SPICULE GV Continuous Flow Diffusion Chamber measurements

Paul J. DeMott
Senior Research Scientist
Colorado State University
Department of Atmospheric Science
1371 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80526
Paul.Demott@colostate.edu
http://chem.atmos.colostate.edu/PJDeMott/
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3719-1889

Co-author: Ryan Patnaude
Graduate Research Assistant
Colorado State University
Department of Atmospheric Science
1371 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80526
ryan.patnaude@colostate.edu
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3129-8279

1.0 Data Set Overview

These measurements were part of the Secondary Production of Ice in Cumulus Experiment (SPICULE). The goal of the SPICULE campaign is to use in situ and remote sensing techniques to better understand the microphysical and dynamical parameters supportive of suspected Hallet-Mossop (HM) secondary ice process (SIP) in cumulus clouds. PI DeMott's group is focused on the question of interaction between clouds and aerosols in developing cumulus clouds and deployed instrumentation for measuring ice nucleating particles (INPs). These measurements of a key aerosol class are one piece to be able to better parameterize cumulus cloud development and formation of ice crystals and precipitation. This archive is for the Colorado State University continuous flow diffusion chamber (CFDC) instrument that was onboard the NSF/NCAR GV. The CFDC was used to measure the variability of INPs throughout the boundary layer and free troposphere, inside and out of clouds. Flights were based from Broomfield, Colorado. The time period covered is May 29 to June 25, 2021. A total of 10 research flights were flown with the CFDC instrument operational at latitudes between 33.7 and 45.2 degrees and longitudes -105.2 to -94.8 degrees, and a maximum altitude of 13123 meters.

2.0 Instrument Description:

The Colorado State University (CSU) Continuous Flow Diffusion Chamber (CFDC) is an ice-thermal gradient diffusion chamber that optically detects the freezing of single aerosol particles from air after exposure to controlled temperature and humidity conditions, including following liquid cloud particle activation. The operating principles of the vertically-oriented, cylindrical-walled CFDC is described in the earlier works of Rogers (1988), Rogers et al.

(2001) and Eidhammer et al. (2010). The "HIAPER" version of the CFDC (CFDC-1H) that flew during SPICULE has a total residence time of approximately 7s, during which INPs are activated and grown as ice crystals for optical detection as distinct from activated cloud droplets (DeMott et al., 2015). Practical operation for measuring INP concentrations of relevance to mixed-phase cloud conditions involves setting the relative humidity with respect to water to values exceeding 100%, typically in the range of 105%, and this was the case for SPICULE. This emphasizes condensation and immersion freezing ice nucleation. Low free-tropospheric INP concentrations during SPICULE and the low flow rate (1.5 vlpm) of the CFDC meant that measurements were focused between -25°C and -20°C or lower. Sampling occurred at various times from a HIAPER Modular Inlet (HIMIL) based at the port front of the GV and from the counterflow virtual impactor (CVI) inlet also at the port front of the GV. The use of the CVI entails a particle enhancement factor due to the aerodynamics of cloud particle separation that the inlet effects. The CFDC sampled from the CVI in the standard mode to capture cloud particle residuals. Aerosol particles larger than 2.4 μm were removed from air entering the CFDC by a set of impactors prior to the chamber inlet in order to eliminate misidentification of large aerosol particles as ice crystals, which are detected at grown sizes >4 μm.

Interval periods of operation in which aerosol particles are filtered from the incoming air stream are used to determine background frost influences on ice particle counts, as described in prior publications (Barry et al., 2021). Temperature uncertainty is ± 0.5°C at the reported CFDC lamina processing temperature. RHw uncertainty depends inversely on temperature, and has been estimated as ± 1.6, 2 and 2.4 % at -20, -25, and -30°C, respectively (Hiranuma et al., 2015).

3.0 Data Collection and Processing:

Data were collected continuously in real-time with the CFDC at a rate of 1 Hz. The data is presented as an array (using ICARTT format) of INP concentrations per standard L of air (100 kPa and 0 °C) as a function of temperature. 90% confidence interval widths (positive and negative, to be added to and subtracted from the measured concentration to obtain confidence interval upper and lower bounds) are also given (Barry et al. 2021). The start, midpoint, and end time of each sample period are listed, as are the mean supersaturation with respect to water, measurement temperature, and pressure, in addition to the length of the sample period in seconds. Positional information is reported as the midpoint latitude, longitude and altitude of the aircraft. The concentrations reported here represent a mean over the reported sampling periods. Finally, INP concentrations data that are being reported are statistically significant, and the best indication of sample type (HIMIL/ambient or CVI) for each record. To obtain INP concentrations and to improve the signal to noise ratio, measurements are averaged over one to several minute periods.

4.0 Data Format:

CFDC data are reported in standard ICARTT format. The list of variables and units are given in the data file header but are repeated here.

