Title: Possible Effects of Ammonium on Lightning Polarity

Author: Themis Chronis

Affiliation: University of Alabama in Huntsville

Corresponding Author: Themis Chronis, themis.chronis@nsstc.uah.edu

University of Alabama in Huntsville

Earth System Science Center

320 Sparkman Dr., Huntsville 35805, AL

## Abstract

This paper assembles evidence to discuss a mechanism that may contribute to the positive Cloud to Ground (+CG) lightning presence over the US Great Plains (GP). Data from EPA reveal maximum ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) concentrations in precipitation over the entire US are observed over the GP. Laboratory experiments show NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> favors graupel's positive charging, a key-process for +CG enhancement. This study speculates that the spatial coherency between the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations and the enhanced presence of +CG may not be a coincidence but relate to a physical mechanism that acts independently from the established thunderstorm charging processes.

#### 1. Introduction

Perhaps the most interesting and intriguing feature of the US lightning climatology is observed over the region stretching from North Dakota to Oklahoma, trailing the north-central Great Plains (GP). It is over that region where the Cloud-to-Ground (CG) lightning flashes exhibit a distinct positive (i.e., +CG) polarity enhancement. Figure 1 illustrates the relative CG flash counts for both polarities (+CG/-CG ratio) as these were observed from the National Lightning Detection Network (NLDN, Cummins et al., 1998) during 2003-2010. The +CG/-CG ratio enhancement over the GP region has also been shown in numerous past studies (e.g., Lyons et al., 1998; Orville and Huffines, 2001; Koshak et al., 2014 and references therein).

Although still an elusive process, thunderstorm electrification is presently acknowledged as the result of rebounding collisions between graupel and ice crystals in the presence of super-cooled water (Takahashi, 1978; Saunders et al., 2006). Despite some disagreements in the findings or the employed laboratory techniques, the majority of research studies agree that the electrostatic charge exchange between ice crystals and graupel is a multi-parametric process where temperature, water content, drop size distribution and purity of the involved substances play a decisive role (see Jayarante, 2003). It is generally accepted that there is a graupel charging charge-reversal temperature which is a function of the respective water content. Takahasi and Miyawaki (2002) document that at temperatures T<~ -10°C the main limiting factor is cloud liquid water content which, for values less than < -0.1 g m<sup>-3</sup> or  $> \sim 2.0$  g m<sup>-3</sup>, the graupel is charged positively whereas for the same temperature range accompanied by intermediate water content values, the opposite charging occurs. Emersic and Saunders (2010) expanded previous works and observed that the charge transfer between the ice particles (crystals and graupel) is dictated by the saturation of water/ice and the growth speed of the respective particles.

Williams et al., (2005, hereinafter W05) proposed that higher cloud bases over the GP result in larger updrafts that limit entrainment, resulting in higher water content available for the positive graupel charging. Moreover, higher cloud bases also imply lesser warm cloud depth and suppress warm rain process, allowing higher water amounts to be transported into the mixed layer. The latter is expected to invigorate the storm's updraft but also provide more readily available charging particles (i.e., ice crystals) that could lead to enhanced Intra Cloud (IC) lightning. The latter is further supported by observations in Boccippio et al., (2001) and Medici et al., (2015).

Many follow-on studies supported W05 (Carey and Buffalo, 2007; MacGorman et al., 2008 and references therein). Field observations from the Severe Thunderstorm Electrification and Precipitation Study (Lang et al., 2004 and references therein) also documented that the majority of the +CG-enhanced storms exhibit an "inverted polarity" charge structure, where positively charged graupel is present in the mid-levels while negatively charged ice is present aloft (see Bruning et al., 2014 for an insightful discussion on inverted polarity). In line with W05, Fuchs et al., (2015) found that Colorado storms strongly favored +CG production over the other three regions studied (central Oklahoma, northern Alabama, and Washington, DC) but also featured significantly higher cloud bases and greater instability, which may enable greater liquid water contents in the mixed-phase region.

