

# Impact Assessment of Biomass Burning in Southeast Asia to 2019 Annual Average PM<sub>2.5</sub> Concentration in Thailand using Atmospheric Chemical Transport Model

Nanthapong Chantaraprachoom<sup>1,\*</sup>, Daichi Mochizuki<sup>1</sup>, Hikari Shimadera<sup>1</sup>, Mui Viet Luong<sup>1</sup>, Tomohito Matsuo<sup>1</sup>, and Akira Kondo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Sustainable Energy and Environmental Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

\* Correspondence: nanthapongc@ea.see.eng.osaka-u.ac.jp

**Abstract.** Agricultural residues burning as a means of land preparation is commonly practiced in many Southeast Asian countries, causing significant deterioration of ambient air quality and public health. In this study, WRF-CMAQ Atmospheric Chemical Transport Model was used to conduct a year-round simulation (1 January - 31 December 2019) of PM<sub>2.5</sub> dispersion over Southeast Asia. The model utilized biomass burning emission input from National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), the Fire emission Inventory from NCAR (FINN) version 1.5. The model was validated by comparing with observed values of nine major cities from The Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET). The model shows acceptable performance reproducing the PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration with 14.9% normalized mean bias (NMB). After that, the simulation was conducted again without biomass burning emission input. The results from both with and without biomass burning emission scenarios were then compared to evaluate contribution of biomass burning to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in two major cities of Thailand: Bangkok and Chiang Mai. The comparison shows that biomass burning contributes to 49.1% and 13.1% of PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual average concentration in Chiang Mai and Bangkok respectively with highest month being April for Chiang Mai (70.7% contribution) and March for Bangkok (35.5% contribution).

## 1. Introduction

Biomass burning (BB) of agricultural refuse with the purpose of land preparation for the upcoming plantation is widely practiced in Southeast Asian countries: mainly, Thailand, Vietnam, Myanmar, Cambodia, and Laos [1-10]. Biomass burning is in favor of cultivators as it is an inexpensive method to clear the agricultural residue from land for faster crop rotation, control undesirable weeds, pests, and diseased crops as well as to return some nutrients to the soil [10]. Rapid release of gaseous and particulate pollutants from biomass burning significantly deteriorates ambient air quality [12-15], degrades visibility [16], and poses adverse health effects to humans [12, 17-19]. Biomass burning does not only influence air quality locally but also has regional and global effects as biomass burning plumes are capable of long-distance-travelling, causing transboundary pollution problem [2,12,20-21].


Particulate pollutant with size smaller than 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) is known to have adverse effect to human health such as respiratory and cardiovascular diseases [22]. The annual national average of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in Thailand has been exceeding the value of WHO air quality guidelines by 5 times in the last decade [11,23]. Biomass burning plumes, both domestic and transboundary-transported, are reported as significant source of PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution in Southeast Asia, especially during high-burning episode toward the end of dry season, from January to April [2,11,24].

Atmospheric chemical transport modelling is a powerful tool widely used to study source apportionment, contribution assessments, and policy evaluation studies [25-26]. This study aims to assess the contribution of biomass burning in Southeast Asia to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in two major cities of Thailand: Bangkok and Chiang Mai using Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) meteorological model coupled with Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) atmospheric chemical transport model.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Model description – WRF and CMAQ

WRF version 4.3 was used to generate meteorological input for CMAQ version 5.3.3 in this study. CMAQ was then used to simulate PM<sub>2.5</sub> dispersion over Southeast Asian countries. In WRF, domain was defined as 205 x 142 gridded lat-lon projection over Asia with resolution of 45 x 45 km as illustrated in figure 1. The model was set with 30 vertical sigma levels up to top of the domain pressure at 50 hPa. WRF physics settings are shown in table 1.



**Figure 1.** WRF domain configuration.

### 2.2. Emission input

The Fire emission Inventory from NCAR (FINN) from National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) was used as biomass burning emission input in this study. FINN utilizes satellite remote sensing data of active fires and land cover, combined with emission factors and estimated fuel loadings to estimate daily emission from biomass burning at high resolution [30]. The MODIS data from FINN version 1.5 was used in this study. Other emission inventories used in the model are listed table 2.

