Letter Report

Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative
**Air Quality Scoping Study for Crater Flat,
Nye County, Nevada**

prepared by

Johann Engelbrecht, Ilias Kavouras, Dave Campbell,
Scott Campbell, Steven Kohl and David Shafer
Desert Research Institute
Nevada System of Higher Education

submitted to

Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
Las Vegas, Nevada

August 2008

The work upon which this report is based was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract #DE-AC52-06NA26383.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government of any agency thereof.

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.
Available for sale to the public, if paper, from:

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
Phone: 800.553.6847
Fax: 703.605.6900
Email: orders@ntis.gov
Online ordering: <http://www.ntis.gov/ordering.htm>

Available electronically at <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>.

Available for a processing fee to the U.S. Department of Energy and its contractors, in paper, from:

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062
Phone: 865.576.8401
Fax: 865.576.5728
Email: reports@adonis.osti.gov

Erata Sheet

Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative Air Quality Scoping Study for Caliente, Lincoln County, Nevada

Page 3, 4th line from the bottom, date should read December 5, 2006

Page 21, caption should read: Figure 22. Wind direction and speed (mph) at Caliente.

Page 24, last para, last sentence should read: This may be explained by water-bound clay and organic particles.

Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative Air Quality Scoping Study for Crater Flat, Nye County, Nevada

Page 6, Table 3, line 12, should be Ca^{2+}

Page 18, caption should read: Figure 18. Wind direction and speed (mph) at Crater Flat.

Page 21, first paragraph line 6, date should be July 29, 2007

Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative Air Quality Scoping Study for Pahrnagat National Wildlife Refuge, Lincoln County, Nevada

Page 3, third line from bottom, date should read February 17, 2007

Page 6, Table 3, line 12, should be Ca^{2+}

Page 21, caption should read: Figure 22. Wind direction and speed (mph) at Pahrnagat NWR.

Page 22, line 9 should read: southeasterly and northerly winds (Figure 25 and Figure 26).

Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative Air Quality Scoping Study for Tonopah Airport, Nye County, Nevada

Page 10, 3rd line from the bottom, date should read August 29, 2007

Page 7, Table 3, line 5, should be Ca^{2+}

Page 21, caption should read: Figure 22. Wind direction and speed (mph) at Tonopah Airport.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
SITE LOCATION AND CHARACTERISTICS	1
AEROSOL SAMPLING AND MONITORING	2
Filter Sampling	2
Sampler Description and Procedures	2
Gravimetry	4
Chemical Analysis	6
Aerosol Monitoring	10
Monitor Description and Procedures	10
Continuous DUSTTRAK Measurements of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}	12
Comparison of Filter to Continuous Results	14
METEOROLOGY	15
Relationships of Meteorology with Aerosol Measurements	19
CONCLUSIONS	21
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	22
REFERENCES	22

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Southern Nevada map showing the location of Site #7 (at Crater Flat), Nevada Test Site, and Yucca Mountain.	1
2. Photographs of PQ100 (green/gray box in left photo), PQ200 (white box in left photo) and their sampling inlets (right photo).	2
3. A diagrammatic representation of the BGI PM _{2.5} sampler showing the PM ₁₀ size selective impactor head as the first stage followed by a PM _{2.5} VSCC.	3
4. Time series of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} mass concentrations ($\pm$ uncertainty) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	5
5. Relationship between mean ($\pm$ uncertainty) daily PM _{2.5} and PM ₁₀ at Crater Flat.	6
6. Reconstructed mass for PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} based on chemical composition.	10
7. Left photograph: The front panels of PM ₁₀ (right on the left photograph) and PM _{2.5} (left on the left photograph) of TEOM. Right photograph: The DUSTTRAK monitors (green) resting on top of the two TEOM measuring units.	11
8. Schematic drawing of the sampling inlet for the DUSTTRAK (not to scale).	11
9. Mean 24-h PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} mass concentrations measured by DUSTTRAK at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	12
10. PM _{2.5} /PM ₁₀ mass ratios at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	13
11. Variation of mean ($\pm$ st.error) PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in weekdays and weekends at Site #7 (Crater Flat) (Monday=1, Tuesday=2, Wednesday=3, Thursday=4, Friday=5, Saturday=6, Sunday=7).	13

12. Relationships between PM ₁₀ concentrations (µg/m ³) measured by DUSTTRAK, and filter-based methods.....	14
13. Relationships between PM _{2.5} concentrations (µg/m ³) measured by DUSTTRAK, and filter-based methods.....	15
14. Solar radiation (in watts/m ²) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).....	16
15. Temperature (in °F) and relative humidity at Site #7 (Crater Flat).....	16
16. Wind speed (in miles/hr) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).....	17
17. Wind direction at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	17
18. Wind direction and speed at Crater Flat.	18
19. Average wind speed for each wind direction sector.....	19
20. Hourly variation of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} mass concentrations (µg/m ³) as well as wind speed (miles/hour) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).....	20
21. Mean (± st.error) of PM ₁₀ mass concentrations (µg/m ³) for different wind direction sectors at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	20
22. Mean (± st.error) of PM _{2.5} mass concentrations (µg/m ³) for different wind direction sectors at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	21

LIST OF TABLES

1. Longitude, latitude, and elevation of the mobile trailer location at Site #7 (Crater Flat).	2
2. Collection days, filter numbers, mass, and uncertainties by gravimetric analysis, and associated flags of samples from Site #7 (Crater Flat).	4
3. Results of the chemical analysis for selected filters from Crater Flat. Chemical components with concentrations higher than twice the uncertainty are in bold, while those with concentrations lower than twice the uncertainty are in italics. Concentrations are in µg/m ³	6
4. Statistics for 24-h PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} mass concentrations.	12
5. Descriptive statistics of 1-hour meteorological data.....	15
6. Wind condition classifications.....	18

The Desert Research Institute (DRI) is performing a scoping study as part of the U.S. Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative (EMSI). The main objective is to obtain baseline air quality information for Yucca Mountain and an area surrounding the Nevada Test Site (NTS).

