List of Figures

Executive Summary Figure 1. A terrain map of Texas and Mexico as well as some major cites and points of interest to the BRAVO study. E-2
Executive Summary Figure 2. Big Bend's particulate light extinction budget during BRAVO E-3
Executive Summary Figure 3. Big Bend National Park five-year light extinction budget. All days with that fall on the same day of the year were averaged together, then the data were smoothed using a 15-day moving average. E-4
Executive Summary Figure 4. (Left) SO_2 emissions based on the 1999 BRAVO emissions inventory used in the REMSAD and CMAQ-MADRID modeling. No emissions were included beyond the black outline shown in the figure. Mexico City and Popocatepetl volcano emissions are located in the three most southern emission grid cells E-5
Executive Summary Figure 5. Fraction of time that air parcels spent during ten-day trajectories for periods with the a) 20% highest concentrations of particulate sulfate compounds and b) for the periods with the 20% lowest concentrations of particulate sulfate during the BRAVO study period July through October 1999. ....E-7
Executive Summary Figure 6. Airmass transport patterns to Big Bend, TX, during three sulfate episodes. Each isopleth shows the most likely pathway the airmass traversed prior to impacting Big Bend. E-8
Executive Summary Figure 7. Estimates by several data analysis and modeling methods of the study-period averaged percent contributions to particulate sulfate at Big Bend by U.S. and Mexico sources. TAGIT only attributed the Carbón power plants, while CMAQ and Synthesized CMAQ attribution did not distinguish Carbón from Mexico. E-10
Executive Summary Figure 8. Smoothed daily estimates by source regions to particulate sulfate concentration (top plot) and fraction of total predicted particulate sulfate (bottom plot) at Big Bend during the study period. E-11
Executive Summary Figure 9. Estimated contributions to particulate haze by various particulate sulfate source regions. The top plot shows the absolute haze contributions by the various particulate sulfate sources as well as the total particulate haze level (black line). The bottom plot shows the fractional contribution to haze by the various sources. E-12
Executive Summary Figure 10. Estimated contributions by particulate sulfate source regions to Big Bend particulate haze levels for the 20% haziest days and the 20% least hazy days of the BRAVO study period. E-12
Executive Summary Figure 11. Examples of geographic distribution of the fraction of time that air parcels spend during the five days prior to arriving at Big Bend National Park for the months of January, May, July, and September based upon a five-year analysis period (1998 to 2002). E-15
Figure 1-1. Location map of Big Bend National Park in southwestern Texas. 4
Figure 1-2. Texas and Mexico (above) and the terrain surrounding Big Bend National Park in western Texas and northern Mexico (below) 5
Figure 1-3. Map showing monitoring sites for preliminary visibility study. 7
Figure 1-4. Big Bend five-year composite contributions to haze by components. This figure was generated from IMPROVE aerosol data collected at Big Bend NP from 1998–2002 8
Figure 1-5. Trends in Big Bends reconstructed particulate light extinction for the worst 20% of the haze days (top trend), the middle 20% of the haze days (middle trend) and best 20% of the haze days (bottom trend). The open symbols are annual values and the closed symbols are a 5-year moving average. The Theil regression line and slope are plotted for the 5-year

moving average values. The worst and middle 20% trend lines are significant at a p-value below 0.01 9
Figure 1-6. Site map of Mexican cities and Texas counties with SO_2 emissions greater than 5000 tons SO_2/yr. The location of Big Bend National Park is also shown. 10
Figure 1-7. The percent change in the SO_2 emissions for each state in the conterminous United States from 1990–1999. The light gray states have decreasing trends while the dark gray states have increasing trends. States with hatch marks have trends that are significant with a two sided P value below 0.1. The percent changes were calculated by dividing the change in emissions over the twelve year period by the 1990 emissions estimated from the trend line. The 1999 SO_2 emission rates for each state are in parentheses. The emission rates are from the National Emission Trend database [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2001]. 10
