

# In situ terminal settling velocity measurements at Stromboli volcano: Input from physical characterization of ash

V. Freret-Lorgeril, F. Donnadieu, Julia Eychenne, C. Soriaux, T. Latchimy

# ▶ To cite this version:

V. Freret-Lorgeril, F. Donnadieu, Julia Eychenne, C. Soriaux, T. Latchimy. In situ terminal settling velocity measurements at Stromboli volcano: Input from physical characterization of ash. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 2019, 374, pp.62-79. 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2019.02.005 . hal-02057537

# HAL Id: hal-02057537 https://uca.hal.science/hal-02057537

Submitted on 24 Jan 2020  $\,$ 

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# *In situ* terminal settling velocity measurements at Stromboli volcano: Input from physical characterization of ash

2 3

V. Freret-Lorgeril<sup>1</sup>, F. Donnadieu<sup>1,2</sup>, J. Eychenne<sup>1</sup>, C. Soriaux<sup>1</sup>, T. Latchimy<sup>2</sup>.

4 <sup>1</sup>Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, IRD, OPGC, Laboratoire Magmas et Volcans, F-

5 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

6 <sup>2</sup>CNRS, UMS 833, OPGC, Aubière, France

7 Corresponding author: valentin.freretlo@gmail.com

8

# 9 ABSTRACT

10 Ash particle terminal settling velocity is an important parameter to measure in order to 11 constrain the internal dynamics and dispersion of volcanic ash plumes and clouds that emplace 12 ash fall deposits from which source eruption conditions are often inferred. Whereas the total 13 Particle Size Distribution (PSD) is the main parameter to constrain terminal velocities, many 14 studies have empirically highlighted the need to consider shape descriptors such as the 15 sphericity to refine ash settling velocity as a function of size. During radar remote sensing 16 measurements of weak volcanic plumes erupted from Stromboli volcano in 2015, an optical 17 disdrometer was used to measure the size and settling velocities of falling ash particles over 18 time, while six ash fallout samples were collected at different distances from the vent. We focus 19 on the implications of the physical parameters of ash for settling velocity measurements and 20 modeling. Two-dimensional sizes and shapes are automatically characterized for a large 21 number of ash particles using an optical morpho-grainsizer MORPHOLOGI G3. Manually 22 sieved ash samples show sorted, relatively coarse PSDs spanning a few microns to 2000 µm 23 with modal values between 180-355 µm. Although negligible in mass, a population of fine 24 particles below 100 µm form a distinct PSD with a mode around 5-20 µm. All size distributions 25 are offset compared to the indicated sieve limits. Accordingly, we use the diagonal of the upper 26 mesh sizes as the upper sieve limit. Morphologically, particles show decreasing average form 27 factors with increasing circle-equivalent diameter, the latter being equal to 0.92 times the 28 average size between the length and intermediate axes of ash particles. Average particle densities measured by water pycnometry are  $2755 \pm 50$  kg m<sup>-3</sup> and increase slightly from 2645 29 to 2811 kg m<sup>-3</sup> with decreasing particle size. The measured settling velocities under laboratory 30 conditions with no wind,  $< 3.6 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , are in agreement with the field velocities expected for 31 32 particles with sizes < 460 µm. The Ganser (1993) empirical model for particle settling velocity

33 is the most consistent with our disdrometer settling velocity results. Converting disdrometer 34 detected size into circle equivalent diameter shows similar PSDs between disdrometer measurements and G3 analyses. This validates volcanological applications of the disdrometer 35 36 to monitor volcanic ash sizes and settling velocities in real-time with ideal field conditions. We 37 discuss ideal conditions and the measurement limitations. In addition to providing 38 sedimentation rates in-situ, calculated reflectivities can be compared with radar reflectivity 39 measurements inside ash plumes to infer first-order ash plume concentrations. Detailed PSDs 40 and shape parameters may be used to further refine radar-derived mass loading retrievals of the 41 ash plumes.

## 42 Highlights:

An optical disdrometer is used to measure ash sizes and settling velocities at Stromboli.
Collected ash samples show sorted and coarse particle size distributions.
Ash particles density and sphericity slightly decrease with augmenting size.
Ganser's law (1993) best fits disdrometer field measurements of settling velocities.
Volcanological applications of disdrometers to monitor ash fallout are validated.
Keywords: Terminal Settling Velocity; Ash fallout; Particle size; Morphology;

- 50 Disdrometer; Stromboli.
- 51

# 52 **1. Introduction**

53 Constraining volcanic ash plume dynamics, dispersion and fallout processes is of 54 paramount importance for the mitigation of related impacts, such as those on infrastructure, 55 transportation networks, human health (Baxter, 1999; Wilson et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2012). 56 The terminal settling velocity  $(V_T)$  of particles transported in volcanic ash plumes influences 57 plume dispersal in the atmosphere, controls the sedimentation pattern in space and time, and in 58 turn, the formation of ash deposits (Beckett *et al.*, 2015; Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016a).  $V_T$  is 59 used to estimate ash mass deposition rates (Pfeiffer et al., 2005; Beckett et al., 2015) and it 60 mainly depends on the total grain size distribution (TGSD), and the density and the shape of 61 ash particles. Retrieving the TGSD in real-time is currently impossible for operational purpose 62 owing to the lack of direct measurements of the in situ Particle Size Distribution (PSD; e.g., 63 inside the plume). It is generally obtained from post-eruption analyses of ash deposits 64 (Andronico et al., 2014) or from a multi-sensor strategy (Bonadonna et al., 2011; Corradini et 65 al., 2016) comprising, for instance, satellite images (Prata, 1989; Prata & Grant, 2001; Prata & 66 Bernardo, 2009) and radar remote sensing (Marzano et al., 2006a, 2006b), coupled to ground 67 sampling. Meteorological optical disdrometers, although originally designed for hydrometeors, can be used to record volcanic ash fallout, and provide particle number density, settling 68 69 velocities and sizes in near real-time at a single location. Disdrometer measurements can be 70 used to calibrate dispersion model outputs, as well as radar observations from an empirical law 71 relating derived radar reflectivity factors and associated particle mass concentrations. First-72 order estimates of their mass loading parameters, of primary importance for hazard evaluation, 73 can then be made by comparing the calculated reflectivities to radar measurements inside ash 74 plumes (Maki et al., 2016).

75 Volcanic Ash Transport and Dispersion (VATD) models require equations relating  $V_T$ 76 to particle size distribution in order to make accurate forecasts of ash dispersion and deposition. 77 As  $V_T$  also depends on particle shape parameters and densities, these need to be characterized 78 as a function of sizes. Ash particles are highly heterogeneous in shape and size due to a variety 79 of fragmentation processes (Cashman & Rust, 2016), leading to the development of empirical 80 laws describing the aerodynamic drag of the particles, from which terminal velocity depends. 81 Initially this was done for spherical grains (Gunn & Kinzer, 1947; Wilson & Huang, 1979 and 82 references therein) and then for non-spherical particle shapes based on laboratory experiments

83 (Kunii & Levenspiel, 1969; Ganser, 1993; Chien, 1994; Dellino *et al.*, 2005; Coltelli *et al.*, 84 2008; Dioguardi & Mele, 2015; Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016b; Del Bello *et al.* 2017; Dioguardi 85 *et al.*, 2017). Such studies have revealed the need to consider the morphological aspects of ash 86 particles to refine  $V_T$  estimates, in addition to the total grain size distribution.

A geophysical measurement campaign at Stromboli volcano was carried out between the  $23^{rd}$  of September and the  $4^{th}$  of October 2015 to characterize the mass load of ash plumes and their dynamics using radars at different wavelengths, including a millimeter-wave radar for ash tracking (Donnadieu *et al.*, 2016). In addition, falling ash particles were measured in-situ and in real-time using an optical disdrometer and samples from ground tarps, in order to constrain the PSD. The PSD is required to quantify the mass load parameters of the plume from the radar reflectivity measurements.

In this paper, we present a physical characterization of ash particles from Strombolian weak plumes using ash samples collected from ground tarps and near-ground disdrometer measurements of the falling ash. **Section 2** focuses on the instruments and methodologies utilized to characterize ash samples and these results are presented in **section 3**. In **section 4** we present  $V_T$  measurements of ash particles obtained in the field and under laboratory conditions and compare them to existing empirical models. We discuss the results and limitations and then give conclusive remarks of this study in **section 5** and **6**, respectively.

# 101 **2. Materials and methods**

#### 102 **2.1 Ash sampling in the field**

103 Ash samples from ash-laden plumes of Stromboli volcano were collected on the ground 104 from a 0.4 m<sup>2</sup> tarp (0.45 m  $\times$  0.9 m) and a collector (0.6 m  $\times$  0.6 m) during a Doppler radar measurement campaign between the 23<sup>rd</sup> September and the 4<sup>th</sup> October 2015 (Donnadieu et 105 al., 2016). During this period, Stromboli eruptive activity was weak, producing type 2a and/or 106 107 2b eruptions (Patrick et al., 2007), which are characterized by the emission of ash plumes rising 108 200 to 400 m high above the active vents, and drifted towards the North to the North-East with 109 prevailing winds. Six ash samples from different ash fallout events were collected on a ground 110 tarp at different locations and distances from the area of the craters: (i) two on the NE flank

(Roccete) 500 to 600 m from the summit vents (white cross in Figure 1), (ii) three near Pizzo Sopra la Fossa, ~320-330 m northeast of the SW crater (blue cross in Figure 1), next to the optical disdrometer (white square in Figure 1), and (iii) one in a collector at Punta Labronzo ~2 km to the North (green cross in Figure 1). Details on ash sample collection dates and locations are summarized in Table 1.

Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Eruption time UTC (HH:MM)	location	Sample names	GPS point (UTM)	Collected mass (g)
09/25/2015	16:36	near Pizzo Sopra la Fossa	1636_summit	33 S 0518663 UTM 4293821	0.642
10/02/2015	12:46	NE flank (Roccete)	1246_roc	33 S 0518774 UTM 4294327	4.971
10/02/2015	15:30	Punta Labronzo	1530PL	33 S 0518720 UTM 4295743	0.259
10/02/2015	15:50	near Pizzo Sopra la Fossa	1550_summit	33 S 0518663 UTM 4293821	0.068
10/03/2015	10:42-12:52	NE flank (Roccete)	1042- 1252_roc	33 S 0518774 UTM 4294327	6.801
10/03/2015	16:01	near Pizzo Sopra la Fossa	1601_summit	33 S 0518663 UTM 4293821	25.230

*Table 1*: Date and locations of the six collected ash samples.



119

Figure 1: Map of Stromboli Island. The Optical disdrometer was set up next to Pizzo Sopra la Fossa at
 900 m a.s.l. (white square), 320 m and 330 m away from the NE (white triangle) and the SW crater (red
 triangle), respectively. Ash samples were collected at Pizzo Sopra la Fossa next to the disdrometer (blue
 cross), on the NE flank (Roccete) 500-670 m NE from the vents (white cross) and at Punta Labronzo
 (1530PL sample, green cross) about 2 km North from the vents.

# 125 **2.2 Grain-size and morphological analyses**

126 The samples were manually sieved twice to determine their PSDs at 1/2  $\Phi$  and 1/4  $\Phi$ 127 intervals. The mass of each fraction was measured with a 10<sup>-4</sup> g accuracy weighing scale. The 128 relation between  $\Phi$  scale and circle equivalent diameters (*D*) is given by  $\Phi = -\log_2(D \text{ (mm)})$ . 129 In total, less than 0.5% of the mass of ash collected was lost during the 1/2  $\Phi$  mechanical 130 sieving. We calculated the sorting coefficient *S*<sub>0</sub> from Folk & Ward (1957):

131 
$$S_0 = \frac{\Phi 84 - \Phi 16}{4} + \frac{\Phi 95 - \Phi 5}{6.6},$$
 (1)

132 with  $\Phi$ 84,  $\Phi$ 16,  $\Phi$ 95 and  $\Phi$ 5 being the  $\Phi$  values corresponding to the 84<sup>th</sup>, the 16<sup>th</sup>, the 95<sup>th</sup> and 133 the 5<sup>th</sup> percentiles, respectively, of the calculated PSD. The lower the *S*<sub>0</sub>, the more sorted the 134 PSD.

