Observed impacts of COVID-19 on urban CO2 emissions

Alexander Turner¹, Jinsol Kim², Helen Fitzmaurice², Catherine Newman², Kevin Worthington², Katherine Chan², Paul Wooldridge², Philipp Köhler³, Christian Frankenberg³, and Ronald C Cohen²

¹University of Washington ²University of California ³California Institute of Technology

November 24, 2022

Abstract

Governments restricted mobility and effectively shuttered much of the global economy in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Six San Francisco Bay Area counties were the first region in the United States to issue a "shelter-in-place" order asking nonessential workers to stay home. Here we use CO2 observations from 35 Berkeley Environment, Air-quality and CO2 Network (BEACO2N) nodes and an atmospheric transport model to quantify changes in urban CO2 emissions due to the order. We infer hourly emissions at 900-m spatial resolution for 6 weeks before and 6 weeks during the order. We observe a 28% decrease in anthropogenic CO2 emissions during the order and show this decrease is primarily due to changes in traffic (-44%) with pronounced changes to daily and weekly cycles; non-traffic emissions show small changes (-8%). These findings provide a glimpse into a future with reduced CO2 emissions through electrification of vehicles. (submitted to GRL: 2020-07-24 16:49:19)

Observed impacts of COVID-19 on urban CO₂ emissions

Alexander J. Turner^{1,2,3*}, Jinsol Kim¹, Helen Fitzmaurice¹, Catherine Newman², Kevin Worthington², Katherine Chan², Paul J. Wooldridge², Philipp Köhler⁴, Christian Frankenberg^{3,4}, and Ronald C. Cohen^{1,2}

¹Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA ²College of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA ³Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, 91109, USA ⁴Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences, California Institute of Technology,

Key Points:

1

2

3

4

6 7 8

10

11	•	Observe a 28% decrease in urban CO_2 emissions from the San Francisco Bay Area
12		in response to COVID-19 mobility restrictions
13	•	Changes are primarily driven by a decrease in CO_2 emissions from traffic (-44%)
14	•	Large change to the weekly and diurnal cycle of emissions with reductions in morn-
15		ing rush-hour emissions

^{*}now at: Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195, USA

Corresponding author: Ronald C. Cohen, rccohen@berkeley.edu

Corresponding author: Alexander J. Turner, turneraj@uw.edu

16 Abstract

¹⁷ Governments restricted mobility and effectively shuttered much of the global economy

¹⁸ in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Six San Francisco Bay Area counties were the

¹⁹ first region in the United States to issue a "shelter-in-place" order asking non-essential

workers to stay home. Here we use CO_2 observations from 35 Berkeley Environment, Air-

 $_{21}$ quality and CO₂ Network (BEACO₂N) nodes and an atmospheric transport model to

quantify changes in urban CO_2 emissions due to the order. We infer hourly emissions

at 900-m spatial resolution for 6 weeks before and 6 weeks during the order. We observe

 24 a 28% decrease in anthropogenic CO₂ emissions during the order and show this decrease is primarily due to changes in traffic (-44%) with pronounced changes to daily and weekly

²⁵ Is primarily due to changes in traffic (-44%) with pronounced changes to daily and weekly
 ²⁶ cycles; non-traffic emissions show small changes (-8%). These findings provide a glimpse

into a future with reduced CO_2 emissions through electrification of vehicles.

²⁸ Plain Language Summary

This work uses atmospheric observations to quantify the changes in urban CO₂ emissions from different sectors in response to COVID-19 mobility regulations.

31 1 Introduction

Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is an atmospheric trace gas responsible for most of the growth 32 in anthropogenic radiative forcing (IPCC, 2013). Mitigating long-term climate change 33 necessitates drastic reductions to our CO_2 emissions. Specifically, limiting global mean 34 warming to 1.5° C requires reaching net-zero anthropogenic CO₂ emissions by 2050 (IPCC, 35 2018). Over 70% of these anthropogenic CO_2 emissions in the United States are attributable 36 to urban areas (EIA, 2015; Hutyra et al., 2014); as such, it is important to be able to 37 accurately quantify the emissions from these regions to support regulatory policies aimed 38 at CO_2 reduction and provide citizens with metrics indicating their effectiveness. 39

