

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Aerosol and tracer monitoring site abbreviations, names, latitude, longitude, elevation, and purpose.	17
Table 2-2. Number of measurement sites by measurement type.	18
Table 2-3. Tracer release schedule first phase of study.	20
Table 2-4. Tracer release schedule for the second half of the study.	20
Table 2-5. Sulfate source area names	54
Table 3-1. Statistical summary of optical characteristics of fine and coarse particle absorption and scattering.	60
Table 3-2. Statistical summary of fine mass species concentrations. The parenthetical values are the fraction that each respective species contributes to reconstructed fine mass.	62
Table 3-3. Statistical summary of coarse mass concentrations.	63
Table 3-4. Statistical summary of size and scattering properties of PM _{2.5} ammoniated sulfate mass. The number of data points was 41.	64
Table 3-5. Statistical summary of reconstructed and measured dry fine mass scattering and the scattering associated with each species assuming a model represented by equation 3-1. The parenthetical values are the fraction of scattering associated with each species. The number of data points was 64.	65
Table 3-6. Statistical summary of the mean percent difference between f(RH) curves in specific relative humidity ranges that were derived from aerosol growth predicted by the AIM and ISORROPIA models. The number of data points is 66.	67
Table 3-7. Statistical summary of measured and reconstructed ambient fine mass scattering and scattering associated with each species. Ambient scattering predictions resulting from using different equilibrium model assumptions are also presented. The parenthetical values are the percent scattering associated with that species assuming the AIM metastable equilibrium model. The number of data points was 104.	68
Table 3-8. Statistical summary of the difference between modeled and observed f(RH).	68
Table 3-9. Statistical summary of extinction and the contribution of each species to extinction. The parenthetical values are the fraction that each species contributes to extinction.	78
Table 4-1. Summary of the major differences between the three trajectory models used for BRAVO.	84
Table 4-2. Mean endpoint heights and wind speeds for 5-day back trajectories for July–October 1999 generated by all the model and input data combinations including all the start heights for HYSPLIT. A HYSPLIT start height of 100–1000 refers to an average of the results from 100, 200, 500, and 1000 m start heights.	97
Table 4-3. Mean endpoint heights and wind speeds for 5-day back trajectories for Octobers of 1997–1998 and 2000–2002 generated by all the model and input data combinations including all the start heights for HYSPLIT. A HYSPLIT start height of 100–1000 refers to an average of the results from 100, 200, 500, and 1000 m start heights.	101

Table 5-1. A) The correlation between the measured ocPDCH tracer concentrations at the six 6-hour monitoring sites. B) The same correlation matrix as in A) but the data were aggregated up to 24 hours. The distance between the receptor sites in km are in parentheses.	122
Table 5-2. The correlation of the A) 24-hour particulate sulfur concentrations and B) 24-hour sulfur dioxide between the same six monitoring sites as in Table 5-1.	122
Table 5-3. Comparison of K-Bar and San Vicente’s tracer data.	124
Table 5-4. Comparison of K-Bar’s and Persimmon Gap’s tracer data.	124
Table 5-5. Comparison of San Vicente and Persimmon Gap’s tracer data.	124
Table 5-6. The tracer effective release heights and design tracer emission rates used in the CMC for each simulated tracer release location.	125
Table 5-7. The CMC model performance statistics for the simulation of tracer average over the three Big Bend sites (San Vicente, K-Bar and Persimmon Gap). The modeled and observed statistics used the same days.	129
Table 5-8. The CMC model performance statistics for the simulation of tracer average over the six 6-hour tracer sites: San Vicente, K-Bar, Persimmon Gap, Marathon, Fort Stockton and Monahans Sandhills. The modeled and observed statistics used the same days.	130
Table 5-9. The REMSAD model performance statistics for the simulation of tracer average over the three Big Bend sites (San Vicente, K-Bar, and Persimmon Gap). The modeled and observed statistics used the same days.	134
Table 5-10. The range of tracer simulation performance statistics over all model wind field pairs and aggregation regions in Tables 5-7 to 5-9.	136
Table 5-11. The range of comparisons between the measured tracer concentrations from the three Big Bend monitoring sites in Tables 5-3 to 5-5. These statistics are a measure of the inherent uncertainty due to the model resolution and measured tracer data errors.	136
Table 5-12. Comparison of the REMSAD and CMC model performance statistics for the simulation of tracer average over the three Big Bend sites (San Vicente, K-Bar, and Persimmon Gap). The modeled and observed statistics used the same days. The bias and RMS relative error are ratios; therefore, they are dimensionless.	137
Table 6-1. REMSAD performance statistics for the base simulation calculated at Big Bend NP (K-Bar) and four peripheral sites (Hagerman – northern Texas, Big Thicket – eastern Texas, Laguna Atascosa – southern Texas, Esperanza – western Texas).	148
Table 6-2. REMSAD performance statistics for the base simulation calculated for all 37 BRAVO monitors.	152
Table 6-3. REMSAD performance statistics for the base simulation calculated for the 67 CASTNET monitors that fall within the model domain.	154
Table 6-4. Predicted subregional contributions to Big Bend NP sulfate.	174
Table 6-5. The average July source attribution for all BRAVO monitoring sites. All units are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	174

