cabauw data

In this section procedure of deriving $H$ with the $Ri_B$ number method from the Cabauw measurements is firstly described. Following, average hourly vertical profiles of $Ri_B$
number, \((\overline{Ri_B(z_j, t)})\), where \(j = 10, 20, \ldots, 200\) m are the measuring levels; and the corresponding \(H\) are analyzed and described for every month in year 2001 (Fig. 15).

As mentioned boundary layer height from the Cabauw data \((H_{\text{tower}})\) is determined with the \(Ri_B\) method. Vertical profiles of the \(Ri_B\) number are calculated from the temperature and the wind measured at every tower level with the time interval \(\Delta t = 10\) min during year 2001. In this way the sequence of \(Ri_B(z, t)\) values for the year 2001 is produced and monthly averaged to obtain \(Ri_B\) daily courses, \((\overline{Ri_B(z_j, t)})\) for every month in year 2001 (Fig. 15). It is relatively easy to follow daily and seasonal variations of \(H\) by looking at the \(Ri_{BC} = 0.25\) (the top of blue area in Fig. 15).

The analysis of \(Ri_B(z_j, t)\) provide good insight in processes of development and decay of the CBL and the SBL in different times of the year. The occurrence of the morning and the afternoon transition layer, characterized with a sudden and rapid decay/increase of the CBL, is also shown. In January, Fig. 15a, during the night-time \(H\) is often less than 100 m. Daily development of \(H\) starts after 10:00 a.m. reaching the maximum \(H \approx 200\) m at 01:00 p.m. and lasting approximately 1 h after which \(H\) decreased. In February, Fig. 15b night-time \(H\) is higher than in January, ranging between 100 and 200 m, the CBL starts to develop around 08:00 a.m. reaching the maximum in the period between noon and 02:00 p.m. In February the afternoon transition layer occurred around 03:00 p.m.. Note that the transition layer has similar characteristics for the most of the analyzed months in year 2001. In following spring and summer months from March, Fig. 15c, to August, Fig. 15h, the CBL is progressively intensifying, becoming more and more unstable. In the warmer part of the year the CBL lasted longer, which is expected since the CBL is correlated with the incoming solar radiation. Note appearance of the areas with \(\overline{Ri_B(z_j, t)} < 0\) numbers (yellow area in Fig. 15) in April and becoming largest in June, Fig. 15f. During the SBL conditions, in the warmer part of the year, strong near surface inversions and weak winds are measured in the surface layer. In the night-time SBL conditions, \(Ri_B(z_j, t) \gg Ri_{BC}\) (white areas in Fig. 15) is found and corresponding \(H\) is extremely shallow. In September and October periods stable condi-
tions prevails and SBL is 100 m–150 m thick. In November and December, Fig. 15l and Fig. 15m, respectively, dominantly stable conditions with mostly $\overline{Ri_B}(z, t) > 0$ numbers are present. Unstable conditions occur from 10:00 a.m. to 14:00 p.m. and the average $H$ is only 50 m.

In Fig. 16 monthly correlation coefficients calculated between the $H$ determined from the measurements, $H_{\text{tower}}$, and the modelled values determined with the operational and $Ri_B$ number method; $H_{\text{old}}$ (red) and $H_{\text{new}}$ (blue), respectively. Obviously the new ABL scheme gives significantly better results for all months except for June, July and August i.e. the summer period when both schemes performed equally well in the surface layer. Since at the Cabauw tower there are no measurements above 200 m, during the strong CBL conditions it was only possible to investigate correlations regarding time evolution of the ABL and the strength of turbulence in the lowest part of the ABL. Higher vertical measurements would provide more information and help distinguish between performances of the two ABL schemes. Nevertheless, higher correlation coefficients and similar performance of the two schemes during the warmer part of the year is in agreement with the radiosoundings results, which showed that the ABL scheme based on $Ri_B$ number method performs better in stable conditions than the operational one.