Time_Start, seconds, Time_Start, seconds_past_midnight_UTC
Time_Stop, seconds, Time_Stop, seconds_past_midnight_UTC
Time_Mid, seconds, Time_Mid, seconds_past_midnight_UTC
CFDC_N_INP, number per liter, AerMP_INP_Insitu_Bulk_NumConcSTP, Number of ice nucleating particles per liter of air (ambient temperature and pressure)
CFDC_Lower_CI, number per liter, AerMP_INP_Insitu_Bulk_NumConcSTP, 90 lower confidence interval width for number of ice nucleating particles per liter of air (ambient temperature and pressure)
CFDC_Upper_CI, number per liter, AerMP_INP_Insitu_Bulk_NumConcSTP, 90 upper confidence interval width for number of ice nucleating particles per liter of air (ambient temperature and pressure)
CFDC_Sample_Length, seconds, Sample_Length_s, Length of sample period in seconds
CFDC_SSw, percent, Supersaturation, Mean sample period supersaturation with respect to water in the CFDC
CFDC_Temp, degrees Celsius, Temperature, Mean sample period temperature of the CFDC aerosol lamina
CFDC_Pressure, mb, Pressure, Mean sample period pressure inside the CFDC chamber
LAT, degree, Platform_Latitude_InSitu_None, Midpoint sample period latitude
LON, degree, Platform_Longitude_InSitu_None, Midpoint sample period longitude
ALT, meter, Platform_AltitudeMSL_InSitu_None, Midpoint aircraft altitude (meters ASL) during sample period
CFDC_Sample_Type_Flag, unitless, none, 0=Ambient 1=CVI

The file names archived as “preliminary” are:

SPICULE-CFDC_20210529_R0_RF01.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210601_R0_RF02.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210602_R0_RF03.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210605_R0_RF04.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210609_R0_RF05.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210611_R0_RF06.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210617_R0_RF07.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210620_R0_RF08.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210624_R0_RF09.ict
SPICULE-CFDC_20210625_R0_RF10.ict

Final file versions will have a different version number (Rx). Missing or erroneous values are reported as -9999.

5.0 Data Remarks

Data are not continuous, but the records are listed in chronological order. Start, end and midpoint times of each sample period are provided, and the representative average conditions for each record is listed. The non-significant data are not reported as these data may reflect both an unresolvable INP concentration or simply the operational quality of the CFDC processing conditions at the time of sampling. For example, while background frost concentrations are optimally less than 1 per liter, values exceeding 10 per liter could occur in some flight circumstances, limiting assessment of INP concentrations even for longer sampling intervals. Lastly, CFDC data sampled from the CVI are preliminary, and the CVI enhancement factor has yet to be applied. Future data versions will include this correction.

6.0 References

Barry, K. R., Hill, T. C. J., Levin, E. J. T., Twohy, C. H., Moore, K. A., Weller, Z. D., et al. (2021). Observations of ice nucleating particles in the free troposphere from western US wildfires. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 126, e2020JD033752. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033752

DeMott, P. J., Prenni, A. J., McMeeking, G. R., Tobo, Y., Sullivan, R. C. , Petters, M. D., Niemand, M., Möhler, O., and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Integrating laboratory and field data to quantify the immersion freezing ice nucleation activity of mineral dust particles, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 393–409, doi:10.5194/acp-15-393-2015, 2015.

Eidhammer, T., DeMott, P. J., Prenni, A. J., Petters, M. D., Twohy, C. H., Rogers, D. C., Stith, J., Heymsfield, A., Wang, Z., Haimov, S., French, J., Pratt, K., Prather, K., Murphy, S., Seinfeld, J., Subramanian, R., and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Ice initiation by aerosol particles: Measured and predicted ice nuclei concentrations versus measured ice crystal concentrations in an orographic wave cloud, J. Atmos. Sci., 67, 2417–2436, doi:10.1175/2010JAS3266.1, 2010.

Hiranuma, N., and coauthors: A comprehensive laboratory study on the immersion freezing behavior of illite NX particles: a comparison of 17 ice nucleation measurement techniques, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 2489–2518, doi:10.5194/acp-15-2489-2015, 2015.

Krishnamoorthy K., and L. Meesook (2013) New approximate confidence intervals for the difference between two Poisson means and comparison, Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, 83:12, 2232-2243, DOI: 10.1080/00949655.2012.686616

Rogers, D. C.: Development of a continuous flow thermal gradient diffusion chamber for ice nucleation studies, Atmospheric Research, 22(2), 149-181, doi:10.1016/0169-8095(88)90005-1, 1988.

Rogers, D. C., P. J. DeMott, S. M. Kreidenweis and Y. Chen: A continuous flow diffusion chamber for airborne measurements of ice nuclei, J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 18, 725-741, doi:10.1175/1520-0426(2001)018<0725:ACFDCF>2.0.CO;2, 2001.