This letter report provides a summary of air quality and meteorological data, on completion of the site's sampling program.

Crater Flat is adjacent to the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear repository, just outside of the NTS boundaries. The existing plans for the facility indicate that a railroad and heavy-haul roads, to transfer nuclear waste to the repository, will pass through Crater Flat. The sampling site is located 15 miles southeast of the town of Beatty, and about 6 miles east of U.S. Route 95. It is about 90 miles northwest of Las Vegas (Figure 1).

The mobile trailer was located inside a fenced area at well VH-1, on the edge of the Yucca Mountain Repository Facility Program area. Monitoring of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and meteorological conditions was carried out from May 25, 2007, to August 29, 2007. Because of the remote location of the site, instrumentation that required 120-volt AC power (TEOMs) did not run. The portable DUSTTRAK, meteorological equipment, and integrated PM samplers were run from 12-volt batteries, charged by solar panels.

Table 1. Longitude, latitude, and elevation of the mobile trailer location at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Site	Crater Flat
Latitude	36° 47' 31.81"
Longitude	116° 33' 9.75"

AEROSOL SAMPLING AND MONITORING

Filter Sampling

Sampler Description and Procedures

BGI, Inc., PQ100 and PQ200 Ambient PM_{2.5} Federal Reference Method (FRM) samplers were used to collect 24-h integrated PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} samples. Figure 2 shows the PQ100 and PQ200 in the mobile trailer (left) and the PM₁₀ sampling inlets on the top of the trailer (right). Both the PQ100 (Designation No. RFPS-1298-124) and PQ200 (Designation No. RFPS-0498-116) samplers are designed to meet the criteria for collecting 24-h samples of ambient aerosol according to the U.S. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

Figure 2. Photographs of PQ100 (green/gray box in left photo), PQ200 (white box in left photo) and their sampling inlets (right photo).

Figure 3 shows a schematic drawing of the samplers. Particles with aerodynamic diameter larger than 10 μm are removed by impaction by the size selective inlet, while the smaller particles remain airborne. The PM₁₀ fraction is collected by a filter located downstream of the size selective inlet. For the collection of PM_{2.5}, particles in the range between 2.5 and 10 μm were removed by the Very Sharp Cut Cyclone (VSCC) (U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] Equivalent Designation No. EQPM-0202-142), then collected on a filter.

Figure 3. A diagrammatic representation of the BGI PM_{2.5} sampler showing the PM₁₀ size selective impactor head as the first stage followed by a PM_{2.5} VSCC. This configuration can be readily modified to a PM₁₀ sampler by removal of the VSCC.

For both PQ100 and PQ200, samples were collected at a volumetric flow rate of 16.67 liters/min. The flow rate is controlled to ± 2 percent precision with a mass flow controller. The actual ambient temperature and barometric pressure, filter temperature and pressure, and anomalies (if any) were recorded by a microprocessor. The sampler was equipped to operate from an internal 12-volt DC battery. The battery was normally recharged from 120-volt AC. Alternatively, a 32-watt solar panel with an additional external ballast battery was installed to provide power for periods without electricity. Two sets of PQ100 and PQ200 samplers were installed in the mobile trailer. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} samples were collected on filters in numbered cassettes, labeled TT (for PM₁₀ Teflon), FT (for PM_{2.5} Teflon), TQ (for PM₁₀ Quartz), and FQ (for PM_{2.5} Quartz). Each filter cassette was loaded with a pre-weighed 46.2-mm-diameter PTFE (Teflon) membrane filter (Whatman # 7592-004) or 47-mm quartz fiber (Pallflex #2500QAT-UP) filter. The Teflon membrane collected particles for gravimetric analysis, light absorption by densitometry, and elements by X-ray fluorescence spectrometry. Quartz fiber filters were used for measurement of water-soluble ions by atomic absorption spectrometry, ion chromatography, and automated colorimetry, and also for measurement of carbon species by thermal optical reflectance.

Operation, calibration, and maintenance of PQ100 and PQ200 particulate samplers are described in standard operating procedure DRI SOP # 1-211.2 "BGI PQ100 PM10 and PQ200 PM2.5 REFERENCE SAMPLERS FOR THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN AIR QUALITY PROGRAM." Flow calibration and leak tests (only for PQ200) were performed on the day of installation (May 25, 2007). The leak check was performed according to the manufacturer's operational instruction manual only for PQ200; no procedure exists from the manufacture for the PQ100. The flow rates were set according to a BGI Tri-Cal NIST

traceable standard. The sampler was then placed in “calibration” or “run” mode and a one-point calibration verification or one-point flow-rate verification performed. Aerosol samples were collected on a 1-in-6-day schedule. Audits of the flow and leak tests were done onsite at the beginning and end of the monitoring campaign. Teflon and quartz filters were prepared and assembled in their filter holders by the Desert Research Institute’s (DRI) Environmental Analysis Facility (EAF) in Reno and shipped to DRI’s facilities in Las Vegas. The filters were kept at -4°C and transported to the field in a cryo-cooler. Exposed filters were also stored at -4°C in Las Vegas. Upon completion of the monitoring period at the site, all filters were shipped to the EAF in Reno.