To study the size and shapes of ash particles, we use the MORPHOLOGI G3<sup>TM</sup> 135 automated optical analyzer (named G3 is this study) designed by Malvern Instruments<sup>TM</sup>. 136 137 Particles from a given sieve are placed on a glass plate and illuminated from below (diascopic 138 illumination). The G3's microscope measures the 2-D projected areas and shapes of a sample 139 of particles, allowing an automatic analysis of morphological parameters such as the size and 140 2-D shape parameters. We used a  $\times$  5 magnification leading to an image resolution of 3.3 141 pixel/ $\mu$ m<sup>2</sup> (*i.e.* less than 0.5  $\mu$ m of minimum resolution). Typically, tens of particles of size 1 142  $\Phi$  up to 18000 particles of size < 4  $\Phi$  can be processed in 35 minutes (fast and routine analyzes, 143 Leibrandt & Le Pennec, 2015). In order to reduce the size range of the individual particles 144 analyzed while keeping them optically focused, the half-  $\Phi$  fractions were sieved at a 1/4  $\Phi$ . 145 Obtained sieving results are presented in Appendix A.

We measure the following size parameters: (i) the longest axis (*L*) and (ii) intermediate axis (*I*) in the 2-D plane orthogonal to the light direction; (iii) the circle-equivalent diameter  $D_{CE} = 2 \times (A_p/\pi)^{1/2}$  measured from the particle section area  $A_p$ ; and (iv) the sphere-equivalent volume calculated with diameter  $D_{CE}$ . Due to the 2-D imaging inherent to the methodology, we assume that particles always show the maximum projection area (Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016) and, hence, their short (*S*) axes are always oriented orthogonal to the image plan, *i.e.*  $S \leq I$ .

152 From the measurements of L, I and  $A_p$ , the following morphological parameters are defined: (i) the Elongation e = I/L (Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016b); (ii) the Convexity  $C_v =$ 153  $P_{CH}/P_p$ , corresponding to the textural roundness of the particles with perimeter  $P_p$  (Liu *et al.*, 154 155 2015), and  $P_{CH}$  being the convex hull perimeter (*i.e.* the smallest convex polygon containing all 156 pixels of the analyzed particle); (iii) the solidity  $S_d = A_p/A_{CH}$  (Cioni et al., 2014), indicative of 157 the high wavelength (i.e., morphological) roughness of the particles (Cioni et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2015b) with  $A_{CH}$  being the convex hull area; and (iv) the sphericity  $\varphi = 4\pi A_p/P_p^2$  as an 158 indicator of the roughness and the shape of the particles (Riley *et al.*, 2003). The sphericity  $\varphi$  is 159 equal to the square of the circularity  $C_c$  (*i.e.* equal to  $2(\pi A_p)^{1/2}/P_p$ ) defined by Leibrandt & Le 160 Pennec (2015). According to Liu et al. (2015a), the shape parameters associated to the convex 161 162 hull, such as  $S_d$  and  $C_v$ , characterize the roughness of particles independently of their form.

163 These parameters range from 0 to 1 (*e.g.*, a perfect sphere has a value of 1) and are all described 164 in Leibrandt & Le Pennec (2015), Liu *et al.* (2015a, 2015b) and Riley *et al.* (2003).

165 A complete PSD from G3 analyses, comprising all analyzed 1/4  $\Phi$  sieved fractions, is 166 estimated by combining (i) the measured mass fractions from 1/4  $\Phi$  sieving with (ii) the sphere-167 equivalent volume ( $V_{SE}$ ) of particles measured by the G3 for each analyzed fraction:

168 
$$m_i^{wt\%} = \sum_j \left( \frac{\mathbf{V}_{SEi,j}}{\sum_i \left( \mathbf{V}_{SEi,j} \right)} m_j^{wt\%} \right), \tag{2}$$

169 where subscript *i* denotes the size bin containing individual particles analyzed by the G3 having 170 a  $D_{CE}$  diameter within the upper and lower bounds of the bin, whereas subscript *j* stands for the 171 sieve size fraction from manual sieving. Each bin *i* has a 5 µm resolution and the uncertainty 172 associated with the G3 image resolution is thus considered as negligible.  $m_i^{wt\%}$  is the weight 173 fraction of particles in the *i*th bin size, and  $m_j^{wt\%}$  is the mass percentage of the analyzed sieve 174 fraction *j* of the total sample mass. The ratio  $V_{SEi,j} / \sum_i (V_{SEi,j})$  is the sphere-equivalent volume

175 ratio of particles belonging to the *i*th bin size with respect to all particles from a sieved fraction 176 *j*. We use the sphere-equivalent volume derived from the G3, rather than the number of 177 particles, to minimize the error propagation in the mass calculation due to the large increase in 178 particle number with decreasing size.

#### 179 **2.3 Ash density measurements**

180 The average densities of ash particles of  $1/4 \Phi$  sieved fractions of the two samples with 181 the largest mass (1601\_summit and 1246\_roc) are measured by water pycnometry (Eychenne 182 & Le Pennec, 2012). This method allows the estimation of ash particle density by volume 183 difference between a  $9.5 \times 10^{-6}$  m<sup>3</sup> boro-silicate pycnometer filled with distilled and degassed 184 water and then filled with water and a known mass of ash sample.

185 The density of particles is given by:

186 
$$\rho_i = \frac{m_i \rho_w}{m_{w1} - m_{w2}},$$
 (3)

187 with  $\rho_i$  the density of the *i*th ash size class in kg.m<sup>-3</sup>,  $\rho_w$  the density taken to be 1000 kg m<sup>-3</sup>,  $m_i$ 188 the mass of ash incorporated into the pycnometer (0.4 to 2 g),  $m_{w1}$  the mass of water required 189 to fill the reference pycnometer volume and  $m_{w2}$  the mass of water required to fill the 190 pycnometer once the ash sample has been added.

By using water pycnometry, we measure the average particle density of a given sieved fraction. For particles between 125 μm and 700 μm, we assume that water surface tension can be considered as sufficiently strong to avoid vesicle and asperity filling. For this hypothesis to be verified, the particles are dried in an oven before being incorporated into the water (Eychenne & Le Pennec, 2012). Thus, the measured densities correspond to the apparent densities of the particles, which represents their mass divided by their solid volume and the volume linked to their porosity.

#### 198 **2.4 The optical disdrometer and particle settling experiments**

199 The optical disdrometer Parsivel<sup>2</sup>, designed by OTT, uses a 780 nm wavelength laser 200 beam emitted from a transmitter to a receiver, which converts the transmitted laser light into a 201 voltage signal. Described in Löffler-Mang & Jürg (2000) and Tokay et al. (2014), the 202 disdrometer measures the settling velocities and sizes of particles when as they pass through 203 the laser sheet. The laser obscuration time is used to estimate the settling velocities. The longer 204 a particle takes to cross the beam, the lower the settling velocity. Then, the amplitude of the 205 laser light extinction is used to calculate the size of the particles. By measuring the number of falling particles and their settling velocity class values (Appendix B), the disdrometer 206 207 calculates the number density of particles crossing the beam as:

208 
$$N_i(D_i) = \frac{n_i}{v_i A \Delta t dD_i},$$
 (4)

with  $N_i(D_i)$  the particle number density (mm<sup>-1</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>) of the *i*th disdrometer size class,  $n_i$  the number of detected particles with measured settling velocity  $v_i$  (m s<sup>-1</sup>), A the laser sheet area (54 × 10<sup>-4</sup> m<sup>2</sup>),  $\Delta t$  the sampling interval (10 s) and  $dD_i$  the size range (mm) of the disdrometer *i*th size class. The disdrometer measures settling velocities between 0.05 and 20.8 m s<sup>-1</sup> distributed among 32 classes (Classes 1 to 22 are displayed in **Appendix B**) and detects particles with diameter from 250 µm to 26 × 10<sup>3</sup> µm. We performed in-situ measurements of falling ash during the field campaign at Stromboli. The disdrometer was set up about 80 cm above the ground close to Pizzo Sopra La Fossa (**Figure 1**), 320-330 m northeast of the SW crater. The disdrometer recorded the ash fallout events from weak Strombolian plumes that produced the two ash samples collected from ground tarps next to the disdrometer (1601\_summit) and lower down the NE flank (1246\_roc).

In order to establish the ash fallout detection limits of the disdrometer and to estimate the influence of the wind on particle settling velocities in the field, disdrometer retrievals are tested under laboratory conditions of no horizontal nor vertical wind. Sieved ash particles from the 1601\_summit sample are dropped from heights between 3 m and 11 m above the disdrometer laser sheet in order to verify that terminal settling velocities were reached for each sieved size fraction.

#### 226 **2.5 Terminal settling velocity models**

The terminal settling velocity depends on the size, the shape and the density of falling particles that affect their drag forces and hence the flow regime adopted by the ambient carrier fluid. For individual particle settling,  $V_T$  is defined by the following equation (Wilson & Huang, 1979; Woods & Bursik, 1991; Sparks *et al.*, 1997):

231 
$$V_{T} = \sqrt{D_{CE} \frac{4g(\rho - \rho_{a})}{3\rho_{a}C_{D}}},$$
 (5)

where  $V_{\rm T}$  is the terminal settling velocity of the particle (m s<sup>-1</sup>),  $D_{CE}$  is the circle-equivalent diameter corresponding to the diameter of a circle (applicable to a sphere) with area measured by the G3 for each particle, g is the gravitational acceleration (m s<sup>-2</sup>),  $\rho$  and  $\rho_a$  are the particle and air densities, respectively, in kg m<sup>-3</sup>. Here,  $\rho_a$  is equal to 1.2 kg m<sup>-3</sup> at a temperature of 15 °C at sea level (similar to laboratory conditions) and equals to 1.12 kg m<sup>-3</sup> at 900 m a.s.l. (similar to field conditions). Finally,  $C_D$  is the drag coefficient and depends on the shapes of the settling particles and the Reynolds number Re, which describes the flow regime in which particles fall:

$$Re = \frac{V_T D \rho_a}{\mu}, \tag{6}$$

where  $V_T$  corresponds to the settling velocity of a particle within a non-moving ambient fluid (*i.e.* the air in this case) with a viscosity  $\mu$  (Pa s) equals to  $1.85 \times 10^{-5}$  Pa s at a temperature of 15 °C at sea level (similar to laboratory conditions) and equals to  $1.786 \times 10^{-5}$  Pa at 900 m a.s.l. (similar to field conditions).

To verify that ash particles were falling at their  $V_T$ , we compared the disdrometer measurements with empirical  $V_T$  laws that are based on the following assumptions.

First, for particle Reynolds Number between 0.4 and 500 at an altitude of 5 km above sea level (a.s.l.) and assuming spherical particle diameters less than 1500  $\mu$ m,  $V_T$  of a particle can be expressed as (Kunii & Levenspiel, 1969; Bonadonna *et al.*, 1998; Coltelli *et al.*, 2008):

249 
$$V_T = D \left( \frac{4g^2 \rho^2}{255 \mu \rho_a} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$
 (7)

Then, we compare our results with the models of Ganser (1993) and Bagheri & Bonadonna (2016b) based on **Equation 5**, which account for non-spherical particle shapes. In such a case, the drag equations are derived from empirical analyses of particle settling velocities and are not related to the same particle shape parameters.

