AGU Fall Meeting 2014 GC53B-0519

Luke Ellison<sup>1,2</sup>, Charles Ichoku<sup>2</sup> http://feer.gsfc.nasa.gov/





With the advent of the Fire Energetics and Emissions Research (FEER) global top-down biomass burning emissions product from NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, a subsequent effort to analyze and evaluate some of the main (particulate and gaseous) constituents of this emissions inventory against other biomass burning emissions inventories over the African continent is shown here. There is consistent and continual burning during the dry seasons in Africa of many small agricultural fires that, though they individually may be relatively small, collectively contribute 20-25% of the global total carbon emissions from biomass burning. As a top-down method of estimating biomass-burning emissions, FEERv1.0 is able to yield higher and more realistic emissions than previously obtainable using bottom-up methods. This effort is carried out in conjunction with a NASA-funded interdisciplinary research project investigating the effects of biomass burning on the regional climate system in Africa, particularly in Northern Sub-Saharan Africa (NSSA). Essentially, the project aims to determine how fires may have affected the severe droughts that plagued the NSSA region in recent history. Therefore, it is imperative that the biomass burning emissions input data over Africa be as accurate as possible in order to obtain a confident understanding of their interactions and feedbacks with the hydrological cycle in NSSA. A firstcut at estimating the overall uncertainty in FEERv1.0 emissions reveals that there is still room for improvement in this algorithm.

Variable	Description
τ <sub>f</sub>	Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) contributable to a fire.
AT	MODIS AOD pixel size.
WS	Wind Speed.
βe	Smoke aerosol mass extinction efficiency.
FRP	Fire Radiative Power.
L	Length of the plume from its source to the MODIS AOD pixel edge.
Ce	Coefficient of emission.
Mx	Mass of smoke emitted species.
EFx	Emission Factor.

# **Overall Uncertainty Estimations of FEER Version 1.0**

An effort was made to estimate the overall uncertainty in FEER emissions using rough estimates for uncertainties of the contributing variables: first from the literature, if available; otherwise, estimated from our data and relevant equations. Assuming zero covariance between all involved variables, the uncertainty calculated from the propagation of error is given in the equation to the right. This equation is applied to the FEER equations below,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial f(x_i)}{\partial x_i}\right)^2 \delta x_i^2$ along with the values in the tables below, to estimate FEE

Coefficient of Emission

**Emissions of Total** Particulate Matter

Emissions of other

species

 $M_{TPM} = C_e \cdot FRP$ 

N <i>A</i> N <i>A</i>	$EF_{x}$
$M_x = M_{TPM}$	$EF_{TPM}$

 $C_e = \frac{\sum R_{sa}}{\sum FRP} = \frac{\tau_f \cdot A_T \cdot WS}{\beta_e \cdot FRP \cdot L}$ 

Variable	δx/x	δx	Source
τf	—	0.06	Estimated from the $\Delta \tau = \pm 0.05 \pm 0.15\tau$ related at al. (2010) for a background $\tau \approx 0.2$ (glo a range of $\tau \approx [0.2, 0.4]$ which fits the Africation according to Figure 9 in Petrenko et al. (
AT	0.001%	_	Estimated as the minimum difference in nadir) between adjacent pixels.
WS	30%	_	Estimated from the RMSE distribution as 5 in Decker et al. (2012).
β <sub>e</sub>	10%	—	Estimated from Table 5 in Reid et al. (20
FRP	30%	_	e.g. Kaufman et al. (1998), Wooster (200 (2006), Roberts & Wooster (2008, 2014) (2013), Peterson & Wang (2013)
L	10%	_	Independent estimation based off of the validation against digitized smoke plume Siberian fires from the MISR satellite (Ne 2008, 2013), and using an average wind

(mean values)	CO	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH4	TPM
EF <i>[g/kg]</i>	92.00	1569	4.125	11.85
σ <sub>ΕF</sub> [g/kg]	40.3	123	1.60	3.87
σ <sub>EF</sub> /EF	44%	8%	39%	33%

## References

- Ichoku, C., & Ellison, L. (2014). Global top-down smoke-aerosol emissions estimation using satellite fire radiative power measurements. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14(13), 6643–6667. doi:10.5194/ acp-14-6643-2014.
- \*\* Please see the attached document for a list of all articles referenced on this poster.

### Contact

Addresses:

- 1) Science Systems and Applications, Inc. Lanham, MD 20706
- 2) NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Org. 613 Greenbelt, MD 20771

Emails: luke.ellison@nasa.gov charles.ichoku@nasa.gov



ER uncertainty (see Fig. 3).  

$$\frac{\delta C_e}{C_e} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta \tau_f}{\tau_f}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta A_T}{A_T}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta WS}{WS}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta \beta_e}{-\beta_e}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta FRP}{-FRP}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta L}{-L}\right)^2}$$

$$\frac{\delta M_{TPM}}{M_{TPM}} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta C_e}{C_e}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta FRP}{FRP}\right)^2}$$

$$\frac{A_x}{x} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta M_{TPM}}{M_{TPM}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta EF_x}{EF_x}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta EF_{TPM}}{-EF_{TPM}}\right)^2}$$

tionship in Levy bal average) and can fire domain (2012).

areas (i.e. at

s shown in Figure

)05).

03), Zhukov et al. , Peterson et al.

e PDF found from es of May 2003 elson et al., speed.

different FEER *Ce* and emissions variables based on varying values of AOD from fire using a global AOD background average of 0.2. 250%

Figure 3. Relationships of uncertainties of