Gravimetry

Table 2 shows mass concentrations (and uncertainty) of filters collected at Crater Flat. PM₁₀ mass concentrations varied from 5.24 µg/m³ to 27.62 µg/m³, while PM_{2.5} mass concentrations ranged from 2.99 µg/m³ to 14.31 µg/m³. Similar temporal trends were observed for both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. In all cases, 24-h PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} levels were significantly lower than the NAAQS as recently revised by EPA (24-h PM₁₀: 150 µg/m³, 24-h PM_{2.5}: 35 µg/m³; Annual PM_{2.5}: 15 µg/m³) (Figure 4). On average, fine particulates (PM_{2.5}) accounted for approximately half of PM₁₀ (PM_{2.5}/PM₁₀ ratio of 0.49) (Figure 5). This value indicated the significant contribution of coarse particles probably due to the emissions from nearby unpaved roads that connect several mine operations with U.S. Route 95. The possible contributions of smoke from a human-ignited fire (Zaca) in Santa Barbara, California, may have contributed to high PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} levels. The fire ignited on July 4, 2008, and lasted more than two months.

Table 2. Collection days, filter numbers, mass, and uncertainties by gravimetric analysis, and associated flags of samples from Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Date	No	Type	Mass (µg/m ³)	Uncertainty (µg/m ³)	Flags
5/30/2007	085	PM ₁₀	-99.0000	-99.0000	V: invalid (void) analysis result; T: sampling time error
		PM _{2.5}	6.2422	0.4456	
6/05/2007	087	PM ₁₀	27.6206	0.6986	
		PM _{2.5}	14.3154	0.5148	
6/11/2007	088	PM ₁₀	15.3910	0.5269	N: foreign substance on sample
		PM _{2.5}	9.0266	0.4641	
6/17/2007		PM ₁₀	13.1448	0.5020	
		PM _{2.5}	5.5347	0.4419	
6/23/2007		PM ₁₀	-99.0000	-99.0000	V: invalid (void) analysis result V: invalid (void) analysis result
		PM _{2.5}	-99.0000	-99.0000	
6/29/2007		PM ₁₀	11.6889	0.4873	
		PM _{2.5}	5.9068	0.4436	
7/05/2007		PM ₁₀	8.4443	0.4598	
		PM _{2.5}	4.0349	0.4352	
7/11/2007		PM ₁₀	18.7188	0.5683	N: foreign substance on sample
		PM _{2.5}	8.2779	0.4585	
7/17/2007		PM ₁₀	12.7288	0.4977	N: foreign substance on sample
		PM _{2.5}	7.0715	0.4504	

Table 2. Collection days, filter numbers, mass, and uncertainties by gravimetric analysis, and associated flags of samples from Site #7 (Crater Flat) (continued).

Date	No	Type	Mass ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Uncertainty ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Flags
7/23/2007		PM ₁₀	23.5827	0.6367	N: foreign substance on sample
		PM _{2.5}	8.2363	0.4582	
7/29/2007		PM ₁₀	14.3095	0.5145	
		PM _{2.5}	7.9867	0.4565	
8/04/2007		PM ₁₀	21.7554	0.6101	N: foreign substance on sample
		PM _{2.5}	11.6473	0.4869	
8/10/2007		PM ₁₀	13.1448	0.5020	
		PM _{2.5}	6.0732	0.4445	
8/16/2007		PM ₁₀	13.0616	0.5011	
		PM _{2.5}	9.9834	0.4719	
8/22/2007		PM ₁₀	19.7171	0.5817	
		PM _{2.5}	8.1981	0.4581	
8/28/2007		PM ₁₀	5.2413	0.4403	
		PM _{2.5}	2.9950	0.4318

Figure 4. Time series of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations ($\pm$ uncertainty) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 5. Relationship between mean ($\pm$ uncertainty) daily $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} at Crater Flat.

Chemical Analysis

Table 3 shows the chemical content of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ samples collected on June 5, 2007 and July 29, 2007. Chemical analysis included elements (from sodium to uranium) with X-ray fluorescence spectrometry (XRF), major anions (sulfate, nitrate, and chloride) by ion chromatography (IC), major cations (sodium, potassium) by atomic absorption (AA), particulate ammonium by automated colorimetry (AC), and elemental and organic carbon by thermal optical reflectance (TOR).

Table 3. Results of the chemical analysis for selected filters from Crater Flat. Chemical components with concentrations higher than twice the uncertainty are in bold, while those with concentrations lower than twice the uncertainty are in italics. Concentrations are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