In Ganser (1993),  $C_D$  is determined as follows:

255 
$$C_{D} = \frac{24}{ReK_{1}K_{2}} \left[ 1 + 0.1118 \left( ReK_{1}K_{2} \right)^{0.6567} \right] + \left( \frac{0.4305}{1 + \frac{3305}{ReK_{1}K_{2}}} \right).$$
(8)

256  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  being the Stokes' shape factor and the Newton's shape factor, respectively:

257 
$$K_1 = \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\varphi^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1}, \qquad (9)$$

258 
$$K_2 = 10^{1.8148(-\log \varphi)^{0.5743}},$$
 (10)

259 where  $\varphi$  is the G3-derived sphericity (Riley *et al.*, 2003) of particles considered as isometric (*I* 260 =*S*) and is the best shape parameter to be used in the Ganser model (Alfano *et al.*, 2011).

In Bagheri & Bonadonna (2016b),  $C_D$  is calculated as:

262 
$$C_{D} = \frac{24k_{S}}{Re} \left[ 1 + 0.125 \left( Re \frac{k_{N}}{k_{S}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \right] + \left[ \frac{0.46}{1 + 5330 \left( Re \frac{k_{N}}{k_{S}} \right)} \right],$$
(11)

263 with  $k_s$  and  $k_N$ , being shape factors equal to:

264 
$$k_{S} = (F_{S}^{1/3} + F_{S}^{-1/3})/2, \qquad (12)$$

265 where 
$$F_s = f e^{1.3} \left( \frac{D_{CE}^3}{L I S} \right)$$
 and  $F_N = f^2 e \left( \frac{D_{CE}^3}{L I S} \right)$ 

266 and

267 
$$k_N = 10^{\alpha_2 \left[-\log\left(F_N\right)\right]^{\beta_2}},$$
 (13)

268 where  $\alpha_2 = 0.45 + 10/\exp(2.5\log(\rho/\rho_a) + 30)$  and  $\beta_2 = 1 - 37/\exp(3\log(\rho/\rho_a) + 100)$ 

These shape factors depend on 3-D ash particle axes such as L, I, S and also the elongation (I/L) and flatness (S/I).

Because  $C_D$ , Re and  $V_T$  are dependent on each other, we use an iterative approach to determine the settling velocities with both aforementioned models. We initialize  $V_T$  using the Stokes law, where  $V_T^{Stokes} = (g D_{CE}^2 (\rho - \rho_a))/18\mu$ , and then iteratively calculate Re,  $C_D$ , and  $V_T$ (Equation 5). The iterations are stopped when the velocity difference is less than 10<sup>-8</sup>.

Finally, we calculate  $V_{\rm T}$  using the Dellino *et al.* (2005) relationship:

276 
$$V_{T} = \frac{1.2065\mu \left( D_{CE}^{3} g \left( \rho - \rho_{a} \right) \rho \psi^{1.6} / \mu^{2} \right)}{D_{CE} \rho}, \qquad (14)$$

where  $\psi$  is a shape factor defined as the ratio between the particle sphericity (Riley *et al.*, 2003) and  $1/C_c$ . Thus, the combination of **Equation 5** and the drag coefficient of spherical particles leads to the equation of Dellino *et al.* (2005), which does not depend on  $C_D$  and *Re*. **Equation 14** is only valid for Reynolds number > 60-100 (Dioguardi *et al.*, 2018).

Ash morphological parameters are required in order to compare models of  $V_{\rm T}$  for nonspherical particles to ash settling velocities measured in the field or under laboratory conditions. These parameters are characterized in the following section for Strombolian ash.

#### 284 **3 Ash characteristics**

#### 285 **3.1** Particle size distribution by mechanical sieving and morpho-grainsizer

286 Here we present sieving results obtained for the six ash samples. Values are available in 287 Appendix A. The PSD from  $1/2 \Phi$  sieving for the proximal samples collected on the summit 288 have modal values ranging from 125-180 µm (1550\_summit) to 250-355 µm (1601\_summit) 289 (Figure 2). The same range of PSD modes is observed for the proximal samples collected lower 290 down on the East flank at Roccete (1042-1252\_roc and 1246\_roc). The 1530PL sample 291 collected 2 km to the North of the summit vent at Punta Labronzo shows a mode at 125-180 292  $\mu$ m. Particle sizes range from < 63  $\mu$ m to 1400  $\mu$ m in 1246\_roc and from < 63  $\mu$ m to 2000  $\mu$ m 293 in 1601\_summit (Figure 2). Therefore, there is no obvious correlation between sample location 294 and PSD, an observation also made by Lautze et al. (2013) on ash samples from type 2 eruptions 295 at Stromboli in 2009. Sorting coefficients  $S_0$  of 0.27-0.47 indicate sorted PSDs for all ash 296 samples from a single ash plume (Figure 2). The higher sorting coefficient  $S_0$  of 0.75 for the 297 1042-1252\_roc sample is due to the collection of a 2-hour long succession of fallout events 298 with potentially variable PSDs, the sum of which leads to a less sorted PSD. We cannot exclude 299 some dust contamination from this sample.

Following the 1/4  $\Phi$  sieving, the particle number frequency histogram of each sieved fraction is calculated from the G3 analyses. As observed by Leibrandt & Le Pennec, 2015, PSDs from the sieve fractions show a large offset toward  $D_{CE}$  values larger than the sieve mesh sizes. In particular, the modal  $D_{CE}$  can lay well beyond the sieve mesh limits as shown for the 1601\_summit sample (fractions < 63 µm to 425-500 µm; **Figure 3**). For example, the 250-300 µm sieve fraction (red PSD in **Figure 3**) actually ranges between 248-551.78 µm in  $D_{CE}$ , with a mode at 350 µm, leading to 95.1% of the PSD lying above the upper sieve limit.



**Figure 2**:  $1/2 \Phi$  Particle size distributions determined by manual sieving for the six ash samples of 309 Table 1. S<sub>0</sub> is the Folk & Ward (1957) sorting coefficient. Lower S<sub>0</sub> indicates better sorting.



Figure 3: Individual particle number frequency histograms retrieved from the G3 analyses of 1/4 Φ sieved fractions from the 1601\_summit ash sample. Shaded red areas highlight the sieve intervals in circle-equivalent diameter and the percentage of the PSD larger than the upper sieve mesh is displayed in red. The vertical purple dashed lines indicate the diagonal dimension of the sieve upper mesh size, a better fit to the true PSD upper bound, as shown by the small residual percentage of the PSD (in black) larger than the diagonal of the sieve upper mesh. The intervals of the corrected sieve mesh sizes (down mesh size to diagonal of the upper mesh size) are indicated in color above each histogram.

319 The number proportion of the PSD lying above the upper sieve limit increases with sieve 320 mesh size, with a minimum value of 26.2% for the  $< 63 \mu$ m fraction and up to 96.2% for the 425-500 µm fraction. This discrepancy is explained by the fact that sieve mesh sizes (side 321 322 dimension of the squared mesh) are given for supposedly spherical particles, whereas ash 323 particles are non-spherical and often depart significantly from a spherical shape. Therefore, 324 many particles with their largest and intermediate axes higher than the mesh size can be found 325 in the sieved fraction depending on their orientation while passing through the mesh. The length 326 of the squared mesh diagonal, as opposed to the mesh size, represents the true sieve upper limit 327 when dealing with non-spherical particles, as shown by the small residual percentages of the 328 PSD (1-6%) above the upper mesh diagonal length. Consequently, we use the lower mesh size and the diagonal length of the upper mesh, *i.e.* the upper mesh side length multiplied by  $\sqrt{2}$ 329

330 (vertical purple dashed line in **Figure 3**), to characterize the circle-equivalent diameter 331 distributions of ash particles. These bounds of  $D_{CE}$  contain more than 94% of the ash particles

- in each fraction and are thus representative. In this new reference frame, for example, the 250-
- 333 300  $\mu$ m sieve fraction (*i.e.*  $\Phi$ =2) has  $D_{CE}$  lower and upper limits of 250 and 424.3  $\mu$ m.



334

**Figure 4**: Comparison of mass- and number-based PSD in the 125-254.6  $\mu$ m sieve fraction from the 1601\_summit ash sample. The right axis represents the number frequency measured by G3 (blue histogram). The left axis represents the particle mass percentage  $m_i^{\%}$  (orange bars) using sphereequivalent volumes measured by the G3.

339 Every sieved fraction of the six ash samples, when analyzed in number frequency, shows 340 a distinct population of very fine ash particles with a relatively constant modal value between 341 5-20 µm. For example, in the 125-254.6 µm fraction of the 1601\_summit sample (blue 342 histogram in Figure 4), the secondary PSD of fine ash represents 73% of the total sieved fraction PSD in terms of particle number frequency (blue histogram in Figure 4), whereas these 343 344 very fine particles represent only 3% of the whole PSD in mass or volume percentage. Likewise, 345 in the other sieve fractions, the population of very fine ash appears as a decoupled PSD with a 346 high contribution to the particle number frequency, but negligible in terms of mass or volume.

347 Finally, because  $D_{CE}$  distributions among successive sieve fractions exhibit a dramatic 348 overlap (Figure 3), we calculate mass percentages (Equation 2) over the whole PSD in 5 µm 349 bins by weighting the high resolution sphere-equivalent volume from the G3 analyses with the 350 mass percentage of each sieved fraction at  $1/4 \Phi$ . This calculation leads to high resolution (5 351 µm) mass percentage PSDs for the six ash samples (Figure 5). They show a unimodal 352 distribution whereas the  $1/4 \Phi$  sieves display two close maxima, the latter due to splitting of a 353 unique mode at the bin transition (250 µm) into adjacent bins in Figures 5A and 5F. For the 354 1601\_summit and the 1042-1252\_roc samples (Figure 5A and Figure 5F), the PSD obtained 355 from the  $1/2 \Phi$  sieving broadly matches the corrected high resolution PSD in terms of modal 356 value, whereas the  $1/4 \Phi$  PSDs tend to show a mode lower than that of the corrected PSD. 357 Unlike the 1601\_summit and 1042-1252\_roc calculated PSD, the other calculated PSDs are 358 well sorted (0.47-0.52).

359 The aforementioned artificial offset of the sieving PSDs toward smaller  $D_{CE}$  is more 360 obvious in the other ash samples (Figures 5B, 5C, 5D and 5E), emphasizing the significant 361 bias on resulting PSD introduced by sieving non-spherical particles. Indeed, whereas spherical 362 particles would be blocked by a sieve squared mesh having its side length corresponding to 363 their diameter, coarser particles with some degree of elongation can cross the squared mesh 364 along its diagonal (side length times  $\sqrt{2}$ ) and appear in lower (smaller mesh-sized) sieves. As sieve mesh size intervals increase with diameter (*i.e.* decreasing  $\Phi$ ), the shift in diameter 365 366 increases for coarser particles. Therefore, the sieving-derived PSDs agree more closely with 367 high resolution PSDs derived from optical measurements for finer particles.

368



Figure 5: Comparison of the PSDs calculated from G3 analyses with the PSDs inferred from manual sieving (1/4 Φ, red step line; 1/2 Φ, black step line) for the six ash samples 1601\_summit (A), 1246\_roc
(B), 1530PL (C), 1550\_summit (D), 1636\_summit (E), and 1042-1252\_roc (F).