The abrupt shuttering of the global economy in response to the COVID-19 global 40 pandemic presents an opportunity to evaluate methods for quantifying urban CO_2 emis-41 sions, to assess our ability to attribute emissions to specific source sectors, and to de-42 scribe the changes in emissions from different sectors. Understanding the changes that 43 occurred during the COVID-19 period will allow us to identify: 1) the magnitude and 44 subset of CO₂ emissions that respond to changes in our travel to/from workplaces on 45 short time scales and 2) the sectors whose emissions persist irrespective of changes in 46 urban travel patterns. Recent research used changes in activity data to predict the im-47 pact of COVID-19 on global CO_2 emissions and inferred a -17% (-11% to -25%) change 48 in global daily CO₂ emissions (Le Quéré et al., 2020). This prediction has yet to be con-49 firmed with measurements of atmospheric CO_2 . 50

The focus of this study is the San Francisco Bay Area in Northern California as 51 it was the first region in the United States to enact regulations on mobility through a 52 "shelter-in-place" (SIP) order on March 16, 2020 (Contra Costa County Health Officer, 53 2020). We use a dense network of CO_2 observations across the north eastern region of 54 the San Francisco Bay Area to quantify the impacts of the SIP order on urban CO_2 emis-55 sions. Figure 1A shows the spatial coverage of our ground-based network of *in situ* sen-56 sors: the Berkeley Environmental Air-quality & CO₂ Network (BEACO₂N; Shusterman 57 et al., 2016; Turner et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2018; Shusterman et al., 2018). We exam-58 ine data from the study period between February 2, 2020 and May 2, 2020, during which 59 35 sensors were operational. 60



Figure 1. Observational network in the San Francisco Bay Area. Panel A shows the location of instruments in the Berkeley Environmental Air-quality & CO₂ Network (BEACO₂N; yellow stars). Panel B shows the cumulative influence to the network derived from STILT foot-prints for observations in March 2020. White contour in both panels indicates the region that contains the largest 40% of the total network influence (referred to as the "BEACO₂N Domain").

61 2 Atmospheric Inversion Framework

Figure 2 shows a comparison of the network-wide CO_2 concentrations averaged for 62 each day-of-week for six weeks before and during the SIP order. We observe a 5-50 ppm 63 decrease in mid-week CO₂ concentrations with the most pronounced changes on Mon-64 day through Thursday during the morning rush-hour ($\sim 07:00$ local time). Weekend con-65 centrations show small differences in the median between the two time periods, although 66 the variability is somewhat larger before the SIP. These observations suggest: 1) large 67 reductions in CO_2 emissions occurred due to the SIP order and 2) marked changes to 68 both the daily and weekly cycle of emissions due to shifts in human activity. Quantify-69 ing and attributing changes in CO₂ concentrations to emissions requires accounting for 70 the coupling of meteorology and emissions. 71

We use the Stochastic Time-Inverted Lagrangian Transport model (STILT; Lin et 72 al., 2003; Fasoli et al., 2018) with meteorology from the NOAA High Resolution Rapid 73 Refresh (HRRR; Kenyon et al., 2016) to both estimate the sensitivity of each measure-74 ment to upwind emission sources and estimate the concentration upwind of our domain. 75 Each measurement (y_i) has a unique surface sensitivity (\mathbf{h}_i) and background concentra-76 tion (b_i) . The measurements are related to the surface CO₂ emissions (**x**) as: $y_i = \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{x}$ 77 b_i and we use Bayesian inference to obtain hourly CO₂ emissions at 900-m spatial res-78 olution from the atmospheric measurements. Prior fluxes are adapted from previous work (Turner et al., 2016; McDonald et al., 2014) but now use a biosphere derived from measurements 80 of solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF; Turner et al., 2020). Additionally, we man-81 ually inspected the 20 largest point sources to ensure they were spatially allocated to plau-82 sible locations. Errors are assumed to be Gaussian and include off-diagonal terms in both 83 error covariance matrices. Following Rodgers (1990), we solve for the hourly posterior 84 fluxes at 900-m spatial resolution as: 85

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}} + (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B})^{T} (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}^{T} + \mathbf{R})^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}})$$
(1)



Figure 2. Weekly CO_2 concentrations before and during shelter-in-place order. Solid lines show the median across the BEACO₂N network and the shaded region indicates the 16th to 84th percentile. Purple shows 6 weeks of data before shelter-in-place (February 2, 2020 through March 14, 2020) and green is 6 weeks during shelter-in-place (March 22, 2020 through May 2, 2020). Blue/yellow background shading is based on cosine of the solar zenith angle with white indicating dawn and dusk.