Figure 1-8. Comparison of the ambient sulfate 80th percentile and NET SO_2 emissions aggregated over northeastern, southeastern, south middle and western United States regions. In each plot the SO_4^{2-} and SO_2 emission scales have a factor of 3 change between the low and high values [Malm et al., 2002]. 12
Figure 1-9. Examples of geographic distribution of the fraction of time that air parcels spend during the five days prior to arriving at Big Bend National Park for the months of January, May, July, and September based upon a five-year analysis period (1998 to 2002). 13
Figure 2-1. 24-hour network of gas and aerosol sampling locations. 16
Figure 2-2. 6-hour network of gas and aerosol sampling locations. 18
Figure 2-3. Release rates of ocPDCH from Eagle Pass (g/min) during the BRAVO study. 21
Figure 2-4. Release rates of iPPCH from Big Brown (g/min) during the BRAVO study. 22
Figure 2-5. Release rates of PDCB from San Antonio (g/min) during the second half of the study. 22
Figure 2-6. Release rates of PTCH from Houston (g/min) during the second half of the study. . 23
Figure 2-7. Example SO_2 emissions (moles hour^{-1}) from point and area sources within the REMSAD model domain. 26
Figure 2-8. SO_2 emissions (Mg/yr) for each source region. 27
Figure 2-9. The spatial domain and horizontal grid used in ARL's EDAS Archive. 28
Figure 2-10. The spatial domain and horizontal grid used in ARL's FNL Archive. 29
Figure 2-11. Radiosonde upper air sites. 30
Figure 2-12. BRAVO wind profiles and other upper air meteorological sites. 31
Figure 2-13. The dynamics of the planetary boundary layer and of pollutants being emitting into this layer as simulated by the CAPITA Monte Carlo model. 36
Figure 2-14. The four source regions evaluated for their impact on SO_4 predicted at BBNP: Mexico, Texas, the eastern U.S., and the western U.S. SO_2 emissions in the region immediately surrounding BBNP are near zero and not included in the emissions processing. 52
Figure 2-15. Example SO_2 emissions (moles/hr) for (a) the Texas "emissions out" scenario and (b) the Texas "emissions in" scenario. 52
Figure 2-16. Consensus source areas used for source attribution of sulfate at Big Bend. 54
Figure 2-17. Source areas used for TrMB modeling of tracers. 55
Figure 2-18. Modified consensus source areas used in the FMBR source attribution of sulfate at Big Bend. The grid represents the 100 x 100 km areas that forward airmass transport was simulated from. The values and colors of each source region are the SO_2 emission rates in 1000 tons/year from the BRAVO and National Emission Trend inventories. 56

Figure 2-19. Source areas used for FMBR modeling of tracers. 56
Figure 3-1. Temporal plot of $b_{ext,}$ ambient $b_{sp, 2.5\mu m,}$ and $b_{sp,coarse}$. 61
Figure 3-2. Summary of the percent scattering associated with fine and coarse particle scattering/absorption. 61
Figure 3-3. Multiple scatter plots of ammoniated sulfate dry mass scattering efficiency (eff_d), geometric mass mean diameter (d_g), geometric standard deviation (σ_g), and ammoniated sulfate mass for the 41 days on which MOUDI size mass size distribution were made. 64
Figure 3-4. An example of dry and relative humidity ramped scattering coefficient for Julian Day 284. The hours showing missing data correspond to a calibration period. 70
Figure 3-5. An example of measured and modeled f(RH) curves where deliquescence was observed for Julian Day 275. The molar ratio of ammonium to sulfate was 1.49 and the inorganic (SO_4+NH_4+NO_3+Na) fine mass fraction was 0.67. 72
Figure 3-6. An example of measured and modeled f(RH) curves for a day where crystallization was observed. The molar ratio of ammonium to sulfate was 1.41 and the inorganic (SO_4+NH_4+NO_3+Na) fine mass fraction was 0.61. 73
Figure 3-7. An example of a measured f(RH) curve where neither deliquescence or crystallization was observed. The modeled f(RH) curves for both deliquescence and crystallization are shown for reference. The molar ratio of ammonium to sulfate was 1.45 and the inorganic (SO_4+NH_4+NO_3+Na) fine mass fraction was 0.45. 74
Figure 3-8. An example of measured f(RH) curve showing the over-prediction of modeled f(RH) when it was assumed the aerosol was dry below 30% RH and the modeled f(RH) when it assumed an amount of water absorption predicted by the AIM equilibrium model at 30% RH. The molar ratio of ammonium to sulfate was 1.46 and the inorganic (SO_4+NH_4+NO_3+Na) fine mass fraction was 0.54. 75