Table 6-6. The average August source attribution for all BRAVO monitoring sites. All units are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	176
Table 6-7. The average September source attribution for all BRAVO monitoring sites. All units are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	177
Table 6-8. The average October source attribution for all BRAVO monitoring sites. All units are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	178
Table 6-9. The average July–October source attribution for all BRAVO monitoring sites. All units are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	183
Table 7-1. Results of TrMB modeling of three BRAVO tracers at K-Bar for 9/17–10/28 (42 days). The first three rows show the tracer name, the release site, the mean measured concentrations, and the percent of the total measured concentration due to each tracer. Negative concentrations were set to zero before summing. The remaining rows give the TrMB modeled percent attributions for several combinations of back trajectory models and input meteorological data and trajectory lengths. Attributions that are accurate to within the uncertainty of the measurement and standard error of the regression coefficients are shown in bold and a larger font for easy identification.....	188
Table 7-2. The retrieved Eagle Pass and northeast Texas tracer release rates and inversion performance statistics.....	192
Table 7-3. Average observed and retrieved tracer emission rates and their contribution to the combined Big Bend trace concentrations.	195
Table 7-4. Columns 2–5 are the percent attributions of predicted REMSAD sulfate by TrMB, all using MM5 winds. For comparison, the top row shows the corresponding REMSAD attributions. REMSAD has boundary conditions = 7% and non-linear = 2%. Values in parentheses are the REMSAD attributions if these are proportionally redistributed. TrMB attributions within 10 percentage points of the REMSAD attributions are shown in larger font bold type. The last three columns are statistics comparing the TrMB predicted concentrations to “observed” (REMSAD predicted) sulfate concentrations. All values are for July 6–October 28, 1999 (115 days).	198
Table 7-5. Source attribution results from the application of the FMBR technique to the REMSAD predicted sulfate concentrations. The REMSAD source attribution results are also provided. Bolded source attributions are within 1 standard error of the REMSAD results. Propagation of errors was used to estimate standard errors for aggregated regions.	205
Table 7-6. Source attribution results from the application of the FMBR technique to the REMSAD predicted sulfate concentrations. The REMSAD source attribution results are also provided. The FMBR used the 10-day plumes and was run under three different conditions defined below. Propagation of errors was used to estimate standard errors for aggregated regions.	206
Table 7-7. The source attribution scaling coefficients and performance statistics resulting from regressing the REMSAD source attribution results for all modeled source regions against the REMSAD-predicted sulfate concentrations at Big Bend and at all BRAVO monitoring	

sites for the entire BRAVO time period. The predicted sulfate concentrations had a 10% normally distributed error added to them..... 209

Table 8-1. Mean sodium concentrations (ng/m^3) during the 1996 Scoping Study and during September and October of 1999 during BRAVO. Values in parentheses are the means with the zeros (below MDL) removed..... 235

Table 8-2. Correlations between fine particle species measured at K-Bar during BRAVO..... 243

Table 8-3. Source attribution scaling coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of the REMSAD source attributions against the particulate sulfur data measured at each BRAVO monitoring site over the entire time period. The monitoring sites needed 75% or 84 valid data points for the regression to be conducted. Regression coefficients are shown only if the source region contributed 6% or more to the receptor site on average as estimated by REMSAD. The West Texas source region is not shown because it rarely contributed 6% of the sulfate to any site. The four eastern U.S. source regions were aggregated together. Source regions with a regression coefficient more than a factor of two of the average standard error away from the average coefficients across all sites are bolded. 276

Table 8-4. Synthesized REMSAD daily source attribution scaling coefficients and their standard error averaged over the entire BRAVO period for each source regions. The standard deviation of the scaling coefficients is also provided. 278

Table 8-5. The performance statistics for each BRAVO monitoring site using the temporally varying source attribution scaling coefficients derived from Synthesized REMSAD. 280

Table 8-6a. Source attribution scaling coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of the REMSAD source attribution estimates against the particulate sulfate data measured at each BRAVO monitoring site from July 9–August 5. The source attribution scaling coefficients for each monitoring site were compared to the Big Bend values using Student t statistics. Source regions that contributed more than 10% of the sulfate as estimated by REMSAD are underlined and if they also had a t value greater than 3 they are bolded. The scaling coefficients for the West Texas, the western U.S., and boundary conditions are not shown. 283