# 2. An alternative hypothesis for the +CG enhancement

The GP is a typical example of extensive anthropogenic impact and land-use modification, considering that the region encompasses the most intense agricultural and livestock farming activities across the US (<u>http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/</u><u>Publications/2012/Online\_Resources/Ag\_Census\_Web\_Maps/</u>, Census of Agriculture). According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reports, these land-use practices are responsible for ~80% of the ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) emissions across the US, especially from fertilizers and livestock urea (Battye et al., 1994; Konarik and Aneja, 2008).

Upon release into the atmosphere,  $NH_3$  dissolves in cloud droplets and converts to ammonium ion ( $NH_4^+$ , Renard et al., 2004; The importance of Ammonia

in the Atmosphere, http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/csd/AQRS/reports/ammonia.pdf). According to Stensland (2000), NH<sub>3</sub> vapor and NH<sub>4</sub>  $^+$  aerosols are scavenged by

precipitation, with the atmospheric  $NH_4^+$  predominately being the form of  $NH_4^+$ sulfate [(NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>] or  $NH_4^+$  bi-sulfate [NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>HSO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>] particles that serve as

condensation nuclei.

An ammonium wet-deposition network of over 260 sites across the US (National Atmospheric Deposition Program/National Trends Network, NADP/NTN, <u>http://epa.gov/castnet/javaweb/precipchem.html</u>, Konarik and Aneja, 2008) shows the NH $_4^+$  averaged annual concentrations for years 2003-2010 (Fig. 2). The qualitative

comparison between Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 reveals that the highest  $NH_4^+$  concentrations

over the US trail part of the GP (Fig. 2). More importantly, one further notes some degree of spatial coherency with the enhanced +CG presence over shown in Fig. 1. [Note that a "pixel-to-pixel" comparison between Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 should account for the fact that Fig. 2 is a product of interpolation from only ~15-20 NADP/NTN ground observations over the GP, which are subsequently mapped on rectangular grid of the substantially higher spatial resolution of Fig. 1, ~0.5 degrees]

Although the pattern similarity between +CG enhancement (Fig. 1) and high  $NH_{\Lambda}^{+}$ 

concentrations (Fig. 2) cannot establish any causality nor lead to any definitive conclusions, few interesting facts become available if we revisit the earlier discussion on the graupel charging mechanisms (section 1). Graupel is formed by the accretion of super-cooled cloud droplets, which in the "non-sterile" atmospheric conditions, unavoidably nucleate on the ambient soluble aerosol particles. Surprisingly, only a small number of studies have studied the charging properties of graupel in the presence of soluble ionic substances and in particular NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Jayarante et al., 1983;

Jayarante et al., 1999; Chelf and Martin, 2001; Nelson and Baker, 2003; Jungwirth et al., 2005; Prakash and Kumar (2010). These studies agree that  $NH_4^+$  demonstrates a

pronounced effect on the charge transfer during the ice-graupel collisions. Although the mechanism is described as highly complex, laboratory experiments show that the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> ions in the rime favor the positive (negative) charging of graupel (ice crystal) (see Yair, 2008). Jayarante (2003) further argues that although the mechanism has not been fully characterized, a possible key-player is the ionic mobility between the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (cation) residing in the inner graupel layer and the conjugent anion residing in the outer part of the graupel (e.g., SO<sub>4</sub>-<sup>2</sup>, frequently encountered in atmospheric conditions as [NH<sub>4</sub>]<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, Stensland, 2000). Consequently, the collisions with ice crystals remove negative charge from the graupel (i.e., leaving it positively charged) while the negative charge is transferred to the ice particle. Chelf and Martin (2001) further discuss that the presence of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> can also effectively lower the ice nucleation temperatures, in agreement with Jayarante et al., (1999) and Prakash and Kumar (2010) who report that the graupel charging sign can be further dependent on the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations and temperature. In particular, Prakash and Kumar (2010) document that positive graupel charging is enhanced at lower concentrations/higher temperatures (-6°C to -15°C) or higher concentrations/lower temperatures (-16°C to -21°C). Further implications have been raised by Jungwirth et al., (2005) and Prakash and Kumar (2010), where the authors discuss that the role of other soluble ions may also explain some of the +CG enhancement that is observed in smoke plumes advected at large distances from wildfires (Lyons et al., 1998; Lang et al., 2006).