In this study, the simulation was conducted in two scenarios: one with all emission inventories and one with all emission inventories but FINNv1.5 (referred to as FINNv1.5 case and BB0 case respectively). The differences between PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration of two scenarios thus reflected the contribution from biomass burning emission.

### 2.3. Model evaluation

The simulation was conducted for a 1-year period from 1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019. In the purpose of model validation, simulated values from FINNv1.5 case were compared to observed values from The Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East Asia (EANET) [31]. Annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from simulation of nine Southeast Asian cities, namely: Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Yangon, Mandalay, Vientiane, Phnom Penh, Jakarta, Hoa Binh, and Manila were compared to observed value individually. Normalized mean bias of simulated and observed data were then calculated to evaluate the ability of the model to reproduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> dispersion.

**Table 1.** Model configuration for WRF and CMAQ

<b>WRF Configuration</b>	
Meteorology Model	WRF v3.3
Explicit precipitation scheme	Morrison 2-moment scheme
Advection	5th/3rd-order upwind-biased (horizontal/vertical)
Longwave Radiation	RRTMG scheme
Shortwave Radiation	RRTMG scheme
Surface-layer option	MYNN surface layer
Land-surface	Noah Land-Surface Model
Planetary boundary layer scheme	MYNN 3rd level TKE scheme
Cumulus option	Grell 3D ensemble scheme
<b>CMAQ Configuration</b>	
Chemistry Model	CMAQ v5.3.3
Horizontal resolution	45 x 45 km nested to 15 x 15 km
Vertical resolution	30 sigma-pressure level (with the top pressure of 50HPa)
Projection	Lambert Conformal Conic
Advection	Yamartino/WRF-based scheme, Multiscale/ACM2
Vertical diffusion	Asymmetrical Convective Model Version 2 (ACM2) [27-28] for M3DRY deposition
Gas-phase chemistry	SAPRC07tc & AERO6 with Aqueous chemistry
Dry deposition	M3DRY [29]
Wet deposition	Henry's law
Aqueous chemistry	CMAQ's standard cloud chemistry treatment (AQCHEM)
Aerosol mechanism	AERO6


**Table 2.** Emission inventories used in this study

Emission source	Inventory used
Anthropogenic emission	REAS version 3.2 [32]
	HTAP version 2.2 [33]
Biogenic volatile organic compound (BVOC) emission	MEGAN version 2.04 [34]
Sulphur dioxide emission from volcanic activity	Carn et al. [35]
Biomass burning	FINN version 1.5 [30]

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Model performance

Figure 2 shows comparison of simulated and observed annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration of nine cities in Southeast Asia. The model shows acceptable performance with normalized mean bias of 14.9%.




**Figure 2.** Comparison of observed and simulated annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration of nine Southeast Asian cities.

### 3.2. Biomass burning contribution

Figure 3 shows simulated annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration and figure 4 shows annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from biomass burning alone. Figure 4 clearly illustrates that PM<sub>2.5</sub> from biomass burning is much more severe in northern Thailand as well as Laos and Myanmar. On the other hand, central region, including Bangkok, is only mildly affected. The contribution percentages were then calculated for Bangkok and Chiang Mai using simulation result from both scenarios. Biomass burning contributes to 49.1% and 13.1% of PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual average concentration in Chiang Mai and Bangkok respectively. Figures 5 and 6 show monthly average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration and corresponding contribution from biomass burning. The PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration peaks in April for Chiang Mai with 70.7% contribution from biomass burning. Whereas March is the highest month for Bangkok with 35.5% contribution from biomass burning.

Chiang Mai suffers more from biomass burning than Bangkok possibly due to higher agricultural activities as well as transboundary transport from neighbouring countries. According to Thailand Pollution Control Department (PCD) [11], biomass burning in neighbouring countries is higher during March to April as the increase in hotspots can be observed by satellite.



