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GLOBAL-MEAN RADIATIVE FORCINGS (RF)
Pre-industrial to present (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007)

Los Angeles denotes level of scientific understanding.

Los Angeles values (W m⁻²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF Terms</th>
<th>Spatial scale</th>
<th>LOSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-lived</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greenhouse gases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric water</td>
<td>Local to</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour from CH₄</td>
<td>continental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface albedo</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>to global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black carbon on snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aerosol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud albedo effect</td>
<td>to global</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear contrails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar irradiance</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net anthropogenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Angeles 1.66 [1.49 to 1.83] Global High
Los Angeles 0.48 [0.43 to 0.53] Global High
Los Angeles 0.16 [0.14 to 0.18] Global High
Los Angeles 0.34 [0.31 to 0.37] Global High
Los Angeles -0.05 [-0.15 to 0.05] Continental to global Med
Los Angeles 0.35 [0.25 to 0.65] Continental to global Med
Los Angeles 0.07 [0.02 to 0.12] Global Low
Los Angeles -0.2 [-0.4 to 0.0] Local to continental Med - Low
Los Angeles 0.1 [0.0 to 0.2] Local to continental Med - Low
Los Angeles -0.5 [-0.9 to -1.1] Continental to global Med - Low
Los Angeles -0.7 [-1.8 to -0.3] Continental to global Med - Low
Los Angeles 0.01 [0.003 to 0.03] Continental Low
Los Angeles 0.12 [0.06 to 0.30] Continental Low
Los Angeles 1.6 [0.6 to 2.4] Global Low
Global average sulfate optical thickness is 0.03: **1 W m\(^{-2}\) cooling**.

In *continental U. S.* typical aerosol optical thickness is 0.1: **3 W m\(^{-2}\) cooling**.
AEROSOL OPTICAL DEPTH
Determined by sunphotometry
North central Oklahoma - Daily average at 500 nm

J. Michalsky et al., JGR, 2001
MONTHLY AVERAGE AEROSOL JUNE 1997
Polder radiometer on Adeos satellite

Optical Thickness $\tau$
$\lambda = 865$ nm

Ångström Exponent $\alpha$
$\alpha = -d \ln \tau / d \ln \lambda$

Small particles are from gas-to-particle conversion.
AEROSOL DIRECT CLOUD-FREE FORCING
Sensitivity to aerosol and surface properties – 24 hr average at equinox

Aerosol Optical Depth

Surface Reflectance

Top of Atmosphere

Surface

McComiskey, Schwartz, Schmid, Guan, Lewis, Ricchiazzi, Ogren, JGR, 2008

Points denote default values of variables.
Indirect forcing is highly sensitive to perturbations in cloud drop concentration.

A 30% increase in cloud drop concentration results in a forcing of ~1 W m⁻².
Cloud albedo and forcing calculated from measured effective radius and liquid water path
North Central Oklahoma

Effective radius determined from slope of Optical depth vs. Liquid water path

Cloud albedo is calculated for observed data and for average effective radius for each day.
Forcing is calculated for indicated conditions relative to October 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, 2000</th>
<th>Effective radius $r_e$, $\mu$m</th>
<th>Optical Depth</th>
<th>Net flux at TOA, W m$^{-2}$</th>
<th>Forcing relative to 10/26, W m$^{-2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/26</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kim, Schwartz, Miller, and Min, JGR, 2003
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THE WAY FORWARD – CCSP SAP 2.3

**Observational tasks**
Maintain current and enhance future *satellite aerosol monitoring* capabilities.
Maintain, enhance, and expand the *surface observation networks*.
Execute a continuing series of *coordinated field campaigns*.
Measure *aerosol, clouds, and precipitation variables jointly*.
Fully *exploit the existing information in satellite observations* of AOD and particle type.
Measure aerosol chemical, physical, and optical properties in *laboratory studies*.
Improve *measurement-based techniques for distinguishing anthropogenic from natural aerosols*. 
THE WAY FORWARD – CCSP SAP 2.3 cont’d

**Modeling tasks**

*Improve model simulation* of aerosols (including components and atmospheric processes) and aerosol direct radiative forcing.

Advance the ability to *model aerosol-cloud-precipitation interaction*.

Refine *emissions inventories*.

