BRAVO

Big Bend
Regional
Aerosol &
Visibility
Observational

Study Results

CIRA

Colorado State University

ISSN 0737-5352-65

Big Bend Regional Aerosol and Visibility Observational (BRAVO) Study Results:

Air Quality Data and Source Attribution Analyses Results from the National Park Service / Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere

2004

Bret A. Schichtel
National Park Service

Kristi A. Gebhart
National Park Service

Michael G. Barna
Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere
Colorado State University

William C. Malm
National Park Service

Derek E. Day
Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere
Colorado State University

Sonia Kreidenweis
Department of Atmospheric Science
Colorado State University

Jeffrey Collett, Jr.
Department of Atmospheric Science
Colorado State University

Contributor
Mark C. Green
Desert Research Institute

Acknowledgments

BRAVO was a collaborative project involving many participating organizations and individuals. All analyses were conducted within an open forum with developments and ideas continually shared among participants. The analyses and results presented herein were considerably enhanced by the careful thought and deliberations of these participants throughout the process.

The list of organizations that participated in the BRAVO study includes

- **Sponsors:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Park Service, and the Texas Council on Environmental Quality;
- **Contributors:** EPRI, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - Air Resources Laboratory;
- **Research Institutions and Universities:** University of California - Davis, Desert Research Institute and the Cooperative Institute for Atmospheric Science and Terrestrial Applications at the University of Nevada, Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere (CIRA) at Colorado State University, the Pennsylvania State University, Carolina Environmental Program at the University of North Carolina, and Brookhaven National Laboratory;
- **Consulting Firms:** Atmospheric and Environmental Research, Inc. (AER), Air Resource Specialists, Inc., and Aerosol Dynamics; and
- **Stakeholders:** the Environmental Defense, the Sierra Club, American Electric Power, TXU, and Reliant Energy.

Within these organizations we would like to especially acknowledge Eladio Knipping from EPRI for his many good suggestions and providing us with the CMAQ-MADRID modeling results which were extensively used in the reconciliation process, James W. Yarbrough from the U.S. EPA Region VI and Marc L. Pitchford from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for their due diligence in maintaining the BRAVO process and directing its progress to a successful conclusion, Ivar Tombach of Camarillo, California, for his numerous insightful comments and suggestions, Christian Seigneur and Betty Pun of AER for their early work on the CMAQ-Madrid model and Betty's review of trajectory mass balance techniques, John Vimont and Mark Scruggs of the National Park Service Air Resources Division for their reviews of early drafts of the report, and several individuals from Colorado State University including Hari Iyer from the statistics department for discussions on uncertainties and comparisons of measured to modeled data, Doug Fox of CIRA for his helpful comments concerning REMSAD modeling, Jeff Lemke of CIRA for his work on graphics and color schemes, and Helene Bennett of CIRA for her technical editing expertise.

We wish to thank John King, Superintendent of Big Bend National Park, park pilot Nick Herring, and the park resource management team for their cooperation, local insight, interest, questions, photographs, discussions, and overviews of the park, its heritage, resources, and visitors.

Finally, we would like to thank Philip K. Hopke, Richard L. Poirot, and Alexander V. Polissar for their careful review of the draft manuscript and many good suggestions for improving the report.

