



Uncertainty and ambiguity in gas transfer coefficients

David Woolf d.k.woolf@hw.ac.uk

International Centre for Island Technology Heriot-Watt University





Overview

- Review of field measurements of k
 - Breadth of techniques
 - Classification by gas etc.
 - What do isotopic analyses tell us?
- What can make sense of all/most of the results?
 - Differences between gases
 - Other mechanisms
 - Is temperature a key?
 - Hybrid models revisited



Methods

- a) Chamber or dome measurements of CO_2 flux
- b) Micrometeorological measurements of CO₂ flux
- c) Budgets of dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC)
- d) Modelling of oceanic DIC
- e) Carbon isotope methods
- f) Oxygen and nitrogen in the atmosphere
- g) Oxygen covariance in the ocean and oxygen deficit method
- h) Oxygen and nitrogen oceanic time series
- i) Triple isotopes of oxygen
- j) Noble gas time series
- k) Radon deficit method
- I) Purposeful tracers (including dual tracer method)
- m) Micrometeorological measurements of dimethyl sulphide









Isotopic Studies

- Naegler et al., 2006
- Sweeney et al., 2007

• Krakauer et al. 2006

$$k_{\rm W} = \langle k \rangle \left(\frac{u^n}{\langle u^n \rangle} \right) (Sc/660)^{-0.5}.$$

Latitudinal variation in k and U



Fig. 1. Annual mean root-mean-square wind speed (m s⁻¹) over the ocean, at 10 m height, from the monthly climatology of Boutin and Etcheto (1997) and Orr et al. (2001), derived from satellite (SSM/I) data. We used the monthly climatology to explore the consequences of different dependences of the air–sea gas transfer velocity on wind speed on ocean ¹⁴C uptake. The root-mean-square wind speed varies from 5 to 6 m s⁻¹ near the equator to around 11 m s⁻¹ over the Southern Ocean.

Data Density



Fig. 3. Distribution of the ocean 14 C measurements used in this analysis (Key et al., 2004). (a) Location of measurements, grouped by decade. The 1970s measurements were made as part of GEOSECS, the 1990s measurements mostly as part of WOCE. The thick lines are the boundaries between the 30 ocean regions we use as basis regions for transport pulse functions. (b) Depth distribution of measurements (100 m bins).

Problems in the Southern Ocean





Fig. 6. Modelled latitudinal distribution of bomb ¹⁴C in the ocean, for a global mean gas transfer velocity $\langle k \rangle$ of 20.6 cm/hr and a dependence on wind speed ranging from cubic to none (n = 3, 2, 1 or 0). A lower dependence on wind speed leads to relatively less uptake at the mid-latitudes and more near the equator. In panel (a), the 1975.0 modelled distribution is compared with extrapolations from GEOSECS observations in 10° bands by Broecker et al. (1995) and by Peacock (2004) (mean of her CFC- and anthropogenic CO₂-based extrapolation approaches). In panel (b), the 1994.5 modelled distribution is compared to the GLODAP gridded distribution based on WOCE observations (Key et al., 2004); the modelled distribution is summed only over the grid cells for which the gridded distribution is available, excluding, for example, the Arctic Ocean.



Fig. 8. Mean air–sea gas transfer velocities over 11 regions (cm/hr), derived using the quadratic relationship with wind speed of Wanninkhof (1992) and Dutay et al. (2002) (top row in each region) and estimated by optimizing the fit to the 1970s (second row) or the 1980s–1990s (third row) ocean bomb ¹⁴C observations. In the second and third rows, we show the mean and the standard deviation of



Constraint	Implied $\langle k \rangle$ (cm/hr)	Implied n
Ocean bomb ¹⁴ C measurements		
Ocean total amount (WOCE)	14–27	
Globally optimum fit of $\langle k \rangle$, <i>n</i> to measurements	20 ± 3	0.5 ± 0.4
Fit of regional gas transfer velocities	19 ± 1	0.6 ± 0.7
Other ¹⁴ C and ¹³ C measurements ^a		
Atmospheric Δ^{14} C: 1990s decline rate	20 ± 4	0.6 (0-2.0)
Atmospheric Δ^{14} C: 1990s latitudinal gradient	28 ± 13	1.5 (0-2.9)
Pre-industrial ocean ¹⁴ C uptake	22 ± 4	
Pre-industrial atmospheric Δ^{14} C latitudinal gradient	26 ± 10	1.3 (0-2.7)
Air-sea ¹³ C isotope flux, 1990s	23 ± 5	0 (0-1.1)
Air-sea ¹³ C isotope flux, pre-industrial		1.2 (0.3–1.9)

An Imposed Temperature Dependence



Average Sea Surface Temperature (°C)



Why the variation in Sc-normalised transfer velocity?

1) Different gases, Sc^{-1/2} doesn't work Some evidence of k less for more soluble gas, but unconvincing 2) Water Temperature Solubility Viscosity Convection Hydration/Dehydration 3) Water Temperature and Sea State (Reynolds number argument)

$k_w = max [k_{minimum}, Sc^{-1/2} a U_* + b(Sc, solubility, viscosity) Re_w]$



Pessimists are rarely disappointed