Figure 3-9. The f(RH) values for ammoniated sulfate and organics derived from a statistical model whose only inputs were measured scattering associated with absorbed water and ammoniated sulfate and organic mass concentrations. Also shown for reference are the average f(RH) curves derived from the AIM equilibrium modeled metastable D/D_o curves without normalization and with normalization to 20% relative humidity. 76
Figure 3-10. Big Bend's daily fine particulate mass budget during the BRAVO study. 79
Figure 3-11. Big Bend's particulate light extinction budget during BRAVO. 80
Figure 3-12. Big Bend National Park five-year light extinction budget. All days that fall on the same day of the year were averaged together, then the data were smoothed using a 15-day moving average. 81
Figure 3-13. Quarterly aerosol contributions to light extinction averaged over five years (1998–2002). Top graphs: all days in each quarter; bottom graphs: annual haziest 1/5 of the days. Percent contributions to particulate haze (the non-Rayleigh light extinction) are shown in parentheses. 82
Figure 4-1. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 9/15/1999, 18:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD outputs, bottom is CMC. 86
Figure 4-2. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 7/19/1999, 6:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD outputs, bottom is CMC. 87
Figure 4-3. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 9/20/1999, 18:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD output, bottom is CMC. 88
Figure 4-4. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 7/24/1999, 12:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD output, bottom is CMC. 89

Figure 4-5. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 7/18/1999, 6:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD output, bottom is CMC. 90
Figure 4-6. Five-day back trajectories generated by all model/input combinations beginning on 8/6/1999, 18:00 CDT. Top are HYSPLIT and ATAD output, bottom is CMC. 91
Figure 4-7. Overall Residence Times all generated with ATAD for July–October 1999, grid size ½ deg lat by ½ deg lon. a) using NOAA rawinsonde data b) using rawinsonde data plus data from four BRAVO wind profilers c) using MM5 36 km gridded meteorology d) using EDAS when available and FNL for October. 93
Figure 4-8. Overall Residence Times for July–October 1999, grid size ½ deg lat by ½ deg lon. all with 36 km MM5 input a) ATAD b) CAPITA MC c) HYSPLIT started at 100, 200, 500, 1000 m AGL. 95
Figure 4-9. Overall Residence Times for July–October 1999, grid size ½ deg lat by ½ deg lon. All with EDAS/FNL input a) ATAD b) CAPITA MC c) HYSPLIT started at 100, 200, 500, and 1000 m AGL. 96
Figure 4-10. Typical heights of all vertical layers for each of the three gridded wind fields. See Figure 4-11 for detail of the lowest layers. 98
Figure 4-11. Typical heights of the vertical layers for each of the three gridded wind fields for the lowest 5000 m (black solid lines) and five HYSPLIT start heights of 10, 100, 200, 500, 1000, and 2000 m, shown as dotted red lines. 98
Figure 4-12. Overall Residence Time Differences for July–October 1999, grid size ½ deg lat by ½ deg lon. All with 36 km MM5 input a) ATAD-CAPITAMC b) ATAD-HYSPLIT..... 100
Figure 4-13. Overall Residence Time Differences for July–October 1999, grid size ½ deg lat by ½ deg lon. All with 36 km EDAS/FNL input a) ATAD-CAPITAMC b) ATAD-HYSPLIT. 100
Figure 4-14. Overall Residence Time differences during July–September 1999 a) ATAD/EDAS-ATADFNL, b) HYSPLIT EDAS-HYSPLIT FNL. 102
Figure 4-15. Overall Residence Time differences during Octobers 1997, 1998, 2000–2002 a) ATAD/EDAS-ATAD/FNL, b) HYSPLIT EDAS-HYSPLIT FNL. 102
Figure 4-16. Overall Residence Time differences during July–October 1999 a) CMC with EDAS/FNL-HYSPLIT with EDAS/FNL, b) CMC with MM5-HYSPLIT with MM5. 103
Figure 4-17. Overall Residence Times calculated with HYSPLIT and EDAS/FNL data during July–October 1999 with start heights of 10, 100, 200, 500, 1000, and 2000 m AGL. 105
Figure 4-18. Overall Residence Times calculated with HYSPLIT and MM5 data during July–October 1999 with start heights of 10, 100, 200, 500, 1000, and 2000 m AGL. 106
Figure 4-19. Back trajectories generated by all model and wind field combinations for the day of maximum tracer concentration at Big Bend for each tracer. The black dots indicate the tracer release sites for the tracer that had the high concentration on that day. 108
Figure 4-20. Differential Probability (HRT-ORT) for the Eagle Pass Tracer (ocPDCH). A high concentration is defined as 80th percentile or greater. 109