DATE	6/05/2007				7/29/2007			
SIZE	PM_{10}		$PM_{2.5}$		PM_{10}		$PM_{2.5}$	
	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.
Mass	27.6206	0.6986	14.3154	0.5148	14.3095	0.5195	7.9867	0.4565
Chloride, Cl^-	0.0986	0.0306	<i>0.028</i>	<i>0.0295</i>	<i>0.0504</i>	<i>0.0297</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0294</i>
Nitrate, NO_3^-	0.7898	0.0389	0.1817	0.0301	0.8003	0.0391	0.256	0.0307
Sulfate, SO_4^{2-}	1.7218	0.0476	1.1772	0.039	1.5718	0.0451	1.3291	0.0413
Ammonium, NH_4^+	0.4994	0.0345	0.4269	0.0333	0.5252	0.035	0.4567	0.0338
Sodium, Na^+	0.2661	0.0086	0.05	0.0057	0.2718	0.0087	0.1657	0.0069
Magnesium, Mg^{2+}	0.12	0.0034	0.0319	0.0015	0.0562	0.0019	0.0281	0.0014
Potassium, K^+	0.2997	0.008	0.0727	0.0035	0.0972	0.0038	0.0637	0.0033
Calcium, Ca_{2+}	3.0348	0.0754	0.41	0.0183	0.4056	0.0182	0.1425	0.0157
OC1	0.2897	0.1142	0.5678	0.2211	0.4678	0.1826	1.0175	0.3951

Table 3. Results of the chemical analysis for selected filters from Crater Flat. Chemical components with concentrations higher than twice the uncertainty are in bold, while those with concentrations lower than twice the uncertainty are in italics. Concentrations are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (continued).

DATE	6/05/2007				7/29/2007			
SIZE	PM ₁₀		PM _{2.5}		PM ₁₀		PM _{2.5}	
	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.
OC2	0.4734	0.1263	0.4045	0.1126	0.9596	0.2273	1.0903	0.255
OC3	1.2018	0.2343	0.5545	0.1764	1.059	0.2203	0.7917	0.1958
OC4	0.9126	0.1081	0.5315	0.0765	0.5889	0.0809	0.3922	0.0667
Pyrolyzed OC-TT	1.5083	0.5148	1.1956	0.4087	0.4746	0.1658	0.2594	0.0958
Pyrolyzed OC-Op	1.531	0.5445	1.1887	0.4234	0.3906	0.1435	0.1357	0.0607
Total OC	4.4084	0.4516	3.247	0.366	3.4659	0.3816	3.4274	0.379
EC1	1.326	0.3031	1.0749	0.2463	0.5904	0.1372	0.348	0.0839
EC2	0.205	0.0801	0.1139	0.053	0.096	0.0484	0.0461	0.0383
EC3	0.0179	0.0115	0.0069	0.0115	0	0.0115	0	0.0115
Total EC	0.0179	0.044	0.0069	0.0439	0.2957	0.0717	0.2583	0.0662
Total Carbon	5.3485	0.5456	3.3492	0.3918	3.7851	0.424	3.6857	0.4166
Carbonate Carbon (CO ₃ ²⁻)	0.9221	0.3424	<i>0.0953</i>	<i>0.2166</i>	<i>0.0235</i>	<i>0.2149</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.2149</i>
Sodium, Na	0.2085	0.0835	<i>0.1068</i>	<i>0.0819</i>	<i>0.1549</i>	<i>0.0827</i>	<i>0.0631</i>	<i>0.0813</i>
Magnesium, Mg	0.3547	0.0453	0.2196	0.0443	0.1242	0.0436	0.0436	0.0432
Aluminum, Al	1.1168	0.0257	0.6696	0.0168	0.4276	0.0124	0.2063	0.009
Silicon, Si	2.9874	0.0646	1.8426	0.0408	1.0569	0.0248	0.496	0.0141
Phosphorous, P	0.0131	0.003	0.0108	0.003	0.0231	0.003	0.0177	0.003
Sulfur, S	0.3513	0.0147	0.3873	0.0152	0.4995	0.0167	0.4579	0.0161
Chlorine, Cl	0.0158	0.0016	0.0088	0.0016	0.0083	0.0016	0.0044	0.0016
Potassium, K	0.585	0.012	0.3554	0.0074	0.2185	0.0047	0.0972	0.0025
Calcium, Ca	1.0629	0.0215	0.5308	0.0109	0.4111	0.0086	0.1653	0.0039
Scandium, Sc	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0058</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0058</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0058</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0058</i>
Titanium, Ti	0.0745	0.0019	0.0463	0.0015	0.04	0.0014	0.0165	0.0012
Vanadium, V	0.0016	0.0001	0.0007	0.0001	0.0012	0.0001	0.0008	0.0001
Chromium, Cr	<i>0</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.001</i>
Manganese, Mn	0.0179	0.0022	0.0122	0.0022	0.0071	0.0021	0.0053	0.0021
Iron, Fe	0.7335	0.0152	0.422	0.0091	0.426	0.0092	0.1505	0.0043
Cobalt, Co	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>
Nickel, Ni	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>
Copper, Cu	0.0049	0.0009	0.0022	0.0009	0.0062	0.0009	0.0028	0.0009
Zinc, Zn	0.004	0.0009	0.0019	0.0009	0.003	0.0009	0.0019	0.0009
Gallium, Ga	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0031</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0031</i>	<i>0.0009</i>	<i>0.0031</i>	<i>0.0017</i>	<i>0.0031</i>
Arsenic, As	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0001</i>
Selenium, Se	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0021</i>	<i>0.0007</i>	<i>0.0021</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0.0021</i>	<i>0.0004</i>	<i>0.0021</i>
Bromine, Br	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.0026</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.005</i>	<i>0.0015</i>
Rubidium, Rh	<i>0.0029</i>	<i>0.0011</i>	<i>0.0022</i>	<i>0.0011</i>	<i>0.0011</i>	<i>0.0011</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0.0011</i>
Strontium, Sr	0.0115	0.002	<i>0.006</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.0017</i>	<i>0.002</i>
Yttrium, Y	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.0008</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.0008</i>	<i>0.0015</i>
Zirconium, Zr	<i>0.0035</i>	<i>0.0035</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0034</i>	<i>0.0002</i>	<i>0.0034</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0.0034</i>
Niobium, Nb	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0026</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0026</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0026</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0026</i>
Molybdenum, Mo	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>

Table 3. Results of the chemical analysis for selected filters from Crater Flat. Chemical components with concentrations higher than twice the uncertainty are in bold, while those with concentrations lower than twice the uncertainty are in italics. Concentrations are in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (continued).