## **3.** Conclusions

Given the highlighted spatial patterns but also the previously discussed laboratory results, this paper highlights a possible role played by the  $NH_{A}^{+}$  on the

graupel charging which could explain to some degree the enhanced +CG presence over the GP region. This tentative hypothesis **does not refute or cast doubt to the overwhelming evidence that identifies the storm microphysical (e.g., Emersic and Saunders 2010 and references therein) or dynamical (e.g., W05 and references therein) processes as the major controlling factors of the CG polarity**. Conversely, this study merely questions whether the above speculations could be viewed as an additional mechanism that might have effect on the +CG presence over the GP region. Recently Albrecht et al., (2011) documented evidence that could be viewed as supportive of the speculations herein. These authors observed enhanced +CG presence over deforested pastures over Rondonia (Brazil), a region that exhibits elevated NH<sub>4</sub>+ concentrations from livestock and agricultural activity (Trebs et al., 2006). Nevertheless, in Albrecht et al. (2011) the authors speculate that the dominant mechanism responsible for the enhanced +CG is also in agreement with W05 and Carey and Buffalo (2007).

Currently the author is in search for additional evidence over other regions world-wide (e.g., Kitagawa and Michimoto, 1994; Chronis 2012), although the joint availability of CG polarity as well as  $NH_4^+$  concentrations in rainwater could be

restrictive. The author also acknowledges that the extrapolation of laboratory results into the "real" atmosphere requires more extensive research, thereby no conclusions can be drawn as to the degree, spatial or temporal scales at which the NH<sub> $_{\Lambda}$ </sub> + charging

mechanism might have an affect on the CG polarity. For instance, Jayarante et al., (1983) and Prakash and Kumar (2010) show a dependence on concentration of  $NH_{\Delta}^{+}$ 

on the graupel charge acquisition (in Normality units) thereby direct comparisons with the ground concentrations of Fig. 2 cannot be made at this moment (personal communication with R. Jayarante). Additional uncertainties stem from the level at which soluble impurities (such as  $NH_4^+$ ) can compete the control exerted by the

saturation of water/ice and the growth speed on the graupel charging processes (see Emersic and Saunders, 2010). Moreover, the speculated mechanism involving  $NH_{4}^{+}$ 

cannot support the enhanced +CG presence over the US west coast (Orville and Huffines, 2001; Ely and Orville, 2005; Orville et al., 2011, also shown in Fig. 1), although Jungwirth et al., (2005) argues that other common soluble aerosol particles over oceanic or coastal environments may also have a similar effect on the +CG production, an argument also recently made by Cooray et al., (2013).

There are additional reasons as to why the hypothesis herein may be proven challenging to test; The most important is the CG year-to-year variation due to storm activity that can overshadow the postulated mechanism (see Koshak et al., 2014). As a result, the comparison between the NH<sub>4</sub>+ concentrations and +CG temporal variation may not be adequate to fully corroborate or refute the above speculations. The examination of the similarities and dissimilarities between individual storms (e.g., in terms of thermodynamics or radar observations) over regions of high versus low NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations could provide a more complete answer nevertheless such task requires elaborate and extensive data analysis which, at present lies outside the scope of this study.

For the curious minds, in spite of the considerable uncertainties, the previous tentative arguments deserve some consideration. As discussed in Lyons et al., (1998), Kreidenweis et al., (2001) and Lang et al., (2006), we presently know that aerosol chemistry (e.g., pertinent to wild-fires) may be playing a very diverse role (personal communication with Walter Lyons). In this context, the critical question to be answered is whether the aerosol chemistry could effectively modulate thunderstorm charging attributes, independently from the well-established relationships with environmental factors (e.g., liquid water content, temperature etc.). Jayarante (2003)

9

indicates that, "*The role played by chemical impurities in determining the sign and magnitude of the charge separated during rebounding collisions between ice particles remains a major mystery and so far it has not been possible to explain it in terms of any of the existing theories*". Possible corroboration of the postulated mechanism by further in-depth analysis will break new ground in atmospheric science research and will establish a novel linkage between multidisciplinary science fields.