Figure 4-21. Differential Probability (HRT-ORT) for the Big Brown (iPPCH). A high concentration is defined as 80th percentile or greater. The two combinations that were subjectively determined to do the best are circled. 110
Figure 4-22. Differential Probability (HRT-ORT) for the San Antonio Tracer (PDCB). A high concentration is defined as 80th percentile or greater. 111

Figure 4-23. Differential Probability (HRT-ORT) for the Houston Tracer (PTCH). A high concentration is defined as 80th percentile or greater. The combinations that were subjectively determined to be doing better than the others are circled. 112
Figure 4-24. Overall Residence Times for 1997–2002 by season, and using ATAD with rawinsonde data, HYSPLIT with EDAS data, and HYSPLIT with FNL data. HYSPLIT results include start heights of 100, 200, 500, and 1000 m. Fall does not include 1999. Colors are the same as in Figure 4-18. 114
Figure 4-25. Mean number of back trajectory endpoints in each directional quadrant from Big Bend using ATAD with rawinsonde data and HYSPLIT with EDAS and FNL data started at 1000 m. Bar colors indicate seasons. 115
Figure 4-26. Mean number of back trajectory endpoints in each directional quadrant from Great Smoky Mountains National Park using ATAD with rawinsonde data and HYSPLIT with EDAS and FNL data started at 1000 m. Bar colors indicate seasons. 116
Figure 4-27. Mean number of back trajectory endpoints in each directional quadrant from Grand Canyon National Park using ATAD with rawinsonde data and HYSPLIT with EDAS and FNL data started at 1000 m. Bar colors indicate seasons. 117
Figure 5-1. The location of the tracer release sites and tracer monitoring network. The distance from the tracer release sites to Big Bend is also noted. 121
Figure 5-2. Comparison of observed and CMC modeled tracer data at Big Bend, Texas. The observed and modeled tracer data were averaged over the K-Bar, Persimmon Gap, and San Vicente monitoring sites which are in or at the boundary of the park. The measured data include error bars. 127
Figure 5-3. Comparison of observed and CMC modeled tracer data in southwest Texas. The observed and modeled tracer data were averaged over the six 6-hour monitoring sites: San Vicente, K-Bar, Persimmon Gap, Marathon, Fort Stockton, and Monahans Sandhills. The measured data include error bars. 128
Figure 5-4. Observed and REMSAD predicted tracer mixing ratios for the a) Eagle Pass tracer, b) northeast Texas tracer, c) San Antonio tracer, and d) tracer released from Parish power plant in Houston. 133
Figure 6-1. Plumes of (a) sulfur dioxide and (b) sulfate defined by 5 $\mu g/m^3$ isosurfaces for October 2, 1999. 139
Figure 6-2. The four source regions evaluated for their impact on SO_4 predicted at BBNP: Mexico, Texas, the eastern U.S., and the western U.S. 140
Figure 6-3. Ground-level sulfate concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) predicted by the REMSAD air quality model for 1500 CST, September 1, 1999. 142
Figure 6-4. The BRAVO monitoring network. Example time series plots and statistics are presented for highlighted monitors. 143
Figure 6-5. The CASTNET monitoring network. Highlighted monitors fall within the REMSAD model domain. 144
Figure 6-6. Observed and predicted sulfate time series for five monitors within the BRAVO network: (a) K-Bar, (b) Hagerman, (c) Big Thicket, (d) Laguna Atascosa, and (e) Esperanza. 148
Figure 6-7. Ground-level sulfate concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$), September 28, 1999. 149
Figure 6-8. Scatter plots of predicted versus observed sulfate concentrations for all 37 BRAVO monitors: (a) July–October, (b) July, (c) August, (d) September, and (e) October. A least-squares linear regression equation and line is also shown. 151

Figure 6-9. Scatter plots of predicted versus observed sulfate concentrations for the 67 CASTNET monitors that lie within the REMSAD model domain: (a) July–October, (b) July, (c) August, (d) September, and (e) October. A least squares linear regression equation and line is also shown. 153
Figure 6-10. Contour maps of interpolated normalized bias: (a) July–October, (b) July, (c) August, (d) September, and (e) October. 156
Figure 6-11. Example SO_2 emissions (moles/hr) for (a) the Texas "emissions out" scenario and (b) the Texas "emissions in" scenario. 158