DATE SIZE	6/05/2007				7/29/2007			
	PM ₁₀		PM _{2.5}		PM ₁₀		PM _{2.5}	
	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.	Conc.	Uncer.
Palladium, Pd	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0045</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0045</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0.0045</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0045</i>
Silver, Ag	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0.0016</i>	<i>0.0041</i>
Cadmium, Cd	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0052</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0052</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0052</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0052</i>
Indium, In	<i>0.0004</i>	<i>0.003</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.003</i>	<i>0.0015</i>	<i>0.003</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.003</i>
Tin, Sn	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0039</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0039</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0.0039</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0.0039</i>
Antimony, Sb	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0073</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0073</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0073</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0073</i>
Cesium, Cs	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0012</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0012</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0012</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0012</i>
Barium, Ba	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0006</i>
Lanthanum, La	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0009</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0009</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0009</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0009</i>
Cerium, Ce	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0013</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0013</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0013</i>	<i>0.0007</i>	<i>0.0013</i>
Samarium, Sa	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0018</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0018</i>	<i>0.0009</i>	<i>0.0018</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0018</i>
Europium, Eu	<i>0.0003</i>	<i>0.0064</i>	<i>0.0028</i>	<i>0.0064</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0064</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0064</i>
Terbium, Tb	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>
Hafnium, Hf	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0139</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0139</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0139</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0139</i>
Tantalum, Ta	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0117</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0117</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0117</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0117</i>
Tungsten, W	<i>0.0087</i>	<i>0.0168</i>	<i>0.0018</i>	<i>0.0168</i>	<i>0.0058</i>	<i>0.0168</i>	<i>0.0026</i>	<i>0.0168</i>
Iridium, Ir	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0036</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0036</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0036</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0036</i>
Gold, Au	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0078</i>	<i>0.0001</i>	<i>0.0078</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0078</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0078</i>
Mercury, Hg	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0024</i>
Thallium, Th	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>
Lead, Pb	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0.0002</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0025</i>
Uranium, U	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0041</i>	<i>0.0021</i>	<i>0.0041</i>

OC = organic carbon

EC = elemental carbon

OP = optical pyrolysis

TT = transmittance

With respect to the chemical composition of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, the following patterns were observed:

- Sulfur (S) was mostly in the form of sulfate (SO_4^{2-}) with sulfate-to-sulfur ratio of 2.90 to 4.90. Sulfate and ammonium were almost entirely associated with fine particles, while less than 30 percent of nitrate (23% to 30%) was measured in PM_{2.5}. Ammonium-to-sulfate molar ratios varied from 1.55 to 1.93, suggesting that sulfate aerosols were mostly in the form of ammonium bisulfate, $(\text{NH}_4)\text{HSO}_4$ (Malm *et al.*, 2002). Nitrates appeared to be partially neutralized by ammonium in the fine particle mode, while coarse particles nitrates may be from evaporites in soils or the product of the reactions of nitric acid with soil dust elements such as Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} , Na^+ , and K^+ (Lefer and Talbot, 2001).
- Carbonaceous aerosol was predominantly in fine particles. For PM_{2.5}, organic carbon (OC) concentrations accounted for 23 to 46 percent of particle mass, while very low

EC/OC ratios were indicative of the absence of high temperature combustion-related sources.

- Soluble potassium (K^+) accounted for 20 to 66 percent of total potassium in PM_{10} and for more than 50 percent of total potassium in $PM_{2.5}$. Soluble potassium in fine particles is a tracer of biomass burning, which suggested the significant impact of emissions from local and/or regional fire (prescribed or wildfire) events. On the other hand, salts in desert soil may be the source of soluble potassium that is mostly present in the coarse fraction. This was further supported by the estimates of nonsoil potassium $K_{\text{non-soil}} (K_{\text{total}} - (0.26 \times [Al]))$ that were comparable to measured water-soluble K^+ . Water soluble K^+ is also present as salts in soils.
- Ratios of Al/Si (0.37 to 0.40) K/Fe (0.51 to 0.80) were comparable to those determined for samples collected at the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visibility Environments (IMPROVE) sites in the western United States (Al/Si: 0.31 to 0.43, K/Fe: 0.67 to 0.78, Al/Ca: 1.4 to 1.7) when soil dust was the major component of particulate matter (Kavouras *et al.*, 2005).