**Figure 3 (upper left).** Annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from simulation.

**Figure 4 (upper right).** Annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from biomass burning (FINNv1.5 – BB0)

**Figure 5 (lower left).** Bangkok Monthly average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration and contribution from BB

**Figure 6 (lower right).** Chiang Mai Monthly average PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration and contribution from BB

#### 4. Conclusion

Agricultural biomass burning in Southeast Asia is an on-going problem which significantly affects air quality and public health. PM<sub>2.5</sub>, one of major pollutants emitted by biomass burning, is known to cause respiratory and cardiovascular diseases and are linked to premature death. This study utilizes coupled atmospheric chemical transport model to assess contribution of biomass burning to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in Bangkok and Chiang Mai, Thailand. A WRF-CMAQ model was used to simulate PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution over Southeast Asia in the year of 2019. The simulation was conducted in two scenarios: with and without emission from biomass burning. The difference between two scenarios then provides the contribution of biomass burning to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration. The result from simulation shows that biomass burning largely contributes to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in both Bangkok and Chiang Mai. Having many agricultural activities and located near neighbouring countries, Chiang Mai is severely affected as biomass burning contributes to 49.1% of annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration with highest contribution at 70.7% toward the end of dry season in April. Meanwhile in Bangkok, biomass burning only contributes to 13.1% of annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration with highest contribution in March at 35.5%. The effect is supposedly less severe due to its urban setting and lesser agricultural activities.

#### 5. References

- [1] Vadrevu K P, Lasko K, Giglio L, Schroeder W, Biswas S and Justice C 2019 Trends in vegetation fires in South and Southeast Asian countries *Sci. Rep.* **9** 7422
- [2] Duc H N, Bang H Q, Quan N H and Quang N X 2021 Impact of biomass burnings in Southeast Asia on air quality and pollutant transport during the end of the 2019 dry season. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* **193** 565
- [3] Grandstaff T B 1980 *Shifting Cultivation in Northern Thailand: Possibilities for Development* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press)
- [4] Blanford H R 1958 Highlights of one hundred years of forestry in Burma *Emp. For. Rev.* **37** 33-42
- [5] Biswas S, Vadrevu K P, Lwin Z M, Lasko K and Justice C O 2015 Factors controlling vegetation fires in protected and non-protected areas of Myanmar *PLoS One* **10** e0124346
- [6] Roder W, Phengchanh S and Keobulapha B 1997 Weeds in slash-and-burn rice fields in northern Laos *Weed Res.* **37** 111–9
- [7] Inoue Y 2018 Ecosystem carbon stock, atmosphere, and food security in slash-and-burn land use: A geospatial study in mountainous region of Laos *Land-Atmospheric Research Applications in South and Southeast Asia* ed K P Vadrevu, T Ohara, et al. (Cham: Springer) pp 641–65
- [8] Scheidel A and Work C 2016 Large-scale forest plantations for climate change mitigation? New frontiers of deforestation and land grabbing in Cambodia *Glob. Governance Politics Clim. Justice Agrar. Justice Link. Chall.* **11**
- [9] Nguyen T L, Vien T D, Lam N T, Tuong T M and Cadisch G 2008 Analysis of the sustainability with the composite swidden agroecosystem in northern Vietnam: 1. Partial nutrient balance and recovery times of uplands fields *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **128** 37–51
- [10] Kim Oanh N T, Ly B T, Tipayaroma D, Manandhar B R, Prapat P, Simpson C D and Liu L-J S 2011 Characterization of particulate matter emission from open burning of rice straw *Atmos. Environ.* **45** 493-502
- [11] Pollution Control Department 2021 *Thailand State of Pollution Report 2020* (Bangkok: Thailand's Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)
- [12] Chen J, Li C, Ristovski Z, Milic A, Gu Y, Islam M S, Wang S, Hao J, Zhang H, He C, et al. 2017 A review of biomass burning: Emissions and impacts on air quality, health and climate in China *Sci. Tol. Environ.* **579** 1000-34
- [13] Reyes F, Ahumada S, Rojas F, Oyola P, Vásquez Y, Aguilera C, Henriquez A, Gramsch E, Kang C M, Saarikoski S, et al. 2021 Impact of biomass burning on air quality in Temuco City, Chile *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* **21** 210110

