



National Institute for Public Health and the Environment Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport 1

nnovation

Field comparison of two novel open-path instruments to measure ammonia fluxes during the RITA'21 campaign.

Susanna Jonker^{1,} Jun Zhang², Daan Swart¹, Shelley van der Graaf¹, Arjan Hensen², Stijn Berkhout¹, Pascal Wintjen^{2,3}, René van der Hoff¹, Marty Haaima¹, Arnoud Frumau², Pim van den Bulk², Ruben Schulte^{1,4}, Thomas van Goethem¹

THÜNE



Motivation and aim of the campaign

- > NH_3 dry deposition is the largest fraction of nitrogen deposition
- > Very difficult to measure
- > Only monthly averaged measurements
- Ruisdael campaign aim: half-hourly flux measurements to see the deposition and emission processes.





Two methods using open path instruments

 Aerodynamic flux gradient method (AGM) using broadband UV-based miniDOAS 2.2D (RIVM)





> Eddy covariance (EC) using

QCL infrared-based HT8700 (Healthy Photon Ltd, Cn)

miniDOAS gradient



miniDOAS gradient



Gradient method requires zero bias



miniDOAS intercalibration



Eddy covariance setup

HT8700 from China

 $F_{\rm NH_3} = -\overline{w' \rm NH'_3}$

- Correction for density impact H_2O etc.
- Correction for spectral loss due to size instrument and spatial separation HT and sonic





Cabauw campaign

27 August to 1 October 2021







Cabauw campaign - instrument setup





HT concentration changed with air temperature



11

HT concentration after temperature correction



Flux comparison



Obstacle-free area: highly comparable fluxes



Potential causes of difference in flux: footprint

- > Flux footprint:
 - the upwind area where the atmospheric flux measured by an instrument is generated.
 - an upwind area "seen" by the instruments measuring vertical turbulent fluxes.
- > Main factors affecting size and shape:
 - measurement height
 - surface roughness
 - atmospheric thermal stability



(Figure from https://footprint.kljun.net/)

Footprint and homogeneity: key factors influencing flux comparison



Diurnal cycle of AGM and EC flux



Only after 15 September: farm manuring stopped

Conclusions

- > Half-hourly flux measurements feasible
- > Under optimal conditions, both systems show:
 - Comparable deposition values
 - Similar structures of timeseries and diurnal cycles
- MiniDOAS ~100% uptime outside calibration periods (~35% of total period)
- > HT data loss during rain (~21% of total period), and mirror deterioration
- Although HT concentration is sensitive to air T, it almost had no impact on HT fluxes.



Preprint paper: https://amt.copernicus.org/preprints/amt-2022-171/



To be continued @ Veenkampen







Acknowledgements

- Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV) for funding
- > The Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI) for site access and assistance
- > Dr. Kai Wang (Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing)
- > Dr. Yin Wang and Dr. Peng Kang (Healthy Photon Lt. Co, China) for discussing HT performance
- > Dr. Daniëlle van Dinther (TNO) for merging various EC data streams
- > Drs. Kim Vendel and Miranda Braam (RIVM) for helping with the AGM data analysis



National Institute for Public Health and the Environment *Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport*

Thank you for your attention

susanna.jonker@rivm.nl

RIVM / MIL – Bilthoven (NL)