The IMPROVE mass calculation was applied to reconstruct aerosol mass into five major species, namely sulfate, nitrate, organic, light-absorbing carbon, and soil. For this scheme, sulfate and nitrate are assumed to be in the forms of ammonium sulfate $[(NH_4)_2SO_4]$ and ammonium nitrate $[NH_4NO_3]$, respectively (Malm *et al.*, 2004). Organic mass concentration [OMC] was estimated as $[OMC] = 1.4 \times [OC]$, where [OC] is the organic carbon concentration. The 1.4 factor was used to estimate for elements not measured (mainly hydrogen and oxygen) in organic compounds (White and Roberts, 1977). Soil mass concentration [SOIL] was estimated as the sum of the elements present in the soil as oxides calculated as follows:

$[SOIL] = 2.2 \times [Al] + 2.49 [Si] + 1.63 \times [Ca] + 2.42 \times [Fe] + 1.94 \times [Ti]$. Therefore, the reconstructed aerosol mass was estimated as follows:

$$[Aerosol\ Mass] = (128/96) \times [SO_4] + (80/62) \times [NO_3] + EC + [OMC] + [SOIL]$$

Figure 6 shows the reconstructed concentrations of ammonium sulfate, ammonium nitrate, organic carbon, elemental carbon, and soil for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ collected on June 5, 2007 and July 29, 2007 in Crater Flat. Considering the positive bias for organic carbon measurements:

- Reconstructed particle mass accounted for 83 to 95 percent of measured PM_{10} mass and for 101 to 119 percent of $PM_{2.5}$ mass.
- Carbonaceous aerosol (OMC and EC) appeared to account for 22 to 36 percent of PM_{10} and 32 to 63 percent of $PM_{2.5}$.
- Soil represented 37 to 49 percent of PM_{10} and about 29 to 56 percent of $PM_{2.5}$ mass, while sulfate contributed between 8 and 15 percent on PM_{10} and 11 to 22 percent on $PM_{2.5}$ (Figure 6).

The differences of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ fractions are due to higher concentration of soil elements in the coarse fraction (particles with diameter between 2.5 and 10 μm). Higher $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations for July 29, 2007, may be attributed to increased concentrations of organic carbon and to a lesser extent on soil and sulfate concentrations.

Figure 6. Reconstructed mass for PM10 and PM2.5 based on chemical composition.

Aerosol Monitoring

Monitor Description and Procedures

The DUSTTRAK™ Aerosol Monitors from TSI continuously measured PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations (Figure 7). They are portable, battery operated laser photometers that provide measurements of particle mass, based on light scattering. Atmospheric aerosol passes through a size selective inlet (either PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}) and is directed to an optics chamber at a flow rate of 1.7 l/min. The light source is a laser diode that emits light at a wavelength of 780 nm. Sampled aerosol is drawn into the sensing chamber where it is illuminated with a narrow beam of laser light. Light scattered by aerosol particles is collected by a set of lenses and focused onto the photodetector. The detector signal is proportional to the amount of scattered light, which is proportional to the mass concentration of the aerosol. Voltage is read by the processor and multiplied by an internal calibration constant to yield mass concentration. The calibration constant is pre-set by the manufacturer for scattering characteristics of the respirable mass of ISO 12103-1, Al test dust. Local variations in aerosol particle size distribution and composition relative to this standard may result in differences in the actual response factor of the instrument. The operation, calibration, and maintenance of the DUSTTRAK is described in DRI SOP 1.211-2 “TSI INCORPORATED MODEL 8520 DUSTTRAK AEROSOL MONITOR FOR THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN AIR QUALITY PROGRAM.”

Figure 7. Left photograph: The front panels of PM₁₀ (right on the left photograph) and PM_{2.5} (left on the left photograph) of TEOM. Right photograph: The DUSTTRAK monitors (green) resting on top of the two TEOM measuring units.

Both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} DUSTTRAK inlets were attached on a wide “Y” connector, which was connected to one leg of a second “Y” (Figure 8). A funnel with a suction fan was connected to the other leg of the second “Y” to achieve fast exchange of ambient air into the sampling line. Flow calibration and zero-test were performed on the day of installation (May 25, 2007) and subsequent site visits. Deviations in flow were predominantly due to failure of the pump diaphragm. In those cases, the instrument was replaced. Deviations of the zero check were corrected by performing zero calibration according to the manufacturer’s operational instruction manual.

Figure 8. Schematic drawing of the sampling inlet for the DUSTTRAK (not to scale).

Continuous DUSTTRAK Measurements of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}

Trends and correlations of particle mass are examined using hourly DustTtak data integrated for 24 hours (from 0:00. to 23:59). Statistics of 24-h particle mass are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Statistics for 24-h PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations.

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
PM ₁₀	102.84	70.92	0.30	1,001.00	156.09
PM _{2.5}	24.01	10.58	0.05	541.60	32.50

Twenty-four-hour PM₁₀ levels ranged from 0.30 to 1,001.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, with a mean of 102.84 ($s=156.09$) $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, while PM_{2.5} concentrations varied from 0.05 to 541.60 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, with a mean of 24.1 ($s=32.50$) $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. PM₁₀ mass concentrations increased drastically after July 12, 2007. It should be mentioned that the DUSTTRAK (S/N: 85200794) was replaced by another (S/N: 85200795) on July 13, 2007. Given the limitations of DUSTTRAK to measure coarse particles, the intercomparison between filter samples and DUSTTRAK will determine whether variations were caused by atmospheric conditions or not (Figure 9). A consistent relationship between PM fractions was observed before July 12, 2007, with fine particles being accounted for about three quarters of PM₁₀ (PM_{2.5}/PM₁₀ ratio of 0.75) and about 10 percent for the remaining period (Figure 10). All the operating parameters (flow and zero) were within the acceptable ranges (flow: 1.7 ± 0.1 liters/min and Zero: 0.000 ± 0.001 mg/m^3). While differences in particle mass for weekdays/weekends were not statistically significant, somewhat higher PM₁₀ levels were measured on Monday (Day#1) and Tuesday (Day #2) (Figure 11).