#### Acknowledgements

I acknowledge the support by Dr. Steve Goodman. The NLDN data were provided by Vaisala Inc. through a UAH/ESSC memorandum of agreement, for research purposes only. The NLDN data are available at <u>http://</u> <u>thunderstorm.vaisala.com</u>. The NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> data are acquired from the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NRSP-3). 2007. NADP Program Office, Illinois State Water Survey, 2204 Griffith Dr., Champaign, IL 61820. The IDL support from Dr. David Fanning is always greatly appreciated.

## References

Battye, R., W. Battye, C. Overcash, and S. Fudge. 1994. *Development and Selection of Ammonia Emission Factors*. EPA/600/R-94/190. Final report prepared for U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development. USEPA Contract No. 68-D3-0034, Work Assignment 0-3.

Baustian, K. J., Wise, M. E., and Tolbert, M. A., 2010. Depositional ice nucleation on solid ammonium sulfate and glutaric acid particles, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 2307-2317, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2307-2010.

Boccippio, D.J., Cummins, K.L., Christian, H.J., and Goodman, S.J., 2001. Combined satellite and surface-based estimation of the intracloud/cloud-to-ground lightning ratio over the continental United States. <u>Mon. Wea. Rev.</u> 129: 108-22.

Bruning, E.C., Stephanie A. Weiss, Kristin M. Calhoun, 2014. Continuous variability in thunderstorm primary electrification and an evaluation of inverted-polarity terminology, 2014: Atmospheric Research, Volumes 135–136, Pages 274-284, ISSN 0169-8095, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2012.10.009</u>.

Cantrell, W. and Heymsfield, A., 2005. Production of ice in tropospheric clouds: a review, B. Am. Meteor. Soc., 6, 795–807.

Carey, L. D., and Buffalo, K. M., 2007. Environmental Control of Cloud-to-Ground Lightning Polarity in Severe Storms. Monthly Weather Review, 135(4), 1327-1353. Chronis, T. G. 2012. Preliminary lightning observations over Greece, J. Geophys. Res., 117, D03113, doi:10.1029/2011JD017063. Cooray, V., Rohan Jayaratne, Kenneth L. Cummins, 2014. On the peak amplitude of lightning return stroke currents striking the sea, Atmospheric Research, Volume 149, Pages 372-376, ISSN 0169-8095, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2013.07.012.

Cummins, K. L., M. J. Murphy, E. A. Bardo, W. L. Hiscox, R. B. Pyle, and A. E. Pifer, 1998. A combined TOA/MDF technology upgrade of the U.S. national lightning detection network, J. Geophys. Res., 103, 9035–9044.

Ely, B. L., and R. E. Orville, 2005. High percentage of positive lightning along the USA west coast, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L09815, doi:10.1029/2005GL022782.

Emersic, C., C.P.R. Saunders, 2010. Further laboratory investigations into the Relative Diffusional Growth Rate theory of thunderstorm electrification, Atmospheric Research, Volume 98.

Jayarante, E.R., Saunders, C.P.R., Hallet, J., 1983. Laboratory studies of the charging of soft hail during ice crystal interactions. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 109, 609–630.

Jayaratne, E. R., 1999. Thunderstorm electrification: The effect of chemical impurities in cloud water, in Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Atmospheric Electricity, pp. 312–315, NASA, Washing- ton, D. C.

Jayaratne, R., *The Lightning Flash*, ed. by V. Cooray, 2003. Institution of Electrical Engineers, London, pp. 17–44

Jungwirth, P., D. Rosenfeld, and V. Buch, 2005. A possible new molecular mechanism of thundercloud electrification, Atmos. Res., 76, 190–205.