Figure 6-12. Degree of non-linearity between the "emissions out" and the "emissions in" simulations. (a) Predicted sulfate at K-Bar for the base emissions simulation. (b–e) Difference in predicted attributions for each source region (i.e. attribution from the "emissions out" simulation subtracted from the attribution from the "emissions in" simulation) for emission sources in (b) Texas, (c) the eastern U.S., (d) Mexico, (e) the western U.S., and (f) boundary concentrations. 160
Figure 6-13. Predicted and observed Houston tracer concentrations measured at K-Bar. 161
Figure 6-14. Surface sulfate concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) on August 17, 1999, 1500 UTC, for the (a) base emissions simulation and contributions from the five emissions sensitivity simulations: (b) Mexico, (c) Texas, (d) the eastern U.S., (e) the western U.S., and (f) GOCART boundary concentrations. 164
Figure 6-15. Four month average contributions to predicted sulfate at Big Bend NP from the "emissions out" sensitivity simulations for the four regional sources and the boundary concentrations. 166
Figure 6-16. Observed sulfate, predicted sulfate, and predicted sulfate by source region at Big Bend NP for the "emissions out" simulations for (a) the entire BRAVO study period (July–October 1999), (b) July 1999, (c) August 1999, (d) September 1999, and (e) October 1999. 167
Figure 6-17. Relative contribution of predicted sulfate to Big Bend NP by source region for the "emissions out" simulations for (a) the entire BRAVO study period (July–October 1999), (b) July 1999, (c) August 1999, (d) September 1999, and (e) October 1999. 168
Figure 6-18. Daily absolute attribution of sulfate to Big Bend NP. 170
Figure 6-19. Daily relative attribution of sulfate to Big Bend NP. 171
Figure 6-20. Domain map, showing the (a) Carbón I & II power plants and the subregions of (b) northeastern Texas, (c) southeastern Texas, (d) Missouri/Illinois/Arkansas, (e) Louisiana/Mississippi, and (f) "East Central". 173
Figure 6-21. The average source attribution to each BRAVO monitoring site for each month during BRAVO. The average observed sulfate and REMSAD predicted sulfate are also included. Only days with a valid measured sulfate concentration were used in each site's averages. 180
Figure 6-22. The average source attribution to each BRAVO monitoring site over the entire BRAVO period. Only days with a valid measured sulfate concentration were used in each site's averages. The boxes show the west, south, and east Texas aggregation regions used in Figure 23. 181
Figure 6-23. The daily source attribution average over all monitoring sites in a) West Texas, b) southern Texas, c) East Texas, and d) all of Texas. The size of the aggregation regions are defined in Figure 22. The sum of the source contribution from the four regions is approximately equal to the predicted sulfate concentrations. 182

Figure 7-1. Observed perfluorocarbon tracer concentrations (ppq) at K-Bar during the second half of the BRAVO study after negative concentrations were set to zero. 187
Figure 7-2. The source regions from which 7-day forward plumes were simulated using the CAPITA Monte Carlo model. 190
Figure 7-3. Big Bend transit probabilities for the July–October BRAVO time period and the months of July and October. 191
Figure 7-4. Reconstruction of the Eagle Pass and Big Brown tracer release sites and rates using tracer concentration measured all monitoring sites from July–October. The tracer release sites are identified by the stars and the monitoring site locations by the squares. 192
Figure 7-5. Reconstruction of the Eagle Pass and Big Brown tracer release sites and rates using tracer concentration from only the Big Bend monitoring site from July–October. The tracer release sites are identified by the stars and the monitoring site locations by the squares... 193
Figure 7-6. The combined tracer time series at Big Bend (K-Bar) monitoring site and the contribution of each tracer to the total. 194
Figure 7-7. The four tracer source regions used in the FMBR analysis. 195
Figure 7-8. The tracer average source attribution and standard errors. 196
Figure 7-9. The observed and predicted total tracer and the predicted source attribution of each tracer to the total. 196
Figure 7-10. Time lines of the observed (black) and predicted (red) REMSAD sulfate in ng/m^3 (top) and number of back trajectory endpoints in each of the source areas using the CAPITA MC model and 5-day back trajectories. The blue vertical lines are the first days of August, September, October, and November. 199
Figure 7-11. Time lines of the observed (black) and predicted (red) REMSAD sulfate (top) and number of back trajectory endpoints in each of the source areas using the HYSPLIT model and 5-day back trajectories. The blue vertical lines are the first days of August, September, October, and November. 200