Figure 9. Mean 24-h PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations measured by DUSTTRAK at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 10. $PM_{2.5}/PM_{10}$ mass ratios at Site #7 (Crater Flat) Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 11. Variation of mean ($\pm$ st.error) PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$) in weekdays and weekends at Site #7 (Crater Flat) (Monday=1, Tuesday=2, Wednesday=3, Thursday=4, Friday=5, Saturday=6, Sunday=7).

Comparison of Filter to Continuous Results

Figure 12 and Figure 13 show the relationships between PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} measured by DUSTTRAK and filter-based methods. The correlations between PM measurements by DUSTTRAK and filter methods were poor, with correlation coefficients of 0.52 for PM₁₀ and 0.206 for PM_{2.5}. The slopes for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} measured by DUSTTRAK were 7.46505 and 1.99644, respectively, while high intercepts are computed. The poor correlation for PM₁₀ may be attributed to the low range of filter-based values (10 to 20 µg/m³).

Figure 12. Relationships between PM₁₀ concentrations (µg/m³) measured by DUSTTRAK, and filter-based methods.

Figure 13. Relationships between PM_{2.5} concentrations (µg/m³) measured by DUSTTRAK, and filter-based methods.

METEOROLOGY

Variations of hourly data for each meteorological parameter are presented in Figure 14 through 17. Descriptive statistics of hourly data also are presented in Table 5. Solar radiation progressively increased up to 87.4 watts/m² (Figure 14). Ambient temperature varied from 50.2 to 109.5°F with a mean temperature of 86.0°F for the monitoring period (Table 5; Figure 15). Relative humidity remained lower than 60 percent. No rainfall events were recorded.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of 1-hour meteorological data.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Solar radiation (watts/m ²)	28.0	0.0	87.4
Wind speed (miles/h)	9.4	0.0	33.1
Temperature (°F)	86.0	50.2	109.5
Relative humidity (%)	14.5	2.9	58.2

Figure 14. Solar radiation (in watts/m²) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 15. Temperature (in °F) and relative humidity at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 16. Wind speed (in miles/hr) at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 17. Wind direction at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Wind conditions for the monitoring period were described by northerly winds during the night and southerly winds during the day, with wind speeds mostly in the range of 5 to 15 miles/hour (Figure 16 and Figure 17). The classification of wind conditions (Table 6) was

retrieved from the Federal Meteorological Handbook. The mean wind speed for each direction bin (8 bins) is presented in Figure 18.

Table 6. Wind condition classifications.

Miles/hour	Specification
<1	Calm; smoke rises vertically.
1 to 5	Direction of wind shown by smoke drift not by wind vanes. Wind felt on face; leaves rustle; vanes moved by wind.
5 to 9	Leaves and small twigs in constant motion; wind extends light flag.
9 to 14	Raises dust, loose paper; small branches moved.
14 to 23	Small trees in leaf begin to sway; crested wavelets form on inland waters. Large branches in motion; whistling heard in overhead wires; umbrellas used with difficulty.
23 to 35	Whole trees in motion; inconvenience felt walking against wind. Breaks twigs off trees; impedes progress.
35 to 48	Slight structural damage occurs. Trees uprooted; considerable damage occurs.
>48	Widespread damage.

(retrieved from Federal Meteorological Handbook; Chapter 5. Wind;
<http://www.nws.noaa.gov/oso/oso1/oso12/fmh1/fmh1ch5.htm#chp5link>)

Figure 18. Wind direction and speed at Crater Flat.

On average, winds blowing from south were slightly stronger (11.5 miles/hr) than those from the north (9.6 miles/hr). This is controlled by the north-south-trending topography of the region. Lower wind speeds are recorded for winds blowing from the northwest (Figure 19).

Figure 19. Average wind speed for each wind direction sector. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Relationships of Meteorology with Aerosol Measurements

Trends and correlations of PM mass with meteorological conditions are shown for hourly DUSTTRAK data. A weak bimodal pattern is observed for both fractions of particle mass (Figure 20). The first mode is associated with comparatively higher particle mass concentration in early morning (7:00 to 9:00 for PM_{10} and 10:00 to 11:00 for $PM_{2.5}$) followed by a gradual decrease. The second mode for PM_{10} can be observed in early afternoon (13:00 to 15:00) as winds were increasing, followed by an increase in the evening (19:00 to 22:00). There are significant differences of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations for different wind directions, with highest PM_{10} levels for northwest winds, and highest $PM_{2.5}$ levels for northerly winds (Figure 21 and Figure 22).

Figure 20. Hourly variation of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) as well as wind speed (miles/hour) at Site #7 (Crater Flat). Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 21. Mean ($\pm$ st.error) of PM₁₀ mass concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for different wind direction sectors at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

Figure 22. Mean ($\pm$ st.error) of PM_{2.5} mass concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for different wind direction sectors at Site #7 (Crater Flat).