4 Conclusions

The new $K(z)$ and the ABL schemes were implemented in the EMEP model. Prior to incorporation in the model vertical profiles of $K(z)$ have been analyzed on the LES data (DATABASE64; Esau and Zilitinkevich, 2006) and better performance of the Griso-gono scheme is established in stable atmospheric conditions. Further, evaluation of the model performance based on $r$ and BIAS on all EMEP stations in year 2001 was conducted for the operational and the new model setup. Uncertainties in the observations are taken into account in order to find the models ability to reproduce spatial variability in simulation of different chemical species. However, it should be pointed that the model BIAS is an overall measure for improvement evaluation since it is very
sensitive too changes in parameterization and the modelled absolute values can easily
be right for the wrong reasons. Therefore, with respect to model performance for NO₂,
SO₂ and SO₄⁻² the conclusions are based on the changes in correlation coefficients
between observations and model results. Main conclusions are:

- The EMEP model shows moderate improvement in r for NO₂ and SO₂ and slight
improvement for SO₄⁻² for most of the analyzed stations. The r(NO₂) is improved
nearly 30% on 51% of analyzed stations, while r(SO₂) with the Grisogono scheme
have an increase from 10% up to 50% on 54% of stations. For sulphate there is
an increase in r(SO₄⁻²) from 5 to 10%. Yearly scatter plots between measured and
modelled daily surface concentrations at all analyzed stations except those with
higher uncertainties in measurements show improvement in correlation coefficient
from 0.63 to 0.65 for NO₂, and from 0.55 to 0.57 for SO₂ with the new scheme.
For SO₄⁻² correlation coefficient is around 0.61 with both schemes.

- Based on the LES data it is found that the Grisogono scheme is generally less
diffusive, which is an important preference especially in stable atmospheric con-
ditions. Underestimation of sulphate is also generally lower on most of the an-
alyzed stations with the new scheme. The proposed Grisogono scheme is rec-
ommended for application due to its scientific and technical advantages (when
remaining within the first-order closure schemes) since it demands only two input
variables instead of four as in the O’Brien scheme. In practical implementations
e.g. in air quality modelling, both schemes depend on capabilities of used me-
teorological drivers as well as on model’s horizontal and vertical grid resolution.
Therefore improvements in the NWP model performance would yield to apprecia-
able difference in terms of both, magnitude and spatial distribution of pollutants.

- Stations which are more affected by the local emission sources, as well as moun-
tain stations do not show significant improvement with the change of the K(z)
scheme. On those stations the magnitude of the error was much higher than the
magnitude of the variability resulting from the change of the $K(z)$ scheme. These results indicate that higher horizontal resolution, as well as better defined emissions is needed in order to be able to simulate air pollution transport in a complex coastal terrain under the influences of local sources.

- The ABL height, $H$, calculated with the EMEP model is in a good agreement with the radiosounding measurements from different stations in Europe. The EMEP model is able to reproduce spatial and temporal variability of $H$, with $r$ from 0.7 to 0.9 during convective conditions, and $r$ from 0.4 to 0.6 in stable conditions with the both ABL schemes. However, the new ABL scheme based on the $Ri_B$ number performs better in the stable conditions compared to the method based on the Blackadar $K(z)$ profiles which is also confirmed with significantly lower BIAS values.

- Results of the intercomparison between the modelled and the ABL heights derived from the Cabauw data reveal systematic improvement with the new ABL scheme especially during the colder part of the year (Fig. 16).