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ($m \times 1$) is the posterior fluxes, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}$ ($m \times 1$) is the prior emissions, \mathbf{y} ($n \times 1$) is the BEACO₂N observations, \mathbf{H} ($n \times m$) is the matrix of footprints from HRRR-STILT, \mathbf{R} ($n \times n$) is the model-data mismatch error covariance matrix, and \mathbf{B} ($m \times m$) is the prior error covariance matrix (see Supplemental Section S4 for additional details).

Posterior fluxes will reflect the prior fluxes in regions with low sensitivity from the 90 measurements. This can be clearly seen by looking at the gain matrix $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B})^T (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R})^{-1}$ 91 and Eq. 1. We can see that $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}$ in Eq. 1 as $\mathbf{G} \to \mathbf{0}$, indicating that our posterior 92 solution will not deviate from the prior in regions of low sensitivity. As such, we focus 93 our study on regions with high sensitivity because those are the regions that our obser-94 vations can robustly constrain. Figure 1B shows the region of influence for the BEACO₂N network. We find the network to be most sensitive to the eastern portion of the San Fran-96 cisco Bay Area with upwind influence extending east across the bay to San Francisco. 97 The white contour in Figure 1B encapsulates the top 40% of the total of the network sen-98 sitivity, hereafter referred to as the "BEACO₂N Domain", where we expect strong con-99 straints from the measurements. 100

¹⁰¹ 3 High Resolution Posterior Fluxes

The resulting posterior fluxes inferred using $BEACO_2N$ observations are shown in 102 Figure 3. Figs. 3A and 3B show the spatial patterns before and during the shelter-in-103 place order, respectively, while Fig. 3C shows the difference. Changes on roadways are 104 evident in the pattern of differences. Changes to other sectors are more subtle. We have 105 high confidence in the fluxes within the BEACO₂N Domain because this is the region 106 the $BEACO_2N$ network is strongly sensitive to, fluxes outside of this region will revert 107 to the prior emissions. Two spatial features that immediately stand out in Fig. 3C are: 108 a 0.4 tC km⁻² hr⁻¹ decrease in emissions over urban areas within the BEACO₂N Do-109 main and a modest decrease $(0.15 \text{ tC km}^{-2} \text{ hr}^{-1})$ across most of the San Francisco Bay 110 Area. We are able to attribute these observed changes to particular sectors because of 111 the: 1) high spatial resolution obtained here, 2) satellite observations to constrain the 112 biosphere, and 3) detailed prior information available in the region. We find that the mod-113 est regional decrease is due to the biosphere and the large changes in urban areas are 114 predominantly due to decreases in traffic. 115



Figure 3. Spatial patterns of CO_2 fluxes in the San Francisco Bay Area. Panel A shows the average CO_2 fluxes for 6-weeks before shelter-in-place (February 2, 2020 through March 14, 2020). Panel B shows the average over 6-weeks during shelter-in-place (March 22, 2020 through May 2, 2020). Panel C is the difference. Black contour in all panels is the 60th percentile of total network influence (BEACO₂N Domain). Cross hatching indicates regions with low sensitivity to the BEACO₂N nodes.

Estimating CO_2 fluxes from observations during spring is complicated by the on-116 set of photosynthesis which results in a decrease in atmospheric concentrations. In North-117 ern California, this begins with the grasslands and chaparral in land surrounding the ur-118 ban core. As mentioned above, we use high-resolution satellite observations of SIF to con-119 strain the biospheric activity during this time of year (see Turner et al., 2020), which have 120 been shown to correlate strongly with photosynthetic activity (e.g., Frankenberg et al., 121 2011; Yang et al., 2015, and others). These space-borne SIF measurements indicate a 252% (26 tC/hr) increase in daytime CO₂ uptake from the biosphere across the BEACO₂N 123 Domain when comparing before and during the SIP order. This increase in biospheric 124 activity inferred from space-borne SIF measurements drives the regional decrease in CO_2 125 fluxes shown in Figure 3C. 126