12

Kitagawa, N., and K. Michimoto, 1994. Meteorological and electrical aspects of winter thunderclouds, J. Geophys. Res., 99, 10,713–10,721.

Koshak, W.J., Kenneth L. Cummins, Dennis E. Buechler, Brian Vant-Hull, Richard J. Blakeslee, Earle R. Williams, and Harold S. Peterson, 2015. Variability of CONUS Lightning in 2003–12 and Associated Impacts. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, **54**, 15–41. doi: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-14-0072.1</u>

Kreidenweis, S.M, L.A. Remer, R. Bruintjes and O. Dubovik, 2001. Smoke from biomass burning in Mexico: Hygroscopic smoke optical model. J. Geophys. Res., 106, D5, 4381-4844.

Konarik Stephen, Viney P. Aneja, 2008. Trends in agricultural ammonia emissions and ammonium concentrations in precipitation over the Southeast and Midwest United States, Atmospheric Environment, Volume 42, Issue 14, Pages 3238-3252

Lang, T. J., and S. A. Rutledge, 2006. Cloud-to-ground lightning downwind of the 2002 Hayman forest fire in Colorado, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L03804, doi: 10.1029/2005GL024608.

Lang, T. J., L. J. Miller, M. Weisman, S. A. Rutledge, L. J. Barker, III, V. N. Bringi,V. Chandrasekar, A. Detwiler, N. Doesken, J. Helsdon, C. Knight, P. Krehbiel, W. A.Lyons, D. MacGorman, E. Rasmussen, W. Rison, W. D. Rust, and R. J. Thomas, 2004.

The Severe Thunderstorm Electrification and Precipitation Study (STEPS). Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 85, 1107-1125.

Leblanc, F., K. L. Aplin, Y. Yair, R. G. Harrison, J. P. Lebreton, M. Blanc, 2008. Planetary Atmospheric Electricity, ISBN: 978-0-387-87663-4, Springer.

Lyons WA, Uliasz M and Nelson TE, 1998. Large peak current cloud-to-ground lightning flashes during the summer months in the contiguous United States. Monthly weather review

Lyons, W. A., T. E. Nelson, E. R. Williams, J. A. Cramer, and T. R. Turner, 1998. Enhanced positive cloud-to-ground lightning in thunderstorms ingesting smoke from fires. Science, 282, 77-80.

Medici, G., M, K. Cummins, <u>W. J. Koshak</u>, S. D. Rudlosky, R. J. Blakeslee, S. J. Goodman, <u>D. J. Cecil</u>, and D. R. Bright, 2015. The Intra-Cloud Lightning Fraction in the Continental United States, AMS Phoenix AZ.

Nelson, J. and Baker, M.: Charging of ice-vapor interfaces: applications to thunderstorms, 2003. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 3, 1237-1252, doi:10.5194/acp-3-1237-2003.

Orville, R. E. and G. R. Huffines 2001. Cloud-to-ground lightning in the United States: NLDN results in the first decade, 1989–98. Mon. Wea. Rev., 129, 1179-1193.

14

Orville, R.E., Huffines, G.R., Burrows, W.R., Cummins, K., 2011. The North American Lightning Detection Network (NALDN): analysis of flash data — 2001–2009. Mon. Weather Rev. 1305–1322. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1175/2010MWR3452.1.

Prakash, P. J., and P. P. Kumar, 2010. Effect of sulfates and chlorides on electrification by a noninductive process applicable to stratiform clouds, J. Geophys. Res., 115, D02206, doi:10.1029/2009JD012470.

Renard, J. J., Sheryl E. Calidonna, Michael V. Henley, Fate of ammonia in the atmosphere—a review for applicability to hazardous releases, 2004. Journal of Hazardous Materials, Volume 108, Issues 1–2, 30, Pages 29-60, ISSN 0304-3894, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2004.01.015.