This comprehensive evaluation study of different $K(z)$ and ABL schemes applied in the EMEP model provides a basis for further model evaluation and development within the frame of the EMEP4HR project.
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Table 1. List of radio sounding stations over Europe used for validation of the ABL height, $H$, from the EMEP model in January and July 2001. Station name, coordinates, country and observational terms according to UTC are given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Altitude(m)</th>
<th>UTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>57.67 N, 12.32 E</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orland</td>
<td>63.70 N, 9.6 E</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavanger</td>
<td>63.70 N, 9.6 E</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>60.2 N, 11.08 E</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torshavn</td>
<td>62.20 N, 6.77 E</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>54.8 N, 6.17 W</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>00, 06, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearstmonceux</td>
<td>50.9 N, 0.32 E</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>38.77 N, 9.13 W</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>45.82 N, 16.03 E</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payerne</td>
<td>46.82 N, 6.95 E</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiningen</td>
<td>50.57 N, 10.37 E</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>48.25 N, 16.87 E</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trappes</td>
<td>48.77 N, 2.02 E</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legionowo</td>
<td>52.4 N, 20.97 E</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uccle</td>
<td>50.8 N, 4.35 E</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>30.43 W, 27.17 E</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Coruna</td>
<td>43.73 N, 8.42 W</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>40.45 N, 3.55 W</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practica di Mare</td>
<td>41.46 N, 12.43 W</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>00, 06, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw</td>
<td>51.13 N, 16.98 E</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>55.77 N, 12.53 E</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>00 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>50 N, 14.45 E</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>00, 06, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>45.43 N, 9.28 E</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>00, 06, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Stations used for evaluation of the EMEP model performance. Station altitude is represented with different colours ranging from less than 300 m (blue) to higher than 3000 m (red).
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Fig. 2. Vertical profiles of mechanical eddy diffusivity $K_m$ calculated with the O'Brien (grey solid line) and Grisogono method (black solid line) against $K_m$ from the LES data (red triangles) for: (a) the nocturnal conditions and (b) long-lived stable conditions.
Fig. 3. Time series of the measured (black line) and the modelled daily surface NO$_2$ concentrations ($\mu$g(N)m$^{-3}$) for: (a) Westerland (DE01) and (b) Svatouch (CZ01) in year 2001. Modelled results are obtained with two different vertical diffusion schemes: O’Brien (red line) and Grisogono (blue line). Time is given on x-axes in Julian days.
**Fig. 4.** Same as Fig. 3 but for SO$_2$ ($\mu$g(S)m$^{-3}$) on the stations: (a) Ilmitz (AT02) and (b) Vorhegg (AT05).
Fig. 5. Same as Fig. 3 but for $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ($\mu g(S)m^{-3}$) on the stations: (a) Neuglobsow (DE07) and (b) Peyrusse Vielle (FR13).
Fig. 6. Relative differences in correlation coefficients, $RD(r)$, calculated between the two EMEP modelled data sets and the observations from the EMEP stations in year 2001 for: (a) NO$_2$, (b) SO$_2$ and (c) SO$_4^{2-}$. Values $RD(r)>0$ denotes better performance of the Grisogono scheme.
Fig. 7. Same as in Fig. 6 but for relative differences in BIAS, $RD(BIAS)$. Values $RD(BIAS)<0$ denotes better performance of the Grisogono scheme.
Fig. 8. Differences in (a) correlation coefficient, $D(r)$, and (b) BIAS values, $D(\text{BIAS})$ calculated between the modelled and measured daily surface $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ concentrations determined with the two different vertical diffusion schemes, the O'Brien and Grisogono, for year 2001. Values $D(r)>0$ and $D(\text{BIAS})<0$ denotes better performance of the Grisogono scheme.
Fig. 9. Annual course of: (a) $r$, (b) BIAS, (c) RMSE between the measured and modelled $c(NO_2)$ and (d) average monthly $c(NO_2)$ values in year 2001. Two different $K(z)$ schemes were used O’Brien (red) and Grisogono (blue), monthly averages calculated from observations are marked with green line (d).
Fig. 10. Annual scatter plots between the measured and modelled (a) $c(\text{NO}_2)$, (b) $c(\text{SO}_2)$ and (c) $c(\text{SO}_4)$ values. Modelled concentrations are determined with two $K(z)$ schemes: O’Brien (left panel) and Grisogono (right panel) for all analyzed stations in the EMEP domain in 2001.
Fig. 11. Monthly: (a) $r$, (b) BIAS and (c) average calculated between the ABL height, $H$, determined from the soundings ($H_{\text{ sond}}$), and $H$ calculated from the EMEP model with the O’Brien scheme ($H_{\text{ old}}$) and with the $Ri_B$ scheme ($H_{\text{ new}}$) for different radiosounding station in Europe (Table 1) in January 2001 at 12:00 and 00:00 UTC.
Fig. 12. Time series of $H_{\text{sond}}$, $H_{\text{old}}$ and $H_{\text{new}}$ at (a) Herstmonceux, (b) Stavanger, (c) Torshavn and (d) Legionowo in January 2001.
Fig. 13. Same as Fig. 11 but for July, 2001 at 12:00 and 00:00 UTC.
Fig. 14. Same as Fig. 12 but for (a) Meiningen, (b) Madrid, (c) Torshavn and (d) Lisbon in July 2001.
Fig. 15. Monthly vertical profiles of average hourly \( R_i_B \) number calculated from the Cabauw data in from January (a) to December (l) in year 2001. The ABL height, \( H \), is represented with \( R_i_{BC} = 0.25 \) (the top of the blue area).
Fig. 16. Monthly $r$ between the $H$ calculated from the Cabauw measurements, and the $H$ calculated with the old ($H_{\text{old}}$) – red, and the new ABL scheme ($H_{\text{new}}$) – blue, in the EMEP model for year 2001.