The large changes within the BEACO₂N Domain coincide with major freeways in the San Francisco Bay Area. In particular, the largest decreases are observed over Interstate 880 (I-880) that runs north-south from San Jose to Oakland. Our observational network is only sensitive to the northern half of I-880, but the entirety of that section shows decreases in CO₂ fluxes in excess of 0.4 tC km⁻² hr⁻¹. I-880 is a crucial freeway for workers commuting to San Francisco. Other freeways that serve commuters also show large decreases in CO₂ fluxes (e.g., Interstates 80 and 580).

We leverage the high spatial resolution obtained here to partition our posterior CO₂ fluxes to specific sectors because sources spatially separate as the resolution increases. For example, McDonald et al. (2014) demonstrated that 1-kilometer spatial resolution was necessary to distinguish freeways from arterial roads. Here, we classify grid cells that have the majority of prior emissions coming from a single sector (e.g., we classify a grid cell as "traffic" if more than 50% of the prior emissions come from the traffic sector). See Supplemental Section S5 for more details.

Figure 4 attributes the posterior CO_2 emissions within the BEACO₂N Domain to 141 three sectors, 1) vehicle traffic, 2) industrial point sources, home heating, and other non-142 vehicle related anthropogenic emissions, and 3) biogenic. On weekdays before the SIP 143 order, vehicles are the largest source of CO_2 during daytime, while on pre-SIP weekends 144 "other anthropogenic" are the largest daytime source. After the SIP order, "other an-145 thropogenic" is always the largest source. We observe the highest CO_2 emissions dur-146 ing the morning rush hour in the middle of the week. This peak is only present during 147 the weekdays. Daily average emissions increase from Sunday to their maximum on Wednes-148

day and then decrease from Wednesday to Saturday. In contrast, daily average emissions 149 during SIP have more subtle differences between weekdays and weekends, as suggested 150 by the day of week variation in the concentrations of CO_2 shown in Figure 2. Weekday 151 emissions start earlier than on weekends before and after the SIP order. After the SIP, 152 rush hour emissions are lower but they still extend emissions earlier and later than seen 153 on weekends, resulting in a flatter weekday daytime emissions profile than on weekends. 154 Emissions from vehicles at night pre-SIP averaged ~ 150 tC/hr and during SIP the night-155 time emissions averaged $\sim 60 \text{ tC/hr}$. This represents a 61% decrease in nighttime emis-156

sions and a 39% decrease during daytime (245 to 157 tC/hr).



Figure 4. Weekly cycle of CO_2 fluxes before and during shelter-in-place order. Solid lines are the weekly mean CO_2 fluxes over the BEACO₂N Domain (40th percentile shown in Fig. 1) and shading is 1- σ . Black are the total fluxes. Orange are the traffic emissions. Purple are other anthropogenic emissions: industrial point sources, residential heating, and other non-vehicle anthropogenic sources. Green are the biosphere fluxes (Net Ecosystem Exchange; NEE). Panel A shows emissions before shelter-in-place (February 2, 2020 through March 14, 2020) and panel B shows emissions during shelter-in-place (March 22, 2020 through May 2, 2020).

We find a -44% change (-91 tC/hr) in the weekly average CO₂ emissions from grid cells that are classified as freeway whereas emissions from non-traffic anthropogenic sources ("Other Anthro." in Figure 4) only decreased by 8% (-13 tC/hr). Much of this decrease in non-traffic anthropogenic sources occurs at night. Independent data from the California Department of Transportation also indicates a 41% and 34% decrease in vehicle miles traveled by cars and trucks, respectively, for road segments in the BEACO₂N Domain (Caltrans, 2020). The posterior emissions indicate a small diurnal cycle in this sector that is largely absent before the SIP order and is not present in the prior emissions. Such sectoral changes are possible to observe here due to the densely spaced nodes in the BEACO₂N network, allowing us to obtain sub-kilometer spatial resolution and resolve different sectors.