Disclaimer

The assumptions, findings, conclusions, judgments, and views presented herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the National Park Service policies. The results, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are solely those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the management, sponsors, or collaborators of the BRAVO Study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BRAVO Background and Summary of Findings Fact Sheet....F-1
What is Causing Big Bend's Haze?....F-1
What are the Common Airmass Transport Pathways to Big Bend NP?....F-1
Where Does the Sulfate Haze Come From?....F-2
How Can Visibility be Improved at Big Bend National Park?....F-2
Executive Summary....E-1
Characterization of Big Bend's Haze....E-2
Apportionment of Big Bend's Sulfate Haze....E-4
Spatial Patterns of Aerosol Components....E-6
Airmass Transport to Big Bend during BRAVO Days with High and Low Particulate Sulfate Concentrations....E-6
Quantitative Source Apportionment of Big Bend's Sulfate Haze....E-8
The Contribution of Sulfur Source Regions to Particulate Haze Levels at Big Bend National Park during the BRAVO Study Period....E-11
Application of the Source Attribution Results to Other Months and Years....E-13
Implications....E-15
Abstract....1
Chapter 1) Introduction....3
1.1 Big Bend National Park Setting....3
1.2 Preliminary Study....6
1.3 Big Bend's Seasonal Haze Composition and Long-Term Trends....7
1.4 SO_2 Emissions Sources and Trends....9
1.5 SO_2 Airmass Transport to Big Bend NP....12
1.6 Techniques for Determining Sulfate Attributions....13
Chapter 2) Ambient Monitoring Data, Air Quality Models and Source Apportionment Methods....15
2.1 Air Quality, Emissions, and Meteorological Data and Processing....15
2.1.1 Air Quality Monitoring During BRAVO....15
2.1.1.1 Aerosol and SO_2 Monitoring Network....15
2.1.1.2 Tracer Data....19
2.1.1.3 University Research Glassware (URG) cyclone/annular denuder/filter pack sampling system....23
2.1.1.4 Integrating Nephelometers....24
2.1.1.5 Transmissometer....24
2.1.1.6 Aethalometer....25
2.1.2 BRAVO Emission's Inventory....25
2.1.3 Meteorological Data....27
2.1.3.1 MM5....27
2.1.3.2 EDAS....27
2.1.3.3 FNL....28
2.1.3.4 Rawinsonde Data....29
2.1.3.5 BRAVO Wind Profilers....30
2.1.3.6 Surface Meteorological Data....31
2.1.3.7 Relative Humidity Sensors....32

2.2 Transport and Air Quality Models 32
2.2.1 REMSAD 32
2.2.2 ATAD 33
2.2.3 HYSPLIT 34
2.2.4 CAPITA Monte Carlo Model 34
2.2.4.1 Advection 35
2.2.4.2 Vertical Diffusion 35
2.2.4.3 Horizontal Diffusion 36
2.2.4.4 Meteorological Data Processing 36
2.3 Source Apportionment Methods 37
2.3.1 Qualitative 38
2.3.1.1 Space/Time Pattern Analysis (EOF) 38
2.3.1.2 Factor Analysis 39
2.3.1.3 Ensemble Airmass History Analyses 39
2.3.1.3.1 Residence Time 40
2.3.1.3.1.1 Decomposition of the Residence Time Analysis 41
2.3.1.3.1.2 Source Contribution Function (Distance Weighted Residence Time) 42
2.3.1.3.1.3 Conditional Probability 44
2.3.1.3.1.4 Incremental Probability 44
2.3.1.4 Trajectory Max 44
2.3.2 Quantitative 45
2.3.2.1 Trajectory Mass Balance (TrMB) 45
2.3.2.2 Forward Mass Balance Regression (FMBR) 46
2.3.2.3 Synthesis Inversion – Merging Air Quality Model Source Apportionment Results and Receptor Data 49
2.3.2.3.1 Synthesis Inversion of the Source Receptor Relationship 49
2.3.2.3.1.1 Application to REMSAD and CMAQ-MADRID Source Attribution Results 50
2.3.2.4 REMSAD Emission Sensitivity Simulations 51
2.3.2.5 BRAVO Source Areas 52
Chapter 3) Big Bend's Aerosol and Extinction Budgets during BRAVO 57
3.1 Introduction 57
3.2 Determination of Aerosol Types 59
3.3 Summary of Optical Measurements 60
3.4 Summary of Aerosol Species 62
3.5 Comparison between Measured and Modeled Dry Fine Mass Scattering Coefficients 63
3.6 Comparison of Equilibrium Models 65
3.7 Comparison of Measured and Theoretical Ambient (Wet) Fine Particle Scattering Coefficients 67
3.8 Comparison of Measured and Theoretical Scattering Coefficients as Functions of Relative Humidity 69
3.9 Statistical Estimates of Species Specific f(RH) Curves 76
3.10 Summary of Particle Scattering and Absorption Estimates 77
3.11 Temporal Variation in the Particulate and Light Extinction Budgets 78
3.11.1 Big Bend's Average Seasonal Light Extinction Budget 80

