

Sources of organic acids in the summer Arctic marine boundary layer

Emma L. Mungall¹, Jeremy J. B. Wentzell², Alex Lee¹, Marjolaine Blais³, Michel Gosselin³, Jennie Thomas⁴, Jennifer G. Murphy¹, John Liggio², and Jon P. D. Abbatt¹





3. Methods

The acetate CIMS was located in a trailer behind the bridge. The sample was pulled through 4 feet of ¼" OD Teflon at a flow rate 10 SLPM. The line was externally heated to 80 C. Background values were obtained using a three stage scrubber, (Pt/Pd catalyst heated to 350 degrees), nylon wool soaked in saturated sodium bicarbonate and activated carbon to remove all species from ambient air. Backgrounds were collected during the last ten minutes of each two hour period. An isotopically labeled internal standard (C-13 propionic acid) served as a constant calibration, allowing for post-calibration in the lab. All of the lab calibrations were carried out with a combination of high pressure cylinders, permeation tubes and standards generated with the Ionicon Liquid Calibration Unit. The data have been screened to remove smokestack influence using a threshold value for HONO (normalized to the reagent ion) of 0.0015.





Positive matrix factorization (PMF) was performed on the one-minute time resolution volatile organic compounds (VOCs) measurements to determine their potential sources and formation pathways. The bilinear model was solved using the PMF2 algorithm in robust mode¹ and the final solution was selected using the PMF Evaluation Tool (PET) version 2.06². To prepare a PMF input matrix, a threshold value of 1.5 x 10⁻³ of reagent ion normalized HONO signal was used to eliminate data from the period influenced by ship emissions. The HONO and VOCs measurements were then normalized to their maximal values. In this study, a four-factor solution was selected as the optimum solution based on examination of the PMF quality of fit parameter ($Q/Q_{expected}$) as a function of the number of PMF factors up to ten factors. Increasing the number of factors from four to seven factors only served to further split the factor dominated by saturated monocarboxylic acids, and thus more than five factors were not considered







¹Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto ²Environment Canada ³Université de Québec à Rimouski ⁴LATMOS, Paris

4. Positive Matrix Factorization



5. Stack Factor

This is a non-ideal sampling location. Fortunately, we were able to satisfactorily screen the data to the extent that PMF could extract a smokestack factor, but we had to remove > 60% of the data.



phase under cloudlike conditions. We suggest that the glyoxylic acid factor is indicative of cloud processing⁸. It is also negatively correlated to temperature.



Glyoxylic Factor

8. Continental Factor

The compounds associated with the continental factor have all been observed previously in biomass burning plumes⁹. The potential emission sensitivity plots below show that at times when the continental factor was high, the airmass arriving at the ship originated in the vicinity of wildfires (shown in the magenta points).



9. Conclusions & Future Work

- Oceanic dissolved organic carbon contributes to measured organic acids in the summer Arctic marine boundary layer, possibly via reactions occurring at or in the sea surface microlayer.
- PMF separates a factor that may be linked to cloud processing.
- OVOCs from biomass burning and/or 3. continental vegetation are present in the summer Arctic marine boundary layer.

Future Work: Perform PMF on more m/z time series to try to find the link to growth.

10. References

- I. Paatero, P. & Tapper, U. *Environmetrics* **5,** 111–126 (1994). 2. Ulbrich, I. M., Canagaratna, M. R., Zhang, Q., Worsnop, D. R. & Jimenez, J. L. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 9, 2891-2918 (2009). 3. Johnson, M. T. Ocean Sci. 6, 913-932 (2010).
- 4. Gantt, B., N. Meskhidze, M. C. Facchini, M. Rinaldi, D. Ceburnis, and C. D. O'Dowd. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 2011
- 5. Zhou, S. *et al. Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **14,** 1371–1384 (2014). 6. Zhou, X. & Mopper, K. *Marine Chemistry* **56,** 201–213 (1997). 7. Fu, H. *et al. J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **137,** 8348-8351 (2015). 8. Carlton, A. G., Turpin, B. J., Lim, H.-J., Altieri, K. E. & Seitzinger, S. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33,**
- L06822 (2006). 9. Veres, P. et al. J. Geophys. Res. 115, D23302 (2010).

11. Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the funding support of NETCARE, as well as Environment Canada for the collaboration. This work would not have been possible without the efforts of all the scientists and crew aboard the Amundsen in 2014. Special thanks are due to Tim Papakyriakou and Tonya Burgers for generously sharing their meteorological data.