- [14] Mehmood K, Chang S, Yu S, Wang L, Li P, Li Z, Rosenfield W D and Seinfeld J H 2018 Spatial and temporal distributions of air pollutant emissions from open crop straw and biomass burnings in China from 2002 to 2016 *Environ. Chem. Lett.* **16** 301–9
- [15] Crutzen P J, Heidt L E, Krasnec J P, Pollock W H and Seiler W 1979 Biomass burning as a source of atmospheric gases CO, H<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO, CH<sub>3</sub>Cl and COS *Nature* **282** 253–6
- [16] Lee H H, Bar-Or R Z and Wang C 2017 Biomass Burning Aerosols and the Low-Visibility Events in Southeast Asia *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **17** 965–80
- [17] Pavagadhi S, Betha R, Venkatesan S, Balasubramanian R and Hande M P 2013 Physicochemical and toxicological characteristics of urban aerosols during a recent Indonesian biomass burning episode *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **20** 2569–78j
- [18] Sigsgaard T, Forsberg B, Annesi-Maesano I, Blomberg A, Bølling A, Boman C, Bønløkke J, Braeuer M, Bruce N, Héroux M-E, et al. 2015 Health impacts of anthropogenic biomass burning in the developed world *Eur. Respir. J.* **46** 1577–88
- [19] Wiwanitkit V 2008 PM<sub>10</sub> in the atmosphere and incidence of respiratory illness in Chiangmai during the smoggy pollution *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk. Assess.* **22** 437–40
- [20] Oanh N K, Upadhyay N, Zhuang Y H, Hao Z P, Murthy D, Lestari P, Villarin J, Chengchua K, Co H and Dung N 2006 Particulate air pollution in six Asian cities: Spatial and temporal distributions, and associated sources *Atmos. Environ.* **40** 3367–80
- [21] Targino A C, Krecl P, Johansson C, Swietlicki E, Massling A, Coraiola G C and Lihavainen H 2013 Deterioration of air quality across Sweden due to transboundary agricultural burning emissions *Boreal Environ. Res.* **18** 19–36
- [22] Xing Y-F, Xu Y-H, Shi M-H and Lian Y-X 2016 The impact of PM<sub>2.5</sub> on the human respiratory system *J. Thorac. Dis.* **8** E69–E74.
- [23] World Health Organization 2021 WHO factsheet on ambient (outdoor) air pollution guideline
- [24] Amnuaylojaroen T, Inkom J, Janta R and Surapipith V 2020 Long range transport of Southeast Asian PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution to Northern Thailand during high biomass burning episodes *Sustainability* **12** 10049
- [25] Askariyeh M H, Khreis H and Vallamsundar S 2020 Air pollution monitoring and modeling *Traffic-Related Air Pollution*, ed H Khreis, M Nieuwenhuijsen, et al. (Amsterdam: Elsevier) chapter 5 pp 111–35
- [26] Beevers S D and Williams M 2020 Traffic-related air pollution and exposure assessment *Traffic-Related Air Pollution*, ed H Khreis, M Nieuwenhuijsen, et al. (Amsterdam: Elsevier) chapter 6 pp 137–62
- [27] Pleim J E 2007 A combined local and nonlocal closure model for the atmospheric boundary layer. Part I: Model description and testing *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* **46** 1383–95.
- [28] Pleim J E 2007 A combined local and nonlocal closure model for the atmospheric boundary layer. Part II: Application and evaluation in a mesoscale meteorological model *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* **46** 1396–1409.
- [29] Pleim J and Ran L 2011 Surface Flux Modeling for Air Quality Applications *Atmos.* **2** 271–302
- [30] Wiedinmyer C, Akagi S K, Yokelson R J, Emmons L K, Al-Saadi J A, Orlando J J and Soja A J 2011 The Fire INventory from NCAR (FINN): A high resolution global model to estimate the emissions from open burning *Geosci. Model Dev.* **4** 625–41
- [31] Acid deposition monitoring network in East Asia (EANET) 2020 *Data report 2019*
- [32] Kurokawa J and Ohara T 2020 Long-term historical trends in air pollutant emissions in Asia: Regional Emission inventory in ASia (REAS) version 3 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **20** 12761–93
- [33] Janssens-Maenhout G, Crippa M, Guizzardi D, Dentener F, Muntean M, Pouliot G, Keating T, Zhang Q, Kurokawa J, Wankmüller R, et al. 2015 HTAP\_v2.2: a mosaic of regional and global emission grid maps for 2008 and 2010 to study hemispheric transport of air pollution *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **15** 11411–32
- [34] Guenther A, Karl T, Harley P, Wiedinmyer C, Palmer P I and Geron C 2006 Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature) *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **6** 3181–210

- [35] Carn S A, Fioletov V E, McLinden C A, Li C and Krotkov N A 2017 A decade of global volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> emissions measured from space *Sci. Rep.* **7** 44095