Figure 7-12. 5-day duration back trajectories arriving at Big Bend during the 24-hours beginning 9/1/99 at 8:00 a.m. Blue are CAPITA MC trajectories (20 every 2 hours), red are HYSPLIT trajectories (1 per hour for each of 4 start heights) and green are ATAD trajectories (4 per day). 201
Figure 7-13. Scatter plots of REMSAD sulfate attributions vs. number of endpoints for each of four large source areas using 5-day back trajectories from the CAPITA MC model and MM5 winds. The solid blue lines are the "true" slopes; the dashed red lines are the TrMB modeled slopes. 202
Figure 7-14. Scatter plots of REMSAD sulfate attributions vs. number of endpoints for each of four large source areas using 5-day back trajectories from the HYSPLIT model and MM5 winds. The solid blue lines are the "true" slopes; the dashed red lines are the TrMB modeled slopes. 203
Figure 8-1. Time lines of the major constituents of fine mass (ng/m^3) at Big Bend. Labels on the x-axis are the day of the year. The vertical blue lines show the beginning of each month. 213
Figure 8-2. Spatial pattern of sulfur on August 21 when S at Big Bend was 2200 ng/m^3 214
Figure 8-3. Spatial pattern of sulfur on September 1 when S at Big Bend was 3080 ng/m^3. 214
Figure 8-4. Spatial pattern of sulfur on September 15 when S at Big Bend was 2545 ng/m^3. 215
Figure 8-5. Spatial pattern of sulfur on October 12 when S at Big Bend was 2291 ng/m^3. 215

Figure 8-6. Mean sulfur concentrations for July 26–October 30, the portion of the study period when all sites had sufficient data. 216
Figure 8-7. Correlations of sulfur measured at Big Bend to sulfur measured at other sites. Light magenta lines are distance in km from Big Bend. 217
Figure 8-8. Boxplots of sulfur concentrations (ng/m^3) by month in four sections of the monitoring domain. 218
Figure 8-9. Overlaid mean sulfur concentrations during September and October 1996 and 1999. Sites listed in the bottom right corner are sites common to both years and the mean concentrations during each study period. 219
Figure 8-10. EOF 1 for sulfur. 220
Figure 8-11. EOF 2 for sulfur. 221
Figure 8-12. EOF 3 for sulfur. 221
Figure 8-13. EOF 1 for iron. 222
Figure 8-14. Correlations of iron measured at Big Bend to iron measured at other BRAVO sites. 223
Figure 8-15. Aluminum vs. calcium (ng/m^3). Several lines have been added for reference. 224
Figure 8-16. Time lines of several trace elements (ng/m^3) measured at Big Bend National Park during BRAVO. Labels on the x-axis are the day of the year. The vertical blue lines show the beginning of each month. 225
Figure 8-17. Mean selenium concentrations. 226
Figure 8-18. Selenium concentrations on August 21. 227
Figure 8-19. Selenium concentrations on September 1. 227
Figure 8-20. Selenium concentrations on September 15. 228
Figure 8-21. Selenium concentrations on October 12. 228
Figure 8-22. Correlations of selenium at Big Bend to selenium at other sites. 229
Figure 8-23. Monthly box plots of selenium (ng/m^3) for four different sections of the monitoring domain. 230
Figure 8-24. Time lines of several trace elements (ng/m^3) at Big Bend. Labels on the x-axis are the day of the year. The vertical blue lines show the beginning of each month. 231
Figure 8-25. Mean vanadium. 232
Figure 8-26. Time lines of Na, NO^-_3, Ca, and Cl^- (ng/m^3) at Big Bend. Labels on the x-axis are the day of the year. The vertical blue lines show the beginning of each month. 233
Figure 8-27. Mean sodium concentrations. 234
Figure 8-28. Box plots of sodium concentrations at Big Bend by year from the IMPROVE network. 235
Figure 8-29. Mean bromine concentrations. 236
Figure 8-30. Combined 1996 and 1999 spatial pattern for Bromine. 237
Figure 8-31. Mean lead concentrations. 238
Figure 8-32. Box plots of lead at Big Bend by year. 239
Figure 8-33. Correlations of lead at Big Bend to lead at other BRAVO sites. 240
Figure 8-34. Correlations between fine particle species measured at K-Bar during BRAVO. . 242
Figure 8-35. Variance explained by each factor in a factor analysis of measured fine particle concentrations at K-Bar. 245
Figure 8-36. Cumulative variance explained by each factor in a factor analysis of measured fine particle concentrations at K-Bar. 245

Figure 8-37. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor one of eight factors..... 248
Figure 8-38. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor two of eight factors. 249