Chapter 4) Airmass History Biases as Functions of Back-Trajectory Model and Input Meteorological Data 83
4.1 Introduction 83
4.2. Evaluations to Determine Whether or Not There Is a Bias during the BRAVO Period 83
4.2.1 Simple Plotting of Trajectories Generated in Various Ways. 83
4.2.2 Calculation of BRAVO Overall Residence Times and the Differences between Them 92
4.2.2.1 ATAD Model with Rawinsonde Data Compared to Other Combinations; Implications for Previous Studies 92
4.2.2.2 Consequences of Using FNL Data Rather Than EDAS during October 99
4.2.2.3 Biases between HYSPLIT and CMC Models 102
4.2.2.4 Further Evaluation of HYSPLIT Start Heights 103
4.3 Qualitative Evaluations Using Tracer Data 106
4.4 Biases at Big Bend during Other Seasons and Other Years 113
4.5 Biases in Other Regions during All Seasons 115
4.6 Conclusions 117
Chapter 5) Forward Model Simulation of BRAVO Tracer Concentrations 120
5.1 Perfluorocarbon Tracer Data and Model Simulation Requirements 120
5.1.1 Spatial Variability in the Tracer Concentration Field 121
5.1.2 Inherent Uncertainty in the Tracer Simulation 123
5.2 CAPITA Monte Carlo Model Simulation of Tracer Data 125
5.2.1 Results of the Monte Carlo Model Tracer Simulation 125
5.3 REMSAD Simulation of Tracer Data 131
5.3.1 Results of the REMSAD Tracer Simulation 131
5.4 Discussion 135
Chapter 6) REMSAD Sulfur Simulation and Apportionment for BBNP 138
6.1 Introduction 138
6.2 Evaluation of REMSAD Base Simulation 141
6.2.1. BRAVO Network: Big Bend NP and Four Peripheral Monitors 145
6.2.2. BRAVO Network: Aggregation of 37 BRAVO Monitors 150
6.2.3. CASTNET Network: Aggregation of 67 CASTNET Monitors 152
6.2.4. Spatial Patterns of Model Bias 154
6.3 Linearity of Sulfate Predictions 157
6.4 Sulfate Attribution Simulations 161
6.4.1 Simulated Sulfate Apportionment at Big Bend NP 165
6.4.2 Simulated Sulfate Apportionment at the BRAVO Monitors 174
Chapter 7) Receptor Model Evaluation 185
7.1 Source Apportionment of Tracer Data 185
7.1.1 Trajectory Mass Balance 185
7.1.1.1 Tracer Concentrations 185
7.1.1.2 Results and Discussion of TrMB Tracer Test 186
7.1.2 Forward Mass Balance Regression 189
7.1.2.1 Transit Probabilities 189
7.1.2.2 Retrieval of Tracer Emission Rates 191
7.1.2.3 Source Apportionment of Combined Tracer Concentrations 194
7.1.2.4 Discussion of FMBR Tests 197