Table 8-6b. Source attribution scaling coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of the REMSAD source attribution estimates against the particulate sulfate data measured at each BRAVO monitoring site from August 6–September 19. The source attribution scaling coefficients for each monitoring site were compared to the Big Bend values using Student t statistics. Source regions that contributed more than 10% of the sulfate as estimated by REMSAD are underlined and if they also had a t value greater than 3 they are bolded. The scaling coefficients for the West Texas, the western U.S., and boundary conditions are not shown. 284

Table 8-6c. Source attribution scaling coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of the REMSAD source attribution estimates against the particulate sulfate data measured at each BRAVO monitoring site from September 20–October 28. The source attribution scaling coefficients for each monitoring site were compared to the Big Bend values using Student t statistics. Source regions that contributed more than 10% of the sulfate as estimated by REMSAD are underlined and if they also had a t value greater than 3

they are bolded. The scaling coefficients for the West Texas, the western U.S., and boundary conditions are not shown.	285
Table 8-7. The optimum synthesized REMSAD average source attribution scaling coefficients and the average standard errors, and the source attribution and standard error for the entire BRAVO time period (7/9–10/28/1999). The regression performance statistics are also provided. The relative contributions are the ratios of average predicted absolute values and are reported as percents.....	287
Table 8-8. The optimum synthesized REMSAD relative source attribution and standard error to the predicted sulfate for each Big Bend sulfate episode. The relative contributions are the ratios of average predicted absolute values.	290
Table 8-9. Source attribution scaling coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of the CMAQ-MADRID source attribution estimates against the particulate sulfate data measured at each BRAVO monitoring site for three time periods. The source attribution scaling coefficients for each monitoring site were compared to the Big Bend values using Student t statistics. Source regions with a t value greater than 3 and which contributed more than 10% to the receptor sites concentration as estimated by CMAQ-MADRID are bolded. The scaling coefficients for the western U.S. and boundary conditions are not shown.	292
Table 8-10. The optimum synthesized CMAQ average source attribution scaling coefficients and the average standard errors, and the source attributions and standard errors for the entire BRAVO time period (7/9–10/28/1999). The regression performance statistics are also provided. The relative contributions are the ratios of average predicted absolute values. .	293
Table 8-11. The optimum synthesized CMAQ relative source attributions and standard errors to the predicted sulfate for each Big Bend sulfate episode. The relative contributions are the ratios of average predicted absolute values.	294
Table 8-12. Relative attributions of median 24-hour sulfur at Big Bend to each source region by each model/wind field combination. Uncertainties are based on the standard errors of the regression coefficients. Model statistics are shown in the last 4 rows.....	301
Table 8-13. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and CAPITA MC MM5 5-day trajectory endpoints.....	304
Table 8-14. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and HYSPLIT EDAS/FNL 5-day trajectory endpoints.	305
Table 8-15. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and ATAD with MM5 input 5-day trajectory endpoints.	306
Table 8-16. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and CAPITA MC MM5 input 7-day trajectory endpoints.	307
Table 8-17. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and HYSPLIT EDAS/FNL input 7-day trajectory endpoints.	308
Table 8-18. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and CAPITA MC MM5 input 10-day trajectory endpoints.	309

Table 8-19. TrMB regression details for particulate sulfur at Big Bend and HYSPLIT EDAS/FNL input 10-day trajectory endpoints.	310
Table 8-20. The FMBR regression results using the MM5 10-day plumes. The bolded rows have p values less than or equal to 0.1 derived from a two sized t test. The FMBR used the MM5- derived 10-day plumes.	312
Table 8-21. The FMBR regression results using the EDAS/FNL 10-day plumes. The bolded rows have p values less than or equal to 0.1 derived from a two sized t test. The FMBR used the EDAS/FNL-derived 10-day plumes.	313
Table 8-22. The FMBR source attribution results for Big Bend scaled to account for biases that were estimated in section 7.2.2 (see Table 7-6).	316
Table 9-1. Summary of the source attribution techniques used in the BRAVO study. Only the receptor techniques that passed all validation studies are shown.	319
Table 9-2. Big Bend’s relative sulfate source attribution results by the various air quality and receptor modeling techniques. The relative contributions are the ratio of the average source attributions to the average predicted concentration at Big Bend during the entire BRAVO period. The bolded values are all within one standard deviation of the mean attribution across all techniques.	320
Table 9-3. Reconciled relative source attributions of Big Bend’s sulfate concentrations. The source attribution results by the various air quality and receptor modeling techniques have been adjusted to correct for identifiable biases. The relative contributions are the ratio of the average source attributions to the average predicted concentration at Big Bend during the entire BRAVO period.	322
Table 9-4. The average of the three-day average relative standard errors and their standard deviation for the BRAVO estimated source contributions of Big Bend’s sulfate and the error of the four-month average source contributions. In the aggregation of the errors, values were used only if the source contributed 5% or more to Big Bend’s estimated sulfate concentration.	327