#### 375 **3.2 Ash densities**

To constrain  $V_T$ , we use water pycnometry to measure the density of ash samples from 376 the fallout detected by the optical disdrometer. Samples 1246\_roc and 1601\_summit have 377 similar density trends (Figure 6). The average particle density of all measurements from the 378 two summit samples is equal to  $2755 \pm 58$  kg m<sup>-3</sup>. The density trend beyond  $\Phi \ge 2.5$  is uncertain 379 380 because the measurement's accuracy is lower for fine particles and small sample mass, as seen 381 from the increased spread of the 1601 summit measurements for  $\Phi \ge 2.5$ . For this reason, we 382 mixed the 3.5 to 2.5  $\Phi$  fractions of the 1246 roc sample to calculate a more representative average density of  $2811 \pm 55$  kg m<sup>-3</sup>. In both samples, average densities slightly decrease with 383 increasing diameter from  $\Phi=2.5$  to  $\Phi=1$  (*i.e.* 180-500 µm) from a maximum value of 2811 ± 384 55 kg m<sup>-3</sup> to  $2645 \pm 35$  kg m<sup>-3</sup>. Over a particle size distribution, tephra densities typically form 385 386 a sigmoidal trend that was previously described for andesitic, dacitic and rhyolitic ash 387 (Eychenne & Le Pennec, 2012; Cashman & Rust, 2016). This sigmoidal trend is apparent for 388  $\Phi \le 0.5$  (*i.e.*  $D_{CE} \ge 710 \ \mu\text{m}$ ) and the slight density decrease with increasing diameter might represent the beginning of a sigmoidal trend in density variation. 389



390 391

**Figure 6**: Ash densities determined by water pycnometry for the two samples 1601\_summit (grey dots) and 1246\_roc (red diamonds) as a function of the 1/4  $\Phi$  fractions. Dashed lines correspond to the average density of each grain size class.

#### 395 **3.3 Particle shapes**

396 A comparison between  $S_d$  and  $C_v$  of the modal PSD classes of the six distinct ash samples (Figures 2 and 5) shows homogeneous average distributions of textural and 397 398 morphological roughness among all samples (Figure 7A and Table 2). This observation is 399 similar to morphometric analyses done by Lautze et al. (2011, 2013) at Stromboli showing no 400 obvious relationship between particle shapes and the relatively short distance travelled from the 401 source vent. In all samples, the average values of  $S_d$  and  $C_v$  are similar (**Table 2**) except for the 402 1042-1252\_roc sample, which records several fallout events over a longer collection time, as 403 opposed to the other samples, and is possibly contaminated by wind-drifted dust. Particles show 404 high average solidity and convexity of 0.954 and 0.943, respectively (snapshot in Figure 7A).

Though rare, irregular shaped particles can be found in several samples. Such particles, characterized by the lowest values of  $C_v$  and  $S_d$  (*i.e.* 0.747 in sample 1530PL and 0.545 in sample 1246\_roc), are displayed in **Figure 7A**. In total, and among all the samples, more than 90% of the analyzed particles show  $C_v$  and  $S_d$  values higher than 0.9, which characterize dense ash fragments (Liu *et al.*, 2015b).

Among the 6 samples, there is no clear systematic trend in sphericity as a function of particle size (**Figure 7B**). Sieved fraction average  $\varphi$  are within a narrow range between 0.7 and 0.92 (< 63 to 750 µm fractions) and decrease under 0.7 to minimum values of 0.5 in the 1530PL sample. Nevertheless, with respect to the standard deviation of sphericity in the 1601\_summit sample, there is no significant variation of  $\varphi$  with  $D_{CE}$  up to 750 µm, beyond which values decrease slightly.

Sample names	Corrected Mesh (µm)	mean $C_v$	Standard deviatio n	Mean S <sub>d</sub>	Standard deviation	mean Ø	Standard deviation
1246_roc	300-502	0.956	$\pm 0.020$	0.947	$\pm 0.027$	0.770	$\pm 0.067$
1601_summit	300-502	0.945	$\pm 0.020$	0.947	$\pm 0.026$	0.765	$\pm 0.068$
1530PL	150-254.6	0.955	$\pm 0.022$	0.943	$\pm 0.031$	0.762	$\pm 0.076$
1550_summit	150-254.6	0.957	$\pm 0.023$	0.939	$\pm 0.034$	0.759	$\pm 0.081$
1636_summit	180-299.8	0.955	$\pm 0.024$	0.938	$\pm 0.034$	0.757	$\pm 0.081$
1042-1252_roc	150-254.6	0.921	$\pm 0.032$	0.927	$\pm 0.033$	0.707	$\pm 0.081$

416 **Table 2**: Average Convexity  $C_v$ , Solidity  $S_d$  and Sphericity  $\varphi$  values of the modal sieved fractions (1/4 417  $\Phi$ ) of the PSD for the six ash fallout samples.



419 **Figure 7:** A) Clustergram of Convexity  $(C_v)$  as a function of the Solidity  $(S_d)$  of particles pertaining to 420 the modal sieved fraction of the PSD for the 6 ash fallout samples. Average values of each population 421 and their standard deviations are indicated in red bars and symbols. **B**) Average Sphericity  $(\varphi)$  of the 422 sieved fractions as a function of their average circle-equivalent diameter  $(D_{CE})$ . **C**) Average Circle-423 equivalent diameter  $(D_{CE})$  as a function of the average Length (L) and average Width (I). **D**) Average 424 elongation (I/L) as a function of sieved fractions average  $D_{CE}$ . Errors bars (standard deviation) are 425 shown in grey for the 1601\_summit average values.

The observation of particle shapes is essential to understand the measurements of the optical disdrometer in terms of  $V_T$  and sizes. Here, we assume that detected ash particles tend to fall perpendicularly to the plane defined by their maximum (*L*) and intermediate (*I*) axes (Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016). Therefore, the disdrometer should measure sizes ranging between *L* and *I*, and an average value statistically approaching (*I*+*L*)/2 if a random orientation of the particle *L* (or *I*) axis in the beam plane is assumed (see **Figure 8**). Taking into account the linear relationships of axes dimensions with particle  $D_{CE}$  found in **Figure IV.7C** for all analyzed ash particles at Stromboli,  $D_{CE}$  can be equated on average to 0.92 (*I*+*L*)/2 with a high correlation ( $R^2 = 0.999$ ). This relationship is used thereafter to find the circle-equivalent dimension of the disdrometer sized classes recording non-spherical ash particles. Hence, the lower detection limit of the disdrometer of 250 µm corresponds to 230 µm in circle-equivalent diameter.





439 *Figure 8:* Schematic representation of particle orientation when crossing the disdrometer laser 440 beam. Assuming random rotating motion and no tumbling, particles may present a length, 441 which is assumed to be equal to (I+L)/2.

With increasing  $D_{CE}$ , the *I/L* ratio (*i.e.* the particle elongation of Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016b) increases non-linearly from 0.66 for  $D_{CE} < 63 \ \mu\text{m}$  to 0.83 for  $D_{CE} > 710\text{-}1414 \ \mu\text{m}$ (**Figure 7D**). Particles tend to be more elongated with decreasing  $D_{CE}$ . This result supports the idea of an increasing proportion of particles passing through smaller sieves during manual sieving, as already suggested by **Figures 3** and **5**.

Figures 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D and Table 2 show the overall morphological similarity among all the ash samples (*i.e.* overlap in morphological parameter space) and the consistent variation of the morphological parameters as a function of size. However, there is an intrinsic heterogeneity existing inside each sample and each sieved fraction is characterized by: (i) the individual scattering of average values of  $C_{\nu}$  as a function of  $S_d$  (Figure 7A) and (ii) the increased spread of all shape parameter standard deviations (Figures 7B, 7C and 7D). This needs to be considered when interpreting disdrometer field measurements of falling ash.

In the next section, we use the G3's capability to measure individual particle shape parameters, in order to compare  $V_T$  measured in the field by the disdrometer, as a function of particle size, with existing  $V_T$  models.

## 457 **4. Terminal settling velocities**

#### 458 **4.1 Field measurements**

459 The disdrometer recorded two ash fallout events on October 2 at 12:46 UTC (Figure 460 9A) and October 3 at 16:01 UTC (Figure 9B) totaling 355 and 2684 detected particles, respectively, which were also sampled from ground tarps (1246\_roc and 1601\_summit 461 samples). Ash particles are detected in the first five size classes (*i.e.*  $230 < D_{CE} < 804 \mu m$ ) and 462 the maximum number of particles (*i.e.* the mode of the PSD) occurs in the 345-460 µm class. 463 Settling velocities ranges from 0.6 to 3.6 m s<sup>-1</sup> and tends to increase with particle size, as tracked 464 from their modal value across the size classes. For both events, modal  $V_T$  are comparable: 465 particles of 230-345  $\mu$ m show 1.2 <  $V_T$  < 1.6 m s<sup>-1</sup> and those of 345-460  $\mu$ m (PSD mode) show 466  $2 < V_T < 2.4$  m s<sup>-1</sup>. Particles bigger than 574 µm show  $V_T \leq 3.6$  m s<sup>-1</sup> in Figure 9A and  $1.6 < V_T$ 467  $< 2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  in Figure 9B, and are present in a small amount (see PSD values in Figures 2 and 5). 468 469 Despite its lower detection limit of 230  $\mu$ m (in  $D_{CE}$ ), the disdrometer was able to detect at least 470 75% and 94% (in vol. %) of the particles present in the 1601 summit and 1246 roc samples 471 analyzed by the G3. In every size class, the spread of  $V_T$  around the modal value is remarkably 472 wide. In the next two sections, we focus on results of  $V_T$  obtained with a representative sample 473 with the highest collected mass (1601 summit).



475 *Figure 9*: Settling velocity as a function of particle size classes measured by disdrometer during two 476 ash fallout events at Stromboli. A) at 12:46 UTC (10/02/2015) and B) at 16:01 (10/03/2015). The color 477 code represents the sum of the detected number of particles inside each class of velocities (y axis) and 478 sizes in circle-equivalent diameter ( $D_{CE}$ , x axis).

# 479 **4.2 Laboratory experiments on ash settling velocity**

474

480  $V_T$  of dropped individual ash particles from the different sieved fractions is measured by 481 the disdrometer under laboratory conditions of no wind. As expected,  $V_T$  distributions for each 482 sieved fraction (Figure 10A and 10B) are unimodal. The most frequently measured  $V_T$  increases with increasing  $D_{CE}$  from 0.95 m s<sup>-1</sup> ± 0.05 m s<sup>-1</sup> for 125-212 µm, to 3.8 m s<sup>-1</sup> ± 0.1 m s<sup>-1</sup> for 483 600-1000  $\mu$ m (Black dashed line in Figure 10A). Nevertheless, the spread of  $V_T$  above and 484 485 under the modal  $V_T$  values in each size class (grey dashed line in **Figure 10A**) highlights the aforementioned heterogeneity of PSDs and particle shapes shown by Figures 3 and Figure 7. 486 487 respectively, in each sieved fraction (Figure 10D). Moreover, the individual detected PSDs 488 from the disdrometer are in broad agreement with the G3 PSDs, taking into account the ratio 489 between  $D_{CE}$  and (L+I)/2 (Figure 10C and 10D). Likewise, a comparison of the mode and 490 adjacent values of  $V_T$  of each sieved fraction (Figure 10B and dashed lines in Figure 10A), or 491 all measurements of  $V_T$  shows broad agreement between values recorded in control experiments 492 and in the field (blue and red histograms in **Figure 10A**, respectively). This highlights, in turn, 493 the quality of the disdrometer data and the broad agreement between field and laboratory 494 measurements. However, the distribution of field  $V_T$  of the 575-690 µm class appears to be 495 bimodal: modal  $V_T$  measured in the lab matches the field mode at 3 m s<sup>-1</sup> while most of the 496 coarse particles in the field fell at lower  $V_T$  (mode at  $V_T = 1.9$  m s<sup>-1</sup>).



497

498 *Figure 10: A)* Settling velocities measured by disdrometer in laboratory conditions (blue histograms)
499 and in the field (red histograms) for every sieved fraction from the 1601\_summit sample. Dashed lines
500 encompass the most frequently measured velocities (mode, bold black line) and adjacent classes (grey
501 line). B) Histogram of settling velocities recorded by the disdrometer in each sieve class. C) Detected

502 *PSD* (in percentage) and **D**) G3-derived PSDs (in frequency) of each sieve fraction.