¹⁶⁹ 4 Conclusions

This unnatural experiment conducted in response to COVID-19 has demonstrated 170 the subset of CO_2 emissions that are elastic and those that are more entrenched. Emis-171 sions from traffic are highly elastic and could be rapidly mitigated in response to either 172 technological advances or regulations. In contrast, the non-traffic emissions (e.g., indus-173 trial sources and residential heating) showed minimal changes in response to the shelter-174 in-place order. This implies that those sources are more entrenched and will require longer-175 time scales to mitigate if we hope to limit future warming. These findings provide a glimpse 176 into a future where CO_2 emissions from vehicle traffic are reduced through the electri-177 fication of the vehicle fleet, which would also have air quality co-benefits; observing these 178 CO_2 emission changes from such a transition will require sustained measurements as the 179 changes will be more subtle than the abrupt 45% changes seen here. 180

181 Acknowledgments

¹⁸² We thank B. Fasoli for recent developments to the STILT model and sharing pre-processing

- code, P. Vannucci and A. Lall for feedback, and former members of the BEACO₂N project
- ¹⁸⁴ for establishing the network: A. A. Shusterman, V. Teige, and K. Lieschke. We thank
- the participants of the Keck Institute for Space Studies workshop on COVID-19 and Earth
- ¹⁸⁶ System Science for feedback. We are grateful to the team that has realized the TROPOMI
- ¹⁸⁷ instrument, consisting of the partnership between Airbus Defence and Space, KNMI, SRON,
- and TNO, commissioned by NSO and ESA. **Funding:** AJT was supported as a Miller Fellow with the Miller Institute for Basic Research in Science at UC Berkeley. This re-
- search was funded by grants from the Koret Foundation and University of California,
- ¹⁹¹Berkeley. This research used the Savio computational cluster resource provided by the
- ¹⁹² Berkeley Research Computing program at the University of California, Berkeley (sup-
- ¹⁹³ ported by the UC Berkeley Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Research, and Chief Infor-
- ¹⁹⁴ mation Officer). Author contributions: AJT and RCC wrote the text with feedback
- ¹⁹⁵ from all authors. JK, HF, CN, KW, KC, and PJW collected CO₂ data. PK and CF per-
- ¹⁹⁶ formed the TROPOMI SIF retrieval. AJT conducted the numerical modeling, analysis,
- downscaled SIF data, and drafted figures. **Competing interests:** The authors declare
- no competing interests. Data and materials availability: CO_2 is available at http://beacon.berkeley.edu/.
- ¹⁹⁹ Code has been deposited in GitHub, https://www.github.com/alexjturner/BEACON_XXXX.

200 References

206

207

- Caltrans. (2020). Performance Measurement System Data Source. California Depart ment of Transportation. Retrieved from http://pems.dot.ca.gov
- Contra Costa County Health Officer. (2020). Contra Costa County Shelter-in Place Order. Contra Costa County. Retrieved from https://cchealth.org/
 coronavirus/pdf/HO-COVID19-SIP-0316-2020.pdf
 - EIA. (2015). *Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the U.S.* (Tech. Rep.). U.S. Energy Information Administration.
- Fasoli, B., Lin, J. C., Bowling, D. R., Mitchell, L., & Mendoza, D. (2018). Simulating atmospheric tracer concentrations for spatially distributed receptors:
 updates to the Stochastic Time-Inverted Lagrangian Transport model's R
 interface (STILT-R version 2). Geoscientific Model Development, 11(7), 2813-
- 212 2824. doi: 10.5194/gmd-11-2813-2018
- ²¹³ Frankenberg, C., Fisher, J. B., Worden, J., Badgley, G., Saatchi, S. S., Lee, J.-E.,