CONCLUSIONS

PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations and meteorological conditions were continuously monitored in Crater Flat, from May 25 to August 29, 2007. Because of the remote location of the site, and reliance only on 12-volt batteries and solar power, continuous measurements of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} were obtained using only DUSTTRAKs, not TEOMs. At the same time, integrated samples of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} were collected using FRM samplers on a 1-to-6-day schedule. Two sets of filters (June 05 and July 29, 2009) were analyzed for major anions (sulfate, nitrate, chloride) and cations (sodium and potassium), 40 elements (from sodium to uranium), and elemental and organic carbon. The comparison of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations obtained by continuous monitors and filters showed that differences are associated with the limitations of the operating principle. For example, while light scattering (the measurement technique for DUSTTRAK) is not influenced by volatilization losses and is accurate for fine particles, it performs poorly for coarse particles, resulting in underestimation of PM₁₀ mass. PM_{2.5} mass measurements obtained by DUSTTRAK, and filter-based methods were also compared.

Mean 24-h concentrations (measured by DUSTTRAK) of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass were 58.4 and 24.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which are lower than the 24-h and annual NAAQS standards (24-h PM₁₀: 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, 24-h PM_{2.5}: 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). Particle mass measured on filters varied from 1.5 to 217.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM₁₀ and from 0.2 to 88.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{2.5}. Substantially higher PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} levels were associated with increased wind speeds blowing mostly from the north and south. The chemical composition of both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} samples indicated that soil is the major component of both fractions, while soil contributes more than 50 percent of PM₁₀.

mass. Sulfate and nitrate account for about 10 percent. Increases in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} mass concentrations are associated with higher concentrations of soil material.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors thank the U.S. Bureau of Land Management for hosting the mobile trailer inside the fence at Well VH-1 at Crater Flat.

REFERENCES

- Engelbrecht, J.P., I.G. Kavouras, D. Campbell, S.A. Campbell, S. Kohl, and D. Shafer, 2007a. Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative. Air Quality Scoping Study for Ash Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, Nevada. Letter Report DOE/NV/26383-LTR2007-01
- Engelbrecht, J.P., I.G. Kavouras, D. Campbell, S.A. Campbell, S. Kohl, and D. Shafer, 2007b. Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative. Air Quality Scoping Study for Beatty, Nevada. Letter Report DOE/NV/26383-LTR2007-02
- Engelbrecht, J.P., I.G. Kavouras, D. Campbell, S.A. Campbell, S. Kohl, and D. Shafer, 2007c. Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative. Air Quality Scoping Study for Rachel, Nevada. Letter Report DOE/NV/26383-LTR2007-03
- Engelbrecht, J.P., I.G. Kavouras, D. Campbell, S.A. Campbell, S. Kohl, and D. Shafer, 2007d. Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Systems Initiative. Air Quality Scoping Study for Sarcobatus Flats, Nevada. Letter Report DOE/NV/26383-LTR2007-04
- Kavouras, I.G., V. Etyemezian, D. DuBois, J. Xu, M. Pitchford, and M. Green, 2005. Assessment of the Principal Causes of Dust-Resultant Haze at IMPROVE Sites in the Western United States. Final report to Western Regional Air Partnership (www.coha.dri.edu/dust).
- Lefer, B.L. and R.W. Talbot, 2001. Summertime measurements of aerosol nitrate and ammonium at a northeastern U.S. site. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 20,365 – 20,378.
- Malm, W.C., B.A. Schichtel, R.B. Ames, and K.A. Gebhart, 2002. A 10-year spatial and temporal trend of sulfate across the United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107, 4627, doi:10.1029/2002JD002107.
- Malm, W.C., B.A. Schichtel, M.L. Pitchford, L.L. Ashbaugh, and R.A. Eldred, 2004. Spatial and monthly trends in speciated fine particle concentration in United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, D03306, doi:10.1029/2006JD003739.
- White, W.H. and P.T. Roderts, 1977. On the nature and origins of visibility-reducing aerosol in the Los Angeles air basin. *Atmospheric Environment*, 11, 803-812.

DISTRIBUTION

Allen Bensen
Yucca Mountain Project Office
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste
Management
U. S. Department of Energy
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134

Jan Cameron, Chair
Amargosa Valley Advisory Board
821 E. Farm Road
Amargosa Valley, NV 89020

Jenny Chapman
Division of Hydrologic Sciences
Desert Research Institute
755 E. Flamingo Road
Las Vegas, NV 89119-7363

Linda Cohn
Environmental Protection Team
Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Russ Dyer
Yucca Mountain Project Office
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste
Management
U. S. Department of Energy
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134

Joni Eastley, Chair
Nye County Commission
P.O. Box 153
Tonopah, NV 89049

Lori Plummer
Environmental Protection Team
Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Marjory Jones
Division of Hydrologic Sciences
Desert Research Institute
2215 Raggio Parkway
Reno, NV 89512-1095

Darrell Lacy, Director
Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository
Project Office
1210 E. Basin Rd., Suite 6
Pahrump, NV 89060

Peter Sanders
Environmental Restoration Project
Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Reina Serino, Contracting Specialist
Office of Business Services
NNSA Service Center
Pennsylvania and H Street, Bldg. 20388
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400

Bonnie Thompson
Water Resources, Nevada District
U.S. Geological Survey
160 N. Stephanie Street
Henderson, NV 89074

Nevada State Library and Archives
State Publications
100 North Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4285

Archives
Getchell Library
University of Nevada, Reno
DeLaMare Library/262
University of Nevada, Reno

Document Section, Library
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Library
Southern Nevada Science Center
Desert Research Institute
755 E. Flaming Road
Las Vegas, NV 89119-7363

Public Reading Facility
c/o Nuclear Testing Archive
Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98521, M/S 400
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521
(CD)

Technical Library
Nevada Site Office
National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
(CD)

Office of Scientific and Technical Information
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-9939
(electronic copy)