503

504 Figure 11: A) Average settling velocities measured by disdrometer in laboratory conditions (red area 505 encompassing mode and adjacent velocity values, blue histograms for all measured velocities) and 506 calculated with empirical models (curves) using the morphological parameters' average values 507 obtained from the G3 optical analyses. Best match of the Ganser (1993) model (red curve) with the 508 disdrometer data.  $V_T$  calculated with the Ganser (1993) model for all analyzed particles of the 509 1601\_summit sample in each sieve fraction are displayed with colored dots. Error bars correspond to 510 the standard error of the mean for every size class of particle  $V_T$ . B) Individual Reynolds number 511 calculated with the Ganser (1993) drag equation as a function of all analyzed particle sizes of the 512 1601\_summit sample.

## 513 **4.3 Empirical modeling**

514 We compare 1601\_summit ash  $V_T$  measured under laboratory conditions against the four 515 empirical models described in **section 2** (Figure 11A). Using the average  $\varphi$ ,  $D_{CE}$  values and 516 densities found for each sieved fraction (Appendix C), we find that the Ganser model best

517 describes the increase in  $V_T$  for particles with  $D_{CE}$  from 125 to more than 800  $\mu$ m in our data.

518 As shown in the preceding sections, the heterogeneity of particle shapes, sizes and densities is

- 519 the cause of the spread of settling velocity measurements either in the field or under laboratory
- 520 conditions. Therefore, we used the G3-inferred individual particle shape parameters to initialize
- 521 the Ganser model.

# 522 **5. Discussion**

# 523 **5.1 Empirical model validation**

524 The combination of empirical models describing  $V_T$  of non-spherical particles permits 525 identification of the effects of physical ash particle characteristics such as size, density and 526 shape on the  $V_T$  calculation and also highlights the limits and strengths of each model. As 527 described in Beckett et al. (2015), V<sub>T</sub> empirical models are mainly sensitive to ash PSD, whereas 528 their sensitivity to the shape and density is of lesser importance, but still relevant for precise  $V_T$ 529 modeling. Knowing the PSDs of ash fallout samples at high size-resolution allows 530 quantification of the sensitivity of such models to particle shape and density with a higher 531 precision. For the models of Ganser (1993) and Bagheri & Bonadonna (2016b), the main 532 parameter controlling  $V_T$  is the shape parameter used to calculate the drag coefficient. Ganser's 533 model requires the particle sphericity  $\varphi$ , whereas the Bagheri & Bonadonna model requires 3-534 D particle measurements such as lengths of L, I and S axes. Because the short axis (S) is not 535 measured by the G3 optical analysis in 2-D, we had to hypothesize S as equal to the intermediate 536 (I) axis. This assumption tends to overestimate  $V_T$  in the Bagheri & Bonadonna model. 537 Nevertheless, in order to obtain similar  $V_T$  values between both models, S must be between 0.4I 538 and 0.11. Such S/I ratios, no matter the L values, would correspond to thin or tabular particle 539 shapes, which do not characterize the average shape of our analyzed dense ash particles. Hence, 540 the methodology and analyzed particles used in this study do not permit us to use the Bagheri 541 & Bonadonna model for modeling terminal settling velocities.

542 There are two explanations for the better agreement between our measurements and the 543 velocities of Ganser (1993). First, regarding the abundant presence of dense ash fragments with 544 regular and rounded shapes (**Figures 7A**, 7**B**, 7**C** and **7D**), the sphericity  $\varphi$  of Riley *et al.* (2003) 545 appears to be the optimal parameter to describe our grain population among the 6 ash samples. 546 Such a parameter is known to be well suited for the accuracy of Ganser's  $V_T$  equation (Alfano 547 *et al.*, 2011).

548 Secondly, values of  $V_T$  calculated from empirical models depend on the accuracy of the 549 shape factors used to determine the drag coefficient.  $\varphi$  is calculated from the particle area (*i.e.* 550 linked to its shape) but also its perimeter, which strongly depends on the small scale particle 551 roughness. For example, in Dioguardi et al. (2017), a 3-D sphericity is defined using X-ray 552 microtomography. Their sphericity values are much lower ( $\varphi < 0.434$ ) than those obtained by 553 2-D analyses owing to the high spatial resolution that takes into account the particle roughness 554 at a very small scale. The G3 is less precise than X-ray microtomography for measuring small 555 scale particle asperities, indicating that the variations of  $\varphi$  are mainly due to changes in particle 556 shapes rather than in their roughness (Dioguardi et al., 2018). Moreover, Strombolian ash 557 particles have small-scale roughness as in the study of Ganser (1993). Taken together, these 558 observations explain why, using our methodology, the best model describing  $V_T$ , measured by 559 the disdrometer over the largest interval of ash sizes, is the Ganser model. Using the 560 morphological parameters from our G3 optical analyses, Equation 14 in Dellino *et al.* (2005) 561 is thus valid for coarse ash and lapilli, which remain sparse at Stromboli. Indeed, Equation 14 562 is established for a set of particles having a Reynolds Number > 60-100 (Dioguardi *et al.*, 2018), 563 a range which corresponds to 5-10% of ash particles among the 1601\_summit sample with  $D_{CE}$ 564 larger than 360 to 560 µm (Figure 11B).

565  $V_T$  calculated with the Ganser model for every analyzed particle for the 1246\_roc and 566 1601\_summit samples is in good agreement with ash  $V_T$  measured in the field (Figures 12A) 567 and 12B) and under laboratory conditions. However, as observed in Figures 9 and 10, small  $V_T$ 568 are also observed in the upper disdrometer classes above 460  $\mu$ m in both contexts. Those V<sub>T</sub> 569 can be due to several effects: (i) the  $V_T$  being calculated from the crossing times of particles. 570 Ash particles might not have fallen perpendicularly to the laser sheet, *i.e.* non-vertical 571 trajectories, possibly due to the wind, causing longer crossing periods and thus lower  $V_T$ . (ii) 572 As shown by Bagheri & Bonadonna (2016b), particles may fall with their longest axis 573 perpendicular to their settling axis but may also oscillate and rotate according to this axis 574 resulting in varying crossing times corresponding to one of the 3-D axes of the particles. It is 575 unclear why any of these processes would have affected mainly coarser particles.



577 **Figure 12**: Individual particle  $V_T$  calculated with the model of Ganser (1993) based on sphericities ( $\varphi$ ) 578 and particle sizes measured by G3 in each sieved fraction (color code) for the October 2 2015 at 12:46 579 UTC (**A**) and October 3 2015 at 16:01 UTC (**B**) fallout events. Associated ash deposits, 1246\_roc and 580 1601\_summit samples respectively, were collected from ground tarps immediately after each fallout 581 event. The distribution of disdrometer velocities measured in the field is shown in histograms for 582 comparison.

#### 583 **5.2** Application of particle shape and disdrometer measurements to radar retrievals

584 During our measurement campaign, a 3 millimeter-wave Doppler radar was used in 585 addition to the disdrometer to record ash plumes dynamics and quantify ash concentrations 586 (Donnadieu *et al.*, 2016). Inside a radar beam, when a continuously emitted electromagnetic 587 wave encounters ash particles, its backscatter towards the radar induces a signal, the power of 588 which is used to calculate a reflectivity factor *Z*. By assuming that the target PSD in the probed 589 radar volume is composed of homogeneously distributed spherical ash particles with known 590 diameter *D* (Sauvageot, 1992):

591 
$$Z = \int_{D_{\min}}^{D_{\max}} N(D) D^6 dD.$$

592 (15)

593 Z characterizes the volcanic mixture remotely probed by the radar beam and directly 594 reflects the particle volume concentration, however the strong contribution of spherical particle sizes  $(D^6)$  and lesser contribution of particle amounts (N(D)) of each size cannot be isolated 595 596 without further constraints. One potential application of accurately characterizing volcanic 597 particle sizes is to refine radar retrievals. Disdrometer measurements of the number of 598 individually detected particles, their  $V_T$  and sizes allows estimation of radar reflectivity factors 599 and associated ash concentrations. Thus, the coupling of radar and optical disdrometer methods, 600 as implemented in meteorology (Marzano et al., 2004; Maki et al., 2005), will refine ash mass 601 load retrievals from radar remote sensing of ash plumes and their fallout.

602 The methodology applied in this study to characterize volcanic particle shapes improves 603 the interpretation of disdrometer outputs for a more accurate radar reflectivity estimation. The 604 combination of disdrometer measurements of  $v_i = V_T$  and number of detected particles is used 605 to infer a particle number density per unit volume N(D) (Equation 4), which is used, in turn, 606 to automatically calculate Z from the measured sizes of particles detected by the disdrometer. 607 Under the assumption that particles fall with their L and I axes in the beam plane (i.e. 608 horizontal), the raw disdrometer reflectivity,  $Z_{disdro}$ , is calculated directly from the detected 609 diameter, therefore assuming spherical particles, so that Z<sub>disdro</sub> is biased for non-spherical particles depending on their orientation when crossing the beam. For example, the size of 610 611 particles crossing the beam with their longest axis (L) normal to the detectors alignment are 612 overestimated, and so is Z. Contrastingly, Z is underestimated when the intermediary axis is 613 seen by the beam. From our morphological study, carried out statistically on a large number of 614 ash particles, we conclude that the conversion of  $D_{CE} = 0.92 (L+I)/2$  is appropriate (R<sup>2</sup> of 0.999

615 in Figure 7C) and can be used to constrain disdrometer reflectivities of Strombolian ash.



#### 616

617 *Figure 13*: Disdrometer reflectivity factor (*Z*<sub>disdro</sub>, dot lines) and ash concentration (line with squares) 618 calculated from disdrometer measurements as a function of time during an ash fallout event on October 619 3 2015 (event 16:01 UTC corresponding to the sample 1601\_summit). The black dot line corresponds to the raw  $Z_{disdro}$  calculated with no particle shape conversion, whereas the grey area represents the raw 620 621 reflectivity if the disdrometer detected all particles respectively along their longest and intermediate 622 axis. Purple line and purple dashed lines indicate Z and concentration values by correcting, 623 respectively, only particle sizes in circle-equivalent diameter ( $D_{CE}$  inferred from G3 analyses), or both 624  $D_{CE}$  and settling velocities using the Ganser model (1993).

Comparing  $Z_{disdro}$  with and without (i) conversions for circle-equivalent diameter and (ii) model-derived  $V_T$  (**Figure 13**) shows the respective influence of these two parameters (that are used to calculate  $N_i(D_i)$  in **Equation 4** and **Equation 15**) on the reflectivities. Correcting the PSD by using the ratio (L+I)/2 shows a decrease of 2.18 dBZ in average (**Figure 13**). This highlights the necessity to physically characterize non-spherical particles, such as volcanic ash, and then to correct disdrometer data accordingly when comparing with reflectivities measured *in situ* inside the ash mixtures (*i.e.* plume and fallout).

Furthermore, the best fitting Ganser (1993) model  $V_T$  measured by the disdrometer in the field can be used to calculate  $V_T$  and correct for the data scattering, in particular the outlying 634 low  $V_T$  of coarse ash measured in the field (**Figures 9** and **10**). This results in a further average 635 difference of 1.8 dBZ compared to the PSD correction using the conversion of (L+I)/2, *i.e.* a 636 total decrease of 4 dBZ using PSD and  $V_T$  correction with respect to reflectivities calculated 637 from raw data.