214	Yokota, T. (2011). New global observations of the terrestrial carbon cycle
215	from GOSAT: Patterns of plant fluorescence with gross primary productivity.
216	Geophys Res Lett, 38(17). doi: 10.1029/2011gl048738
217	Hutyra, L. R., Duren, R., Gurney, K. R., Grimm, N., Kort, E. A., Larson, E., &
218	Shrestha, G. (2014). Urbanization and the carbon cycle: Current capabilities
219	and research outlook from the natural sciences perspective. Earth's Future,
220	2(10), 473-495. doi: $10.1002/2014 ef 000255$
221	IPCC. (2013). Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution
222	of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental
223	Panel on Climate Change (Tech. Rep.). Author.
224	IPCC. (2018). Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the im-
225	pacts of global warming of 1.5° C above pre-industrial levels and related global
226	greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global
227	response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts
228	to eradicate poverty (Tech. Rep.). Author.
229	Kenyon, J. S., Moninger, W. R., Smith, T. L., Peckham, S. E., Lin, H., Grell, G. A.,
230	Manikin, G. S. (2016). A North American Hourly Assimilation and Model
231	Forecast Cycle: The Rapid Refresh. Monthly Weather Review, 144(4), 1669-
232	1694. doi: 10.1175/mwr-d-15-0242.1
233	Kim, J., Shusterman, A. A., Lieschke, K. J., Newman, C., & Cohen, R. C. (2018).
234	The BErkeley Atmospheric CO ₂ Observation Network: field calibration and
235	evaluation of low-cost air quality sensors. Atmospheric Measurement Tech-
236	niques, 11(4), 1937-1946. doi: 10.5194/amt-11-1937-2018
237	Le Quéré, C., Jackson, R. B., Jones, M. W., Smith, A. J. P., Abernethy, S., Andrew,
238	R. M., Peters, G. P. (2020). Temporary reduction in daily global CO_2
239	emissions during the COVID-19 forced confinement. Nature Climate Change.
240	doi: 10.1038/s41558-020-0797-x
241	Lin, J. C., Gerbig, C., Wofsy, S. C., Andrews, A. E., Daube, B. C., Davis, K. J., &
242	Grainger, C. A. (2003). A near-field tool for simulating the upstream influ-
243	ence of atmospheric observations: The Stochastic Time-Inverted Lagrangian
244	Transport (STILT) model. J Geophys Res-Atmos, 108(D16), 4493–4510. doi:
245	Artn 4493 Doi 10.1029/2002 jd 003161
246	McDonald, B. C., McBride, Z. C., Martin, E. W., & Harley, R. A. (2014). High-
247	resolution mapping of motor vehicle carbon dioxide emissions. J Geophys Res-
248	Atmos, 119(9), 5283-5298. doi: Doi10.1002/2013jd021219
249	Rodgers, C. D. (1990). Characterization and Error Analysis of Profiles Retrieved
250	from Remote Sounding Measurements. J Geophys Res-Atmos, 95(D5), 5587-
251	5595. doi: Doi10.1029/Jd095id05p05587
252	Shusterman, A. A., Kim, J., Lieschke, K. J., Newman, C., Wooldridge, P. J., &
253	Cohen, R. C. (2018) . Observing local CO ₂ sources using low-cost, near-
254	surface urban monitors. Atmos Chem Phys, $18(18)$, $13773-13785$. doi:
255	10.5194/acp-18-13773-2018
256	Shusterman, A. A., Teige, V. E., Turner, A. J., Newman, C., Kim, J., & Co-
257	hen, R. C. (2016) . The BErkeley Atmospheric CO ₂ Observation Net-
258	work: initial evaluation. Atmos Chem Phys, $16(21)$, $13449-13463$. doi:
259	10.5194/acp-16-13449-2016
260	Turner, A. J., K"hler, P., Magney, T. S., Frankenberg, C., Fung, I., & Cohen,
261	R. C. (2020). A double peak in the seasonality of California's photo-
262	synthesis as observed from space. $Biogeosciences, 17(2), 405-422.$ doi:
263	10.5194/bg-17-405-2020
264	Turner, A. J., Shusterman, A. A., McDonald, B. C., Teige, V., Harley, R. A., &
265	Cohen, R. C. (2016). Network design for quantifying urban CO_2 emissions:
266	assessing trade-offs between precision and network density. Atmos Chem Phys,
267	16(21), 13465-13475. doi: 10.5194/acp-16-13465-2016
268	Yang, X., Tang, J., Mustard, J. F., Lee, JE., Rossini, M., Joiner, J., Richard-

269	son, A. D. (2015). Solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence that correlates
270	with canopy photosynthesis on diurnal and seasonal scales in a temper-
271	ate deciduous forest. Geophysical Research Letters, 42(8), 2977-2987. doi:
272	10.1002/2015gl 063201