

# Timing and coincidence of atmospheric nucleation events in a region

Z. Németh<sup>1</sup>, Zs. Bécsi<sup>2</sup>, Á. Molnár<sup>3</sup>, T. Weidinger<sup>4</sup>, P. Aalto<sup>5</sup>, M. Kulmala<sup>5</sup> and I. Salma<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Chemistry, Eötvös University, Budapest, P.O. Box 32, H-1518, Hungary

<sup>2</sup>University of Pannonia, Veszprém, P.O. Box 158, H-8201, Hungary

<sup>3</sup>MTA-PE Air Chemistry Group, University of Pannonia, Veszprém, P.O. Box 158, H-8201, Hungary

<sup>4</sup>Department of Meteorology, Eötvös University, Budapest, P.O. Box 32, H-1518, Hungary

<sup>5</sup>Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 64, FI-00014 Helsinki, Finland

Keywords: new particle formation, DMPS, ultrafine particles, NPF event coincidence.

Presenting author email: nemeth@elte.hu

Particle number size distributions were measured in urban (Budapest, BP, Salma *et al.*, 2014) and rural background sites (K-pusztá, KP) in the Carpathian Basin. The measurements were performed by Differential Mobility Particle Sizer (DMPS) for two 1-year long time intervals in 2008–09 and 2012–13. The measurement days for both sites were classified into nucleation event, non-nucleation and undefined days according to Dal Maso *et al.* (2005). The beginning ( $t_1$ ) and end ( $t_{\text{end}}$ ) time of nucleation events were set as described earlier in Németh and Salma (2014). Backward air mass trajectories were calculated by HYSPLIT code (Draxler and Rolph, 2013) for each event (from  $t_{\text{end}}$  to  $t_1$ ) and non-event (from mean  $t_{\text{end}}$  to mean  $t_1$ ) day. Meteorological parameters and SO<sub>2</sub> concentration were also investigated.

In total, 64 days with class-1 nucleation event at both sites, and 270 non-nucleation days at both sites were identified. On 58 days, there was nucleation at the rural background site and there was no nucleation in the city, while on 15 days, it was vica versa. Meteorological conditions and SO<sub>2</sub> concentration were averaged between  $t_1$  and  $t_{\text{end}}$  time parameters. Direct solar radiation was 29 (BP) and 28 W m<sup>-2</sup> (KP), and 143 (BP) 147 (KP) W m<sup>-2</sup> for non-nucleation and nucleation events, respectively. Cloudiness and relative humidity have an opposite tendency.

Backward trajectories were evaluated for all nucleation and non-nucleation days for an arriving height of 200 m above ground level. Trajectories were classified into 4 groups (NW, NE, SE and SW) depending on their arriving direction. It is noted that the prevailing wind direction in the central part of the Carpathian Basin is NW, which is in parallel with the line of the Budapest–K-pusztá site. The parallel direction became more frequent on nucleation days (67%) than on non-nucleation days (48%). Parameter  $\tau$  was introduced to investigate whether the nucleating air mass is able to reach the other measurement on time:

$$\tau = \frac{\Delta t_1}{t_{\text{WS}}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta t_1$  is the time difference between the start time of nucleation events at the two measurement sites, and  $t_{\text{WS}}$  represents the time that takes the air mass with the mean wind speed to reach from one site to the other site in case of parallel directions. If the  $\tau$  parameter is greater than 1.00, then the nucleating air mass is able to reach the other

measurement site. If it is smaller than 1.00, there is not enough time for the nucleating air masses to be convected from one of the sites to the other site. In 79% of the cases, parameter  $\tau$  was smaller than 1.00 (Table 1). If the nucleating air masses arrive from the perpendicular directions,  $\Delta t_1$  is only investigated. This all implies that an air mass arriving from one of the sites to the other site only reaches approximately half of the distance in general when the nucleation event already starts at the other site. Hence, nucleation events observed at the sites are realisations of a common phenomenon occurring in the Carpathian Basin. At present knowledge, convection of nucleating air masses within the basin cannot be excluded in some cases. The local realisation also depends on triggering or suppressing processes.

Table 1. Parameters  $\tau$  for parallel arrival directions, and  $\Delta t_1$  in units h:mm for perpendicular arrival directions.

	$\tau$	$\Delta t_1$
Minimum	0.05	0:02
Median	0.45	3:33
Maximum	1.66	6:16
Mean	0.61	3:08
St. dev.	0.41	1:47

Financial support of the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (contract K84091) is appreciated.

Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., Riipinen, I., Wagner, R., Hussein, T., Aalto, P. P., Lehtinen, K. E. J.: Formation and growth of fresh atmospheric aerosols: eight years of aerosol size distribution data from SMEAR II, Hyytiälä, Finland, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 10, 323–336, 2005.

Draxler, R. R., Rolph, G. D.: HYSPLIT (HYbrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory) Model, <http://www.arl.noaa.gov/HYSPLIT.php>, NOAA Air Resources Laboratory, 2013.

Németh, Z., Salma, I.: Spatial extension of nucleating air masses in the Carpathian Basin, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 14, 8841–8848, 2014.

Salma, I., Borsós, T., Németh, Z., Weidinger, T., Aalto, P., and Kulmala, M.: Comparative study of ultrafine atmospheric aerosol within a city, *Atmos. Environ.* 92, 154–161, 2014.