Figure 8-39. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor three of eight factors. 250
Figure 8-40. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor four of eight factors..... 251
Figure 8-41. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor five of eight factors. 252
Figure 8-42. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor six of eight factors..... 253
Figure 8-43. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor seven of eight factors. 254
Figure 8-44. Factor loadings in the bar graph and daily factor scores in the line graph for factor eight of eight factors. 255
Figure 8-45. The distance weighted residence time analysis, conditional probability, and incremental probability functions for the upper 20th percentiles of the tracer data at Big Bend. These transport probabilities were created using airmass histories generated using the EDAS/FNL meteorological data. The * identifies the location of the tracer release site and the triangle is the location of Big Bend. 259
Figure 8-46. The distance weighted residence time analysis, conditional probability, and incremental probability functions for the upper 20th percentiles of the tracer data at Big Bend. These transport probabilities were created using airmass histories generated using the 36 km MM5 meteorological data. The * identifies the location of the tracer release site and the triangle is the location of Big Bend. 260
Figure 8-47. The residence time PDF and its decomposition for the entire BRAVO study. The airmass histories were generated using the EDAS/FNL wind fields. 262
Figure 8-48. The Big Bend NP residence time PDF and its decomposition for the 20% of the days with the highest particulate sulfur. The airmass histories were generated using the EDAS/FNL wind fields..... 263
Figure 8-49. The Big Bend NP residence time PDF and its decomposition for the 20% of the days with the lowest particulate sulfur. The airmass histories were generated using the EDAS/FNL wind fields..... 264
Figure 8-50. Airmass transport pathways to Big Bend NP during three particulate sulfur episodes. Each isopleth shows the most likely pathway the airmass traversed prior to impacting Big Bend. The transport pathways were created using residence time analysis and the contour lines encompass 75% of the residence time hours..... 264
Figure 8-51. The residence time PDF and its decomposition for the 20% of the days with highest particulate sulfur at Big Bend. The airmass histories were generated using the MM5 wind fields..... 265
Figure 8-52. The incremental and conditional probabilities for the upper 20th percentiles of the A) fine particulate sulfur, B) sulfur dioxide, and C) fine particle selenium at Big Bend. These transport probabilities were created using airmass histories generated using the EDAS/FNL wind fields..... 266

Figure 8-53. The Big Bend NP residence time PDF and its decomposition for the 20% of the days with the highest particulate sulfur. 10-day airmass histories were generated using the EDAS/FNL meteorological data. The box in each plot spans the geographic boundary of the residence time plots in Figure 8-48. 268
Figure 8-54. Big Bend ten-day airmass history for September 1, 20:00, 1999, generated using the EDAS/FNL data. The airmass history was divided into elevated and surface trajectories. Each color represents two days of transport with the red trajectories 0 to 2 days and blue 8–10 days prior to reaching Big Bend. 269
Figure 8-55. The incremental and conditional probabilities for the upper 20^{th} percentiles of the particulate sulfur at Big Bend. These transport probabilities were created using 10-day airmass histories generated using the EDAS/FNL data. 270
Figure 8-56. Examples of geographic distribution of the fraction of time that air parcels spend during the five days prior to arriving at Big Bend National Park for the months of January, May, July, and September based upon a five-year analysis period (1998 to 2002). 271
Figure 8-57. Monthly percentages of time that air parcels spend in a region prior to arrival at Big Bend based on 5-day back trajectory calculations for the five-year period from 1998 to 2002. The black lines shown over the months of July through October correspond to the values during the BRAVO study period in 1999. The black line for October was calculated using FNL data rather than EDAS. The plot labeled "Other" represents locations primarily over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. 271