Saunders, C. P. R., H. Bax-Norman, C. Emersic, E. E. Avila, and N. E. Castellano, 2006. Laboratory studies of the effect of cloud condition on graupel/crystal charge transfer in thunderstorm electrification, Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc., 132, 2653–2673.

Stensland, G.J. "Acid Rain" 2000. Encyclopaedia of Environmental Science and Engineering, Volume 1, Fourth Edition, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, New York. (J.R. Pfafflin and E. N. Ziegler, Eds.), 1-13.

Takahashi, T., 1978: Riming electrification as a charge generation mechan- ism in thunderstorms, J. Atmos. Sci., 35, 1536–1548.

Takahasi, T.M., Miyawaki, K., 2002. Reexamination of riming electrification in a wind tunnel. J. Atmos. Sci. 59,1018 – 1025.

Trebs, I., Lara, L. L., Zeri, L. M. M., Gatti, L. V., Artaxo, P., Dlugi, R., Slanina, J., Andreae, M. O., and Meixner, F. X., 2006, Dry and wet deposition of inorganic nitrogen compounds to a tropical pasture site (Rondônia, Brazil), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 447-469, doi:10.5194/acp-6-447-2006.

Williams, E.R., V. Mushtak, D. Rosenfeld, S. Goodman, D. Boccippio, 2005. Thermodynamic Conditions Favorable to Superlative Thunderstorm Updraft, Mixed Phase Microphysics and Lightning Flash Rate. Atmos. Res., 76, 288-306.

Yair R., in Leblanc, F., K. L. Aplin, Y. Yair, R. G. Harrison, J. P. Lebreton, M. Blanc,2008. Planetary Atmospheric Electricity, ISBN: 978-0-387-87663-4, pp.125,Springer.

## **Figures Captions**

Figure 1: The National Lightning Detection Network (NLDN) +CG/-CG ratio. The map is drawn on a ~0.5 degrees rectangular grid. The ratio is computed for each gridbox from on the counts of CGs flashes (both polarities) that were observed form 2003-2010.

Figure 2: Average (2003-2010) NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> precipitation concentrations (mg L<sup>-1</sup>) from the National Atmospheric Deposition Program/National Trends Network (NADP/NTN) Crosses indicate the NADP/NTN sampling stations around the GP region. Data were initially acquired in GeoTiff format in Albers projection of ~3 km resolution. The annual composite precipitation surfaces are derived from an adapted version of a high resolution precipitation model developed by the <u>PRISM Climate Group</u>, and supplemented with NADP precipitation observations (see <u>http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu/data/mapProcess.aspx</u>). The weighted values are calculated using a combination of the PRISM modeled precipitation data, and the NADP observed precipitation values (crosses). The weighting function was established so that as one approaches the edge of the 30 km radius the values of the weighted grid cells approached that of PRISM. Outside of the 30 km radius the annual precipitation grid cells were populated using only PRISM data.

## Figures



Figure 1: The National Lightning Detection Network (NLDN) +CG/-CG ratio. The map is drawn on a  $\sim$ 0.5 degrees rectangular grid. The ratio is computed for each gridbox from on the counts of CGs flashes (both polarities) that were observed form 2003-2010.



Figure 2: Average (2003-2010) NH4<sup>+</sup> precipitation concentrations (mg L<sup>-1</sup>) from the National Atmospheric Deposition Program/National Trends Network (NADP/NTN) Crosses indicate the NADP/NTN sampling stations around the GP region. Data were initially acquired in GeoTiff format in Albers projection of ~3 km resolution. The annual composite precipitation surfaces are derived from an adapted version of a high resolution precipitation model developed by the <u>PRISM Climate Group</u>, and supplemented with NADP precipitation observations (see <u>http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu/data/mapProcess.aspx</u>). The weighted values are calculated using a combination of the PRISM modeled precipitation data, and the NADP observed precipitation values (crosses). The weighting function was established so that as one approaches the edge of the 30 km radius the values of the weighted grid cells approached that of PRISM. Outside of the 30 km radius the annual precipitation grid cells were populated using only PRISM data.