Finally, detected ash concentration  $C_{ash}$  may be calculated using the following equation:

$$C_{ash} = \frac{\pi \rho_i}{6} \int_{D_{i\min}}^{D_{i\max}} N_i(D_i) D_i^3 dD_i .$$
<sup>(16)</sup>

As a result, disdrometer-derived ash concentrations span between 2.23 and 874.52 mg m<sup>-3</sup> without any correction for diameters (**Figure 13**). Using the (L+I)/2 conversion leads to smaller ash concentrations to 1.73-680.79 mg m<sup>-3</sup> (average difference of 22.155 ± 0.003%). Moreover, the use of Ganser's equation (1993) decreases conversion-derived and initial concentrations of 14.32% and 33.3%.

645 Despite the main dependence of ash reflectivity factors and concentrations on particle 646 size ( $D^6$  in **Equation 15** and  $D^3$  in **Equation 16**), low velocities measured by the disdrometer 647 in the field seem to have a non-negligible impact on the quantitative retrievals obtained from 648 disdrometer retrievals.

Thus, as in meteorology, considering similar PSDs between the atmospheric volumes possibly probed by the radar and fallout measurements at ground level (Marzano *et al.*, 2004; Maki *et al.*, 2005), the disdrometer-inferred reflectivity factors provide a reasonable first-order quantification of ash concentrations inside volcanic ash plumes. The next step is to compare disdrometer-inferred reflectivity factors with reflectivity factors measured by radar inside the ash plumes and then estimate the spatial distribution of the ash mass load, one of the most crucial source term parameters.

#### 656 **5.3 Validation and limitation of disdrometer data**

639

657 Despite a disdrometer lower detection limit of 230 μm in  $D_{CE}$  (*i.e.* only coarse ash is 658 detected), the morpho-grainsizer G3 measurements and disdrometer measurements yield 659 similar PSD modes. The low proportion of coarse ash larger than 690 μm detected by the 660 disdrometer can be explained by the difference of spatial resolution between the instrument and 661 the tarp used to sample the fallout (*i.e.* a laser sheet surface of 0.0054 m<sup>2</sup> compared to a 0.4 m<sup>2</sup> tarp). Indeed, the relatively low percentage of particles coarser than 575  $\mu$ m (between 0.21 and 13.75% in **Figure 5**) can lead to an under-sampling of such sparse particles by the disdrometer.

664 The tests under laboratory conditions using empirical models validate the disdrometer  $V_T$  measurements in the field. However, field measurements show a high dispersion of  $V_T$ . With 665 666 a modal value of 2.2  $\pm$  0.2 m s<sup>-1</sup>, measured V<sub>T</sub> in the class 345-460 µm (Figure 10) range between  $1 \pm 0.1$  m s<sup>-1</sup> and  $3 \pm 0.2$  m s<sup>-1</sup>. Such a high variability is also seen with no-wind 667 668 conditions in the laboratory (Figures 10 and 11). We attribute such variations to fluctuations in 669 vertical wind and beam crossing trajectories, but also due to the high variability of particle 670 shapes, sizes, and densities that lead to many possible combinations of interactions with the 671 ambient fluid that can induce 3-D changes in particle rotation (Bagheri & Bonadonna, 2016b).

#### 672 6. Conclusive remarks

This study presents an exhaustive characterization of the ash produced during explosions at Stromboli. We also perform an inter-comparison of empirical settling velocity models to validate terminal settling velocities measured by an optical disdrometer in the field.

The use of mechanical sieving and the morpho-grainsizer MORPHOLOGI G3 reveals the need to consider the geometrical influence of the sieve meshes in the case of non-spherical and rough ash particles. We propose the use of the lower mesh size and the diagonal of the upper mesh size of the mechanical sieve to constrain each PSD fraction.

680 We further propose a method to obtain a total PSD by combining the morpho-grainsizer 681 high-resolution PSD with the weight percentages measured by the mechanical sieving. Our 682 analyses reveal dense and homogenous ash particles in terms of textural and morphological 683 roughness for a set of type 2 eruptions from proximal to medial distance (2 km) from the summit 684 vents of Stromboli. The non-spherical ash particles sampled at Stromboli have their circle-685 equivalent diameter equal to 0.79 times their longest axis, 1.09 times their intermediate axis on 686 average and 0.92 times their average 2-D dimension (L+I)/2. Moreover, we show that particle 687 sphericity tends to slightly decrease with increasing  $D_{CE}$ . This observation may have strong 688 implications for ash dispersion modeling, even in the case of moderate-sized eruptions. Indeed, 689 the residence time of airborne ash particles has been shown to be highly dependent on their 690 shapes, mostly for coarse ash with  $D_{CE} > 200 \ \mu m$  (Beckett *et al.*, 2015; Saxby *et al.*, 2018).

691Disdrometer settling velocity measurements of sieved ash fractions under laboratory692conditions are in broad agreement with the field settling velocities. This validates the693volcanological application of the meteorology-designed OTT Parsivel<sup>2</sup> disdrometer for the694detection and real-time recording of ash particle fallout size and settling velocities. Its695limitations mainly concern the lower threshold in size measurements (230 microns in circle-696equivalent diameter at Stromboli) and the width of each size class (*i.e.* around the 115 μm size697class when used for ash measurements).

Empirical models used to calculate terminal settling velocities are highly dependent on the input shape parameters and their accuracy. Whereas the Bagheri & Bonadonna (2016b) and Dioguardi *et al.* (2017) models are based on high precision 3-D analyses of particles, the lowerresolved G3-derived sphericities from fast routine 2-D optical analyses are better matched to the Ganser model (1993). This is due to the fact that the output of our methodology more accurately reproduces the parameters used in Ganser (1993) to model terminal settling velocities.

705 Finally, the empirical results obtained with the Ganser model (1993) provide the best fit 706 with the terminal settling velocities measured by the disdrometer and highlight the capability 707 of such an instrument to operationally monitor volcanic ash sizes and their settling velocities 708 with higher time resolution (10 s) than other in-situ methods. Despite underestimating coarse 709 ash settling velocities, possibly due to particle interactions with the ambient fluid, our physical 710 ash characterization emphasizes the need to constrain the size of both intermediate and long 711 particle axes (I and L) and their settling velocities in order to calculate radar reflectivity factors. This underlines the important role of disdrometers in the field to constrain radar data for ash 712 713 plume monitoring and mass load retrieval.

# 714 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge DPC members at Stromboli for their help during the measurement campaign, S. Valade (Univ. Firenze) for his precious help in the field, M. Ripepe for facilitating our work, and Mayor of Lipari for work authorization. All OPGC colleagues are deeply acknowledged for their work and enthusiasm in the field. Johanand Gilchrist is thanked for correcting the manuscript. We also thank Elisabetta Del Bello and an anonymous reviewer for their comments that significantly improved the manuscript. The optical disdrometer Parcivel<sup>2</sup> was purchased from the TerMEx-Mistrals INSU-CNRS program. This research was undertaken in the frame of EUROVOLC project and financed by the French Government

723 Laboratory of Excellence initiative n°ANR-10-LABX-0006, the ANR STRAP, the Région

- 724 Auvergne and the European Regional Development Fund. This is Laboratory of
- 725 Excellence ClerVolc contribution number 331.
- 726

# 727 **REFERENCES**

- Alfano, F., Bonadonna, C., Delmelle, P. & Costantini, L., 2011. Insights on tephra settling
  velocity from morphological observations. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res. 208, 86–98.
  doi:10.1016/j.volgeores.2011.09.013.
- Andronico, D., Scollo, S., Cristaldi, A. & Lo Castro, M. D., 2014. Representivity of
  incompletely sampled fall deposits in estimating eruption source parameters: a test using
  the 12-13 January 2011 lava fountain deposit from Mt. Etna volcano, Italy. Bull. Volcanol.
  76(10), 861. doi:10.1007/s00445-014-0861-3.
- Bagheri, G. & Bonadonna, C., 2016a. Aerodynamics of Volcanic Particles: Characterization of
  Size, Shape and Settling Velocity. In: Mackie, S., Cashman, K., Ricketts, H., Rust, A., and
  Watson, M. (Eds.), Volcanic Ash, Elsevier 1, pp. 39–52. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-1004050.00005-7.
- Bagheri, G. & Bonadonna, C., 2016b. On the drag of freely falling non-spherical particles. J.
  Powder Tech. 301, 526–544. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2016.06.015.
- Baxter, P.J., 1999. Cristobalite in Volcanic Ash of the Soufriere Hills Volcano, Montserrat,
  British West Indies. Science 283(5405), 1142–1145, doi:10.1126/science.283.5405.1142.
- Beckett, F.M., Witham, C.S., Hort, M.C., Stevenson, J.A., Bonadonna, C. & Millington, S.C.,
  2015. Sensitivity of dispersion model forecasts of volcanic ash clouds to the physical
  characteristics of the particles. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 120, doi:10.1002/2015JD023609.
- Bonadonna, C., Ernst, G. G. J. & Sparks, R. S. J., 1998. Thickness variations and volume
  estimates of tephra fall deposits: the importance of particle Reynolds number. J. Volcanol.
  Geotherm. Res. 81, 173–187.
- Bonadonna, C., Genco, R., Gouhier, M., Pistolesi, M., Cioni, R., Alfano, F., Hoskuldsson, A.
  & Ripepe, M., 2011. Tephra sedimentation during the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull eruption (Iceland) from deposit, radar, and satellite observations. J. Geophys. Res. 116, B12202.
  doi:10.1029/2011JB008462.
- Cashman, K. & Rust, A., 2016. Volcanic Ash: Generation and Spatial Variations. In: Mackie,
  S., Cashman, K., Ricketts, H., Rust, A., Watson, M. (Eds.), Volcanic Ash, Elsevier, pp. 521. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-100405-0.00002-1.
- Chien, S.F., 1994. Settling velocity of irregularly shaped particles. SPE Drill. Complet. 9, 281288.
- Cioni, R., Pistolesi, M., Bertagnini, A., Bonadonna, C., Hoskuldsson, A. & Scateni, B., 2014.
  Insights into the dynamics and evolution of the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull summit eruption
- 760 (Iceland) provided by volcanic ash textures. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 394, 111–123.