Simulate climate change with *coupled aerosol-climate system models*.
AEROSOL PROCESSES THAT MUST BE UNDERSTOOD AND REPRESENTED IN MODELS

- condensation
- evaporation
- surface chemistry
- coagulation
- light scattering and absorption $f(RH)$
- oxidation
- precursor emissions
- water uptake
- autoconversion
- activation
- diffuse
- scavenging
- subcloud scavenging
- evaporation
- dry deposition
- primary emissions
- new particle formation
- aqueous chemistry
- Radiation transfer in clouds

 APPROACH TO DETERMINE AEROSOL FORCING

Numerical simulation of physical processes

Isomorphism of processes to computer code

Modeling aerosol processes requires understanding these processes, developing and testing their numerical representations, and incorporating these representations in global scale models.
AEROSOL RADIATIVE FORCING DEFINITION
From CCSP SAP 2.3

Net energy flux (downwelling minus upwelling) difference between an initial and a perturbed aerosol loading state, at a specified level in the atmosphere.

There are a number of subtleties associated with this definition:

(1) The initial state against which aerosol forcing is assessed must be specified.

(2) A distinction must be made between

   Total aerosol RF – Initial state is complete absence of aerosols; and

   Anthropogenic aerosol RF - Initial state is natural (preindustrial) aerosol.

(3) In general, total aerosol RF and anthropogenic aerosol RF include energy associated with both the shortwave (solar) and the longwave (primarily planetary thermal infrared) radiative components.

...
AEROSOL RADIATIVE FORCING DEFINITION cont’d

(5) Aerosol RF can be evaluated at the surface, within the atmosphere, or at top-of-atmosphere (TOA).

(6) Differences between TOA forcing and surface forcing represent heating within the atmosphere.

Atmospheric heating can affect vertical stability, circulation on many scales, cloud formation, and precipitation.

In this document these additional climate effects are not included in aerosol RF.

(7) Aerosol direct RF can be evaluated under cloud-free conditions or “all-sky” conditions.

Cloud-free direct aerosol forcing is more easily and more accurately measured or calculated.

Cloud-free direct aerosol forcing generally exceeds all-sky forcing because clouds mask the aerosol contribution to the scattered light.

Indirect aerosol RF must be evaluated for all-sky conditions.

In this document aerosol RF is assessed for all-sky conditions.
(8) Aerosol RF can be evaluated *instantaneously*, or *daily averaged* (24-hour), or some other time period. Measurements generally provide instantaneous values. Models usually consider aerosol RF as a daily average quantity. In this document *daily averaged aerosol RF is reported*.

(9) Another subtlety is the *distinction between forcing and feedback*. The concept of aerosol effects on clouds is complicated by the impact clouds have on aerosols. In this report, *feedbacks are taken as the consequences of changes in surface or atmospheric temperature*.
DIMENSIONS OF AEROSOL RADIATIVE FORCING

At least *six dimensions* to definition of aerosol RF:

- Direct
- Cloud-free
- Top-of-Atmosphere
- Total aerosol RF
- Shortwave
- Instantaneous
- Indirect
- All-sky
- Surface
- Anthropogenic aerosol RF
- Longwave
- 24-hr to annual average

At least *64* aerosol radiative forcing quantities.

Each aerosol RF is a *difference* between two fluxes: perturbed aerosol minus initial aerosol.
No indirect forcing in cloud-free sky.
Indirect forcing must be referred to natural aerosol, not zero aerosol.
Ten forcings to be determined, instantaneous and average.
Twenty, if shortwave and longwave are determined separately.
CHALLENGE TO ARM AND ASP

Determine aerosol radiative forcings at ARM site(s).

... with well specified definitions.

... with “known and reasonable uncertainties”.

Deliver these radiative forcings regularly and systematically as an ARM VAP.

This is a necessary (not sufficient) element of determining anthropogenic aerosol forcing pertinent to climate change over the industrial period.

Developing these forcing products would be an enormous challenge to ARM and ASP requiring substantial resources.
CHALLENGES IN DETERMINING AEROSOL RADIATIVE FORCINGS

Determining *anthropogenic contribution* to aerosol.
Aerosol mass spectrometer
Modeling

Aerosol *optical properties* ($\sigma_{ep}$, $\omega_0$, $g$) including RH dependence as $f(x, y, z)$.

$N_{ccn}(s)$ and $N_{cd}$ for actual and natural aerosol as $f(x, y, z)$. $s$ is supersaturation.

Determination of *3-D cloud morphology*.

*3-D Radiative transfer calculation* of direct and indirect forcing.
Accuracy sufficient to lend confidence to modeling of difference due to anthropogenic aerosol

*Consistency and error estimation* from radiation measurements.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The traditional approach to determining aerosol forcing seems *unlikely to converge* very quickly.

There are *multiple aerosol radiative forcings*. Distinguishing them is essential to progress.

Direct determination of aerosol radiative forcings at ARM sites would be a *stringent test of ability to determine these forcings*.

Determining aerosol radiative forcings at ARM sites would *lend confidence to extending this process globally*, from remote sensing and in-situ measurements.

Confident determination of aerosol radiative forcings at ARM sites would require *substantial new effort and commitment*. 