7.2 Source Apportionment of REMSAD Base Case Sulfate using Receptor Models 197
7.2.1 Trajectory Mass Balance 197
7.2.1.1 Results 197
7.2.1.2 Discussion 203
7.2.2 Forward Mass Balance Regressions 204
7.2.3 Synthesized REMSAD 207
7.3 Discussion and Conclusions of Test Results 209
7.3.1 Model Accuracy 209
7.3.2 Wind Fields 210
7.3.3 Trajectory Lengths 210
Chapter 8) Receptor Oriented Apportionment for Big Bend National Park 211
8.1 Qualitative 211
8.1.1 Space/Time Pattern Analysis (EOF) 211
8.1.1.1 Introduction 211
8.1.1.2 Imputation of Missing Data 211
8.1.1.3 Results for Sulfur 212
8.1.1.4 Iron 222
8.1.1.5 Selenium 224
8.1.1.6 Vanadium & Other Tracers of Mexico 230
8.1.1.7 Sodium 232
8.1.1.8 Bromine 235
8.1.1.9 Lead 237
8.1.1.10 Discussion of Spatial and Temporal Patterns 240
8.1.2 Factor Analysis 241
8.1.3 Evaluation of Airmass Transport to Big Bend National Park 255
8.1.3.1 Residence Time Analysis and Airmass History Calculation 256
8.1.3.2 Evaluation of the Airmass History Techniques. 257
8.1.3.3 Airmass Transport to Big Bend, Texas, during the BRAVO Study. 261
8.1.3.3.1 Airmass Transport during High and Low Particulate Sulfur Days .. 262
8.1.3.3.2 Airmass Transport on High Particulate Sulfur Days Compared to Average Days 265
8.1.3.4 Transport Patterns for 10-Day Airmass Histories 267
8.1.3.5 Big Bend Climatological Airmass History Analysis 270
8.1.3.6 Discussion 272
8.1.4 Trajectory Max - Upper Bounds on Source Contribution to Big Bend's Particulate Sulfur 273
8.2 Quantitative 274
8.2.1 Synthesis Inversion – Merging Air Quality Model Source Apportionment Results and Receptor Data 274
8.2.1.1 Spatial and Temporal Variability in the Source Attribution Scaling Coefficients 276
8.2.1.1.1 Spatial Variability 276
8.2.1.1.2 Temporal Variability 278
8.2.1.2 The Optimum Synthesized REMSAD 281
8.2.1.2.1 The Optimum Synthesized REMSAD Results 286
8.2.1.3 The Optimum Synthesized CMAQ Results 292

8.2.1.4 Summary and Discussion 298
8.2.2 Trajectory Mass Balance (TrMB) 298
8.2.2.1 Input and Modeling Details 298
8.2.2.2 Results and Discussion 301
8.2.3 Forward Mass Balance Regression (FMBR) 311
8.2.3.1 Results 311
8.2.3.2 Discussion 315
9) Reconciliation of Source Apportionment Results and Conclusions 318
9.1 Average Source Attribution Results 318
9.2 Reconciled Source Attribution Results – Fusion of Available Information 321
9.2.1 Daily Attribution of Big Bend's Sulfate Concentrations 323
9.2.2 The Relative Errors in the BRAVO Source Attribution Estimates 326
9.3 The Sulfate Contribution to Haze from each Source Region. 327
9.4 Application of the Source Attribution Results to other Months and Years 329
9.5 Implications 330
References 332

The appendices are numbered by the chapter in which they are first mentioned.

Appendix 2a. Radar Wind Profiler Data*

Appendix 2b. Surface Meteorology*

Appendix 4a. Comparison of MM5, EDAS, and FNL Winds to Radar Wind Profiler Winds

Appendix 4b. 5-day CAPITAMC Back Trajectories*

Appendix 4c. 5-day HYSPLIT Back Trajectories*

Appendix 4d. 5-day ATAD Back Trajectories*

Appendix 6a. REMSAD Model Performance Statistics - BRAVO Sites*

Appendix 6b. Observed and Predicted Sulfate Time Series - BRAVO Sites*

Appendix 6c. REMSAD Model Performance Statistics -CASTNET Sites*

Appendix 6d. Observed and Predicted Sulfate Time Series - CASTNET Sites*

Appendix 6e. Example Observed and Predicted Sulfate and Sulfur Dioxide Ratios*

Appendix 8a. Summary statistics for BRAVO monitoring data.

Appendix 8b. Daily maps of fine particulate sulfur concentrations*

Appendix 8c. Airmass Transport to Big Bend, Texas, during Each Particulate Sulfur Episode

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

*Available only on cd.