- Coltelli, M., Miraglia, L. & Scollo, S., 2008. Characterization of shape and terminal velocity of
  tephra particles erupted during the 2002 eruption of Etna volcano, Italy (2008). Bull.
  Volcanol. 70, 1103–1112, doi:10.1007/s00445-007-0192-8.
- Corradini, S., Montopoli, M., Guerrieri, L., Ricci, M., Scollo, S., Merucci, L. Marzano, F.S.,
  Pugnaghi, S., Prestifilippo, M., Ventress, L.J., Grainger, R.G., Carboni, E., Vulpiani, G.
  & Coltelli, M., 2016. A Multi-Sensor Approach for Volcanic Ash Cloud Retrieval and
  Eruption Characterization: The 23 November 2013 Etna Lava Fountain. Remote Sens.
  8:58, doi:10.3390/rs8010058.
- Del Bello, E., Taddeucci, J., Michieli Vitturi, M., Scarlato, P., Andronico, D., Scollo, S.,
  Kueppers, U. & Ricci, T., 2017. Effect of particle volume fraction on the settling velocity
  of volcanic ash particles: insights from joint experimental and numerical simulations. Sci.
  Rep. 7, 39620, doi:10.1038/srep39620.
- Dellino, P., Mele, D., Bonasia, R., Braia, G., La Volpe, L. & Sulpizio, R., 2005. The analysis
  of the influence of pumice shape on its terminal velocitiy. Geophys. Res. Lett. 32, L21306,
  doi:10.1029/2005GL023954.
- Dioguardi, F. & Mele, D. (2015). A new shape dependent drag correlation formula for nonspherical rough particles. Experiments and results. Pow. Tech. 277, 222–230.
  doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2015.02.062.
- Dioguardi, F., Mele, D., Dellino, P. & Dürig, T., 2017. The terminal velocity of volcanic
  particles with shape otained from 3D X-ray microtomography. J. Volcanol. Geotherm.
  Res. 329, 41–53, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.volgeores.2016.11.013</u>.
- Dioguardi, F., Mele, D. & Dellino, P., 2018. A New One-Equation Model of Fluid Drag for
   Irregularly Shaped Particles Valid Over a Wide Range of Reynolds Number. J. Geophys.
   Res. 123. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JB014926</u>.
- Donnadieu, F., Freret-Lorgeril, V., Delanoë, J., Vinson, J.P., Peyrin, F., Hervier, C., Caudoux,
  C. & Van Baelen, J., 2016. Multifrequency radar imaging of ash plumes: an experiment at
  Stromboli: EGU General Assembly Vienna, 23–28 April 2016.
- Eychenne, J. & Le Pennec, J.L., 2012. Sigmoidal particle density distribution in a subplinian
  scoria fall deposit. Bull. Volcanol. 74, 2243–2249. doi:10.1007//s00445-011-0517-5.
- Folk, R.L. & Ward, W.C. 1957. Brazos River bar: a study in the significance of grain size
  parameters. J. Geology 62, 3–26.
- Ganser, G.H., 1993. A rational approach to drag prediction of spherical and non spherical
  particles. Powder Technol. 77(2), 143–152. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0032-</u>
  5910(93)80051-B.
- Gunn, R. & Kinzer, G., 1949. The Terminal Velocity of Fall for Water Droplets in Stagnant.
  Air. J. Meteorol. 6, 243–248.
- 797 Kunii, D.K. & Levenspiel, O., 1969. Fluidization engineering. Wiley, New York.
- Lautze, N.C., Taddeucci, J., Andronico, D., Cannata, C., Tornetta, L., Scarlato, P., Houghton,
  B. & Lo Castro, M., 2011. SEM-based methods for the analysis of basaltic ash from weak
- B. & EO Castro, M., 2011. SEM-based methods for the analysis of basafic ash from weak
  explosive activity at Etna in 2006 and the 2007 eruptive crisis at Stromboli. Phys. Chem.
  Earth 45-46, 113–127, doi:10.1016/j.pce.2011.02.001.
- Lautze, N., Taddeucci, J., Andronico, D., Houghton, B., Niemeijer, A. & Scarlato, P., 2013.
  Insights into explosion dynamics and the production of ash at Stromboli from samples

- collected in real-time, October 2009. In : Rose, W.I., Palma, J.L., Delgado Granados, H.,
  and Varley, N. (Eds.), Understanding Open-Vent Volcanism and Related Hazards:
  Geological Society of America Special Paper 498, 125–139, doi:10.1130/2013.2498(08).
- Leibrandt, S. & Le Pennec, J. L., 2015. Towards fast and routine analyses of volcanic ash
  morphometry for eruption surveillance applications. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res. 297, 11–
  27. doi:10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2015.03.014.
- Liu, E.J., Cashman, K.V., Rust, A.C. & Gislason, S.R., 2015a. The role of bubbles in generating
  fine ash during hydromagmatic eruptions. Geology 43(3), 239–242, doi:10.1130/G36336.
- Liu, E.J., Cashman, K.V. & Rust, A.C., 2015b. Optimising shape analysis to quantify volcanic
  ash morphology. GeoResJ 8, 14–30, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.grj.2015.09.001</u>.
- Löffler-Mang, M. & Jürg, J., 2000. An Optical Disdrometer for Measuring Size and Velocity
  of Hydrometeors. J. Atm. Ocean. Tech. 17, 130–139.
- Maki, M., Iwanami, K., Misumi, R., Park, S.G., Moriwaki, H., Maruyama, K.I., Watabe, I.,
  Lee, D.I, Jang, M., Kim, H.K, Bringi, V.N. & Uyeda, H., 2005. Semi-operational rainfall
  observations with X-band mutli-parameter radar. J. Atmos. Sci. Lett. 6(1).
  https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.84.
- Maki, M., Iguchi, M., Maesaka, T., Miwa, T., Tanada, T., Kozono, T., Momotani, T., Yamaji,
  A. & Kakimoto, I., 2016. Preliminary Results of Weather Radar Observations of
  Sakurajima Volcanic Smoke. J. Disaster. Res. 11(1), 15–30.
- Marzano, F., Vulpiani, G. & Picciotti, E., 2004. Rain Field and Reflectivity Vertical Profile
  Reconstruction From C-Band Radar Volumetric Data. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remot. Sens.
  42(5). doi:10.1109/TGRS.2003.820313.
- Marzano, F.S., Barbieri, S., Vulpiani, G. & Rose, W.I., 2006a. Volcanic ash cloud retrieval by
  ground-based microwave weather radar. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens. 44, 3235–
  3246.
- Marzano, F.S., Vulpiani, G. & Rose, W.I. (2006b). Microphysical Characterization of
  Microwave Radar Reflectivity Due to Volcanic Ash Clouds. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote
  Sens, 1–15. doi:10.1109/TGRS.2005.861010.
- Patrick, M.R., Harris, A.J.L., Ripepe, M., Dehn, J., Rothery, D.A. & Calvari, S., 2007.
  Strombolian explosive styles and source conditions: Insights from thermal (FLIR) video.
  Bull. Volcanol. 69(7), 769–784, doi:10.1007/s00445-006-0107-0.
- Pfeiffer, T., Costa, A. & Macedonio, G., 2005. A model for the numerical simulation of tephra
  fall deposits. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res. 140, 273–294.
  doi:10.1016/j.volgeores.2004.09.001.
- Prata, A.J., 1989. Infrared radiative transfer calculations for volcanic ash clouds. Geophys. Res.
  Lett. 16(11), 1293–1296.
- Prata, A.J. & Bernardo, C., 2009. Retrieval of volcanic ash particle size, mass and optical depth
  from a ground-based thermal infrared camera. J. Volcanol. Geophys. Res. 186, 91–107.
  doi:10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2009.02.007.
- Prata, A.J. & Grant, I.F., 2001. Retrieval of microphysical and morphological properties of
  volcanic ash plumes from satellite data: application to Mt. Ruapehu, New Zealand. Quat.
- 845 J. R. Meteorol Soc. 127(576), 2153–2179. https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712757615.

- Riley, C.M., Rose, W.I. & Bluth, G.J.S., 2003. Quantitative shape measurements of distal
  volcanic ash. J. Geophys. Res. 108 (B10), 2504.
- 848 Sauvageot, H., 1992. Radar meteorology, Artech House, ISBN 0890063184, Boston.
- Saxby, J. Beckett, F., Cashman, K., Rust, A. & Tennant, E. (2018). The impact of particle shape
  on fall velocity: Implications for volcanic ash dispersion modelling. *Journal of Volcanology* and *Geothermal* Research, 362:32–48.
  <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2018.08.006</u>.
- Sparks, R.S.J., Bursik, M.I., Carey, S.N., Gilbert, J.S., Glaze, L.S., Sigurdsson, H. & Woods,
  A.W., 1997. Volcanic Plumes, Wiley, J., Chichester, England.
- Tokay, A., Wolff, D.B. & Petersen, W.A., 2014. Evaluation of the New Version of the LaserOptical Disdrometer, OTT Parsivel<sup>2</sup>. J. Atm. Ocean. Tech. 31, 1276–1288.
  doi:10.1175/JTECH-D-13-00174.1.
- Wilson, L. & Huang, T.C., 1979. The influence of shape on the atmospheric settling velocity
  of volcanic ash particles. Earth. Planet. Sci. Lett. 44, 311–324.
- Wilson, T.M., Daly, M. & Johnston, D., 2009. Review of Impacts of Volcanic Ash on
  Electricity Distribution Systems, Broadcasting and Communication Networks, Auckland
  Engineering Lifelines Group Project AELG-19. Auckland Regional Council Technical
  Publication 051, April 2009.
- Wilson, T.M., Stewart, C., Sword-Daniels, V., Leonard, G.S., Johnston, D.M., Cole, J.W.,
  Wardman, J., Wilson, G. & Barnard, S.T., 2012. Volcanic ash impacts on critical
  infrastructure. J. Phys. Chem. Earth 45-46, 5–23, doi:10.1016/j.pce.2011.06.006.
- Woods, A.W. & Bursik, M.I., 1991. Particle fallout, thermal disequilibrium and volcanic
  plumes. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res. 53, 559–570.