Figure 8-58. The maximum source contributions to Big Bend's particulate sulfur as estimated from EDAS/FNL airmass histories. A) The maximum source contribution for each 80 x 80 km_2 grid cell. B) The maximum source contribution for each source region defined in Figure 2-14. 274
Figure 8-59. The maximum source contributions to Big Bend's particulate sulfur as estimated from MM5 airmass histories. A) The maximum source contribution for each 80 x 80 km_2 grid cell. B) The maximum source contribution for each source region defined in Figure 2-14 274
Figure 8-60. Synthesized REMSAD daily source attribution scaling coefficients using all sites and a 5-day moving window. The four eastern U.S. source regions were aggregated together because of high collinearities between these source regions. 279
Figure 8-61. The optimum synthesized REMSAD average source attribution and standard errors to Big Bend's predicted sulfate for the entire BRAVO time period (7/9–10/28/1999). The bolded labels are the relative contributions, i.e., the ratios of average absolute values. The values in parentheses are the original REMSAD source attribution estimates. 287
Figure 8-62. The optimum synthesized REMSAD absolute and relative source attribution to the predicted sulfate at Big Bend. 288
Figure 8-63. The optimum synthesized REMSAD average source attribution and standard error to Big Bend's predicted sulfate for each Big Bend sulfate episode. 291
Figure 8-64. The optimum synthesized CMAQ daily source attribution scaling coefficients. .. 295
Figure 8-65. The optimum synthesized CMAQ average source attributions and standard errors to Big Bend's predicted sulfate for the entire BRAVO time period (7/9–10/28/1999). The bolded labels are the relative contributions, i.e. the ratios of average absolute values. The values in parentheses are the original CMAQ-MADRID source attribution estimates. 295

Figure 8-66. The optimum synthesized CMAQ daily absolute and relative source attributions to the predicted sulfate at Big Bend. The daily source attributions were smoothed using a three-day moving average. 296
Figure 8-67. The optimum synthesized CMAQ average source attributions and standard errors to Big Bend's predicted sulfate for each Big Bend sulfate episode. 297
Figure 8-68. Range (in green) and daily median of IMPROVE and URG 24-hour averaged sulfur and sulfate measurements at K-Bar (in black) 300
Figure 8-69. The average source attributions and standard errors to Big Bend's sulfate for the entire BRAVO time period (7/6–10/28/1999). The bolded labels are the relative contributions, i.e. the ratios of average absolute values. The FMBR used the MM5-derived 10-day plumes. 314
Figure 8-70. The average source attribution and standard errors to Big Bend's sulfate for the entire BRAVO time period (7/6–10/28/1999). The bolded labels are the relative contributions, i.e. the ratios of average absolute values. The FMBR used the EDAS/FNL-derived 10-day plumes. 314
Figure 9-1. The average relative contribution of sulfate from major source regions to Big Bend's sulfate during the BRAVO study using various methods. The relative contributions are the ratio of the average source attribution to the average predicted Big Bend sulfate. 322
Figure 9-2. Synthesized CMAQ daily absolute and relative source attributions to the predicted sulfate at Big Bend. The daily source attributions were smoothed using a three-day moving average. The Carbón attributions are derived from synthesized REMSAD. 324
Figure 9-3. Big Bend's average sulfate attribution for days with the highest and lowest 20% measured sulfate concentration during BRAVO. 325
Figure 9-4. The synthesized CMAQ average source attribution to Big Bend's sulfate for each Big Bend sulfate episode. The Carbón contribution was derived from the synthesized REMSAD results. 325
Figure 9-5. The synthesized CMAQ average source attribution to Big Bend's sulfate for each low sulfate periods at Big Bend. The Carbón contribution was derived from the synthesized REMSAD results. 326
Figure 9-6. Estimated contributions to particulate haze by various particulate sulfate source regions. The top plot shows the absolute haze contributions by the various particulate sulfate sources as well as the total particulate haze level (black line). The bottom plot shows the fractional contribution to haze by the various sources. 328
Figure 9-7. Estimated contributions by particulate sulfate source regions to Big Bend particulate haze levels for the 20% haziest days and the 20% least hazy days of the BRAVO study period. 326