1/2 Φ	1601 si	ımmit	1246	roc	153	OPL	1550 s	summit	1636 s	ummit	1042-	1252 roc
Diameter (µm)	Mass (g)	wt%	Mass (g)	wt%	Mass (g)	wt%	Mass (g)	wt%	Mass (g)	wt%	Mass (g)	wt%
2000-2800 1400-2000 1000-1400 710-1000	0,0099 0,0055 0,0185	0,0392 0,0218 0,0733	0,0064 0,0050	0,1287 0,1006			0,0004	0,5891			0,0299 0,0426 0,0111 0,0406	0,4396 0,6264 0,1632 0,5970
500-710	0,6204	2,4590	0,1288	2,5909	0,0003	0,1157	0,0006	0,8837	0,0040	0,6416	0,0318	0,4676
355-500	4,4479	17,6295	1,2990	26,1305	0,0010	0,3855	0,0012	1,7673	0,0280	4,4915	0,0391	0,5749
250-355	7,9853	31,6503	2,3787	47,8496	0,0087	3,3539	0,0033	4,8601	0,1441	23,1152	0,2829	4,1597
180-250	5,5236	21,8932	0,7910	15,9117	0,0606	23,3616	0,0120	17,6730	0,2052	32,9163	1,2834	18,8710
125-180	3,6909	14,6291	0,1902	3,8260	0,1128	43,4850	0,0372	54,7865	0,1961	31,4565	2,1109	31,0385
90-125	1,6927	6,7091	0,0677	1,3618	0,0482	18,5813	0,0124	18,2622	0,0382	6,1277	1,4896	21,9030
63-90	0,7670	3,0401	0,0431	0,8670	0,0227	8,7510	0,0008	1,1782	0,0062	0,9945	0,8614	12,6660
0-63	0,4681	1,8553	0,0613	1,2331	0,0051	1,9661			0,0016	0,2567	0,5776	8,4930
0-63	0,4681 1601_sı	1,8553 1mmit	0,0613	1,2331 _roc	0,0051	1,9661 0PL	1550_s	summit	0,0016	0,2567 summit	0,5776	8,4930 1252_roc
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm)	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 _roc _wt%	0,0051 153 Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 	0,5776 1042- Mass (g)	8,4930 1252_roc wt%
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 _roc _wt%	0,0051 1530 Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 summit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298	8,4930 -1252_roc wt% 0,4501
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 _roc wt%	0,0051 1530 Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,0051
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360 1600-2000 1600-1600	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 roc wt%	0,0051 1530 Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1621
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360 1600-2000 1400-1600 1400	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 roc wt%	0,0051 1530 Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0108	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360 1600-2000 1400-1600 1180-1400 1000-1180	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 ummit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331	0,0051 153( Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0058	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360 1600-2000 1400-1600 1180-1400 1000-1180 850-1000	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 ummit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 _roc wt%	0,0051 153( Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156
0-63 1/4 Φ Diameter (μm) 2360-2800 2000-2360 1600-2000 1400-1600 1180-1400 1000-1180 850-1000 710-850	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g)	1,8553 ummit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g)	1,2331 _roc wt%	0,0051 153( Mass (g)	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g)	summit wt%	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g)	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0008 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4\ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_su Mass (g) 0,0726	1,8553 immit wt%	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173	1,2331 _roc wt%	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000	1,9661 0PL wt%	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000	o,7156 0,0000	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016	0,2567 ummit wt%	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001	1,9661 0PL wt% 0,0000 0,0400	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171	8,4930 .1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4\ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ 425\text{-}500\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265	1,8553 ummit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004	1,9661 0PL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0008 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ 425\text{-}500\\ 355\text{-}425\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003	1,9661 0PL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0008 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ 425\text{-}500\\ 355\text{-}425\\ 300\text{-}355\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027	1,9661 0PL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699	0,2567 	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0008 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ 425\text{-}500\\ 355\text{-}425\\ 300\text{-}355\\ 250\text{-}300\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986	0,0051 153( Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0008 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0\text{-}63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu\text{m})\\ 2360\text{-}2800\\ 2000\text{-}2360\\ 1600\text{-}2000\\ 1400\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1600\\ 1180\text{-}1400\\ 1000\text{-}1180\\ 850\text{-}1000\\ 710\text{-}850\\ 600\text{-}710\\ 500\text{-}600\\ 425\text{-}500\\ 355\text{-}425\\ 300\text{-}355\\ 250\text{-}300\\ 212\text{-}250\\ 300\text{-}315\\ 200\text{-}315\\ 200\text{-}310\\ 200\text{-}300\\ 20$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315	0,0051 1530 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,0213	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ Diameter\\ (\mu m)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 180$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,2522	1,8553 ummit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368	0,0051 1534 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,0213 0,0414 0,0722	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 20,1212	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043 0,0081 0,0081	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 20	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1360	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,624 21,624	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451	8,4930 
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ Diameter\\ (\mu m)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 150-180\\ 125-160\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,3027 1,2002	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514 9,7172 5,8775	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050 0,1390	1,2331 _roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368 2,9405	0,0051 1530 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,00213 0,0414 0,0703 0,0416	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 28,1313 16,6467	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043 0,0081 0,0159	0,7156 0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 28,4436 23,2122	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1316 0,0571	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,6947 0,4121	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451 0,0601	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583 0,2537 0,3655 1,3064 1,8667 7,9274 8,3896 17,2942 14,6521
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ Diameter\\ (\mum)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 150-180\\ 125-150\\ 112\\ 125\end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,3027 1,3902 0,8270	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514 9,7172 5,8665	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050 0,1390 0,0480 0,0228	1,2331 roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368 2,9405 1,0154 0,525	0,0051 1530 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,00213 0,0414 0,0703 0,0416 0,0108	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 28,1313 16,6467 7,0222	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043 0,00159 0,0132 0,00132	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 28,4436 23,6136 7,1556	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1316 0,0571 0,0196	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,6947 9,4131 2,0652	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451 0,9691 0,6154	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu m)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 150-180\\ 125-150\\ 112-125\\ 90, 112\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,3027 1,3902 0,8370 0,9551	1,8553 mmit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514 9,7172 5,8665 3,5321 4,0304	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050 0,1390 0,0480 0,0238 0,0238	1,2331 roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368 2,9405 1,0154 0,5035	0,0051 1530 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,0213 0,0414 0,0703 0,0416 0,0198 0,0234	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 28,1313 16,6467 7,9232 9,3637	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043 0,00159 0,0132 0,0040 0,0051	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 28,4436 23,6136 7,1556 9,1234	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1316 0,0571 0,0186	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,6947 9,4131 3,0663 1,9288	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451 0,9691 0,6154 0,8304	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583 0,2584 1,8064 1,8667 7,9274 8,3896 17,2942 14,6361 9,2942 12,5413
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ Diameter\\ (\mu m)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 150-180\\ 125-150\\ 112-125\\ 90-112\\ 75-90\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,3027 1,3902 0,8370 0,9551	1,8553 immit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514 9,7172 5,8665 3,5321 4,0304	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050 0,1390 0,0480 0,0238 0,0286	1,2331 roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368 2,9405 1,0154 0,5035 0,6050	0,0051 1534 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,0213 0,0414 0,0703 0,0416 0,0198 0,0234 0,0122	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 28,1313 16,6467 7,9232 9,3637 4,8820	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0013 0,0016 0,0043 0,00159 0,0132 0,0040 0,0051 0,0008	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 28,4436 23,6136 7,1556 9,1234 1,4311	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0059 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1316 0,0117 0,0186	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,6947 9,4131 3,0663 1,9288 0,6254	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451 0,9691 0,6154 0,8304 0,5778	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583 0,2574 8,3896 17,2942 14,6361 9,2942 12,5413 7,9712
$\begin{array}{c} 0-63\\ \hline 1/4 \ \Phi\\ \text{Diameter}\\ (\mu m)\\ 2360-2800\\ 2000-2360\\ 1600-2000\\ 1400-1600\\ 1180-1400\\ 1000-1180\\ 850-1000\\ 710-850\\ 600-710\\ 500-600\\ 425-500\\ 355-425\\ 300-355\\ 250-300\\ 212-250\\ 180-212\\ 150-180\\ 125-150\\ 112-125\\ 90-112\\ 75-90\\ 63-75\\ \end{array}$	0,4681 1601_st Mass (g) 0,0726 0,5189 1,7265 2,6035 3,7705 3,2857 3,8763 2,3582 2,3027 1,3902 0,8370 0,9551	1,8553 mmit wt% 0,3064 2,1897 7,2857 10,9865 15,9112 13,8654 16,3576 9,9514 9,7172 5,8665 3,5321 4,0304	0,0613 1246 Mass (g) 0,0173 0,1034 0,4670 0,7508 1,6416 0,5719 0,6160 0,2050 0,1390 0,0480 0,0238 0,0286	1,2331 roc wt% 0,3660 2,1874 9,8794 15,8832 34,7281 12,0986 13,0315 4,3368 2,9405 1,0154 0,5035 0,6050	0,0051 1534 Mass (g) 0,0000 0,0001 0,0004 0,0003 0,0027 0,0047 0,0213 0,0414 0,0703 0,0416 0,0198 0,0234 0,0122 0,0075	1,9661 OPL wt% 0,0000 0,0400 0,1601 0,1200 1,0804 1,8808 8,5234 16,5666 28,1313 16,6467 7,9232 9,3637 4,8820 3,0012	1550_s Mass (g) 0,0004 0,0000 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0004 0,0003 0,0016 0,0043 0,0016 0,0043 0,00159 0,0132 0,0040 0,0051 0,0008 0,0001	0,7156 0,0000 0,5367 0,7156 0,5367 2,3256 2,8623 7,6923 14,4902 28,4436 23,6136 7,1556 9,1234 1,4311 0,1789	0,0016 1636_s Mass (g) 0,0016 0,0022 0,0052 0,0240 0,0699 0,0537 0,1360 0,0893 0,1316 0,0571 0,0186 0,0117 0,0038 0,0011	0,2567 ummit wt% 0,2638 0,3627 0,8572 3,9565 11,5232 8,8526 22,4200 14,7214 21,6947 9,4131 3,0663 1,9288 0,6264 0,1813	0,5776 1042- Mass (g) 0,0298 0,0000 0,0328 0,0108 0,0058 0,0060 0,0209 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0090 0,0171 0,0168 0,0242 0,0865 0,1236 0,5249 0,5555 1,1451 0,9691 0,6154 0,8304 0,5278 0,3712	8,4930 1252_roc wt% 0,4501 0,0000 0,4954 0,1631 0,0876 0,0906 0,3156 0,2583 0,1359 0,2583

# 870 Appendix A: Mass (g) and mass percentage obtained for each sieved fraction for the six ash

871

samples.

Class index	Settling velocity (m s <sup>-1</sup> )	Class spreading (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
1	0.05	0.1
2	0.15	0.1
3	0.25	0.1
4	0.35	0.1
5	0.45	0.1
6	0.55	0.1
7	0.65	0.1
8	0.75	0.1
9	0.85	0.1
10	0.95	0.1
11	1.1	0.2
12	1.3	0.2
13	1.5	0.2
14	1.7	0.2
15	1.9	0.2
16	2.2	0.4
17	2.6	0.4
18	3	0.4
19	3.4	0.4
20	3.8	0.4
21	4.4	0.8
22	5.2	0.8

873	Appendix B: Disdrometer classification of settling velocities.	
-----	--	--

1246_roc Corrected Sieved fraction (μm)	$\overline{D_{CE}}$ (µm)	Std. error	$\overline{\varphi}$	Std. error	$\overline{ ho}$ (kg m <sup>-3</sup> )
500-600	698.97	$\pm 3.77$	0.706	$\pm 0.005$	-
425-500	588.36	$\pm 2.3$	0.745	$\pm 0.003$	2645
355-425	506.01	± 1.73	0.765	$\pm 0.002$	2710
300-355	415.56	$\pm 1.24$	0.770	$\pm 0.002$	2737
250-300	355.28	$\pm 0.68$	0.780	$\pm 0.001$	2708
212-250	307.82	$\pm 0.58$	0.776	$\pm 0.001$	2782
180-212	262.74	$\pm 0.42$	0.777	$\pm 0.001$	2811
150-180	228.19	$\pm 0.75$	0.765	$\pm 0.002$	2811
125-150	185.86	$\pm 0.80$	0.763	$\pm 0.003$	2811
1601_summit			_		_
Corrected Sieved	$D_{CF}$	Std. error	$\overline{\varphi}$	Std. error	$\overline{\rho}$ (kg m <sup>-3</sup> )
francisco ()	64				
Iraction (µm)			-		, ()
500-600	696.59	± 3.06	0.737	± 0.003	-
500-600 425-500	696.59 585.16	$\pm 3.06 \pm 2.08$	0.737 0.764	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$	2683
500-600 425-500 355-425	696.59 585.16 495.67	$\pm 3.06 \\ \pm 2.08 \\ \pm 1.59$	0.737 0.764 0.777	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$	2683 2728
500-600 425-500 355-425 300-355	696.59 585.16 495.67 410.08	$\pm 3.06 \\ \pm 2.08 \\ \pm 1.59 \\ \pm 1.13$	0.737 0.764 0.777 0.765	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$	2683 2728 2743
500-600 425-500 355-425 300-355 250-300	696.59 585.16 495.67 410.08 352.31	$\pm 3.06 \\ \pm 2.08 \\ \pm 1.59 \\ \pm 1.13 \\ \pm 0.73$	0.737 0.764 0.777 0.765 0.759	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.001$	2683 2728 2743 2772
500-600 425-500 355-425 300-355 250-300 212-250	696.59 585.16 495.67 410.08 352.31 297.37	$\pm 3.06 \\ \pm 2.08 \\ \pm 1.59 \\ \pm 1.13 \\ \pm 0.73 \\ \pm 0.51$	0.737 0.764 0.777 0.765 0.759 0.759	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.001$ $\pm 0.001$	2683 2728 2743 2772 2774
500-600 425-500 355-425 300-355 250-300 212-250 180-212	696.59 585.16 495.67 410.08 352.31 297.37 252.94	$\pm 3.06$ $\pm 2.08$ $\pm 1.59$ $\pm 1.13$ $\pm 0.73$ $\pm 0.51$ $\pm 0.42$	0.737 0.764 0.777 0.765 0.759 0.759 0.759	$\pm 0.003$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.002$ $\pm 0.001$ $\pm 0.001$ $\pm 0.001$	2683 2728 2743 2772 2774 2792
500-600 425-500 355-425 300-355 250-300 212-250 180-212 150-180	696.59 585.16 495.67 410.08 352.31 297.37 252.94 211.87	$\pm 3.06$ $\pm 2.08$ $\pm 1.59$ $\pm 1.13$ $\pm 0.73$ $\pm 0.51$ $\pm 0.42$ $\pm 0.35$	0.737 0.764 0.777 0.765 0.759 0.759 0.759 0.744 0.730	$\begin{array}{c} \pm \ 0.003 \\ \pm \ 0.002 \\ \pm \ 0.002 \\ \pm \ 0.002 \\ \pm \ 0.001 \end{array}$	2683 2728 2743 2772 2774 2792 2737

**Appendix C:** Average circle equivalent diameters  $\overline{D_{CE}}$ , Sphericities  $\overline{\phi}$  and densities  $\overline{\rho}$  found 877 for the two summit samples: 1246\_roc and 1601\_summit.