# Spatial and Temporal Variability of Sources of Ambient Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) in California

3 S. Hasheminassab<sup>1</sup>, N. Daher<sup>1</sup>, A. Saffari<sup>1</sup>, D. Wang<sup>1</sup>, B. D. Ostro<sup>2</sup>, C. Sioutas<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Southern California, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Los
Angeles, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup> Air Pollution Epidemiology Section, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, State
of California, Oakland, CA, USA

8 Correspondence to: C. Sioutas (<u>sioutas@usc.edu</u>)

9

# 10 Abstract

To identify major sources of ambient fine particulate matter ( $PM_{2.5}$ ,  $d_p < 2.5 \mu m$ ) and 11 quantify their contributions in the state of California, positive matrix factorization (PMF) 12 13 receptor model was applied on Speciation Trends Network (STN) data, collected between 2002 and 2007 at 8 distinct sampling locations, including El Cajon, Rubidoux, Los Angeles, Simi 14 15 Valley, Bakersfield, Fresno, San Jose, and Sacramento. Between five to nine sources of fine PM 16 were identified at each sampling site, several of which were common among multiple locations. 17 Secondary aerosols, including secondary ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate, were the 18 most abundant contributor to ambient PM2.5 mass at all sampling sites, except for San Jose, with 19 an annual average cumulative contribution of 26 to 63%, across the state. On an annual average 20 basis, vehicular emissions (including both diesel and gasoline vehicles) were the largest primary source of fine PM at all sampling sites in southern California (17-18% of total mass), whereas in 21 Fresno and San Jose, biomass burning was the most dominant primary contributor to ambient 22

 $PM_{2.5}$  (27 and 35% of total mass, respectively), in general agreement with the results of previous 23 source apportionment studies in California. In Bakersfield and Sacramento, vehicular emissions 24 and biomass burning displayed relatively equal annual contributions to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass (12 25 26 and 25%, respectively). Other commonly identified sources at all sites included aged and fresh sea salt as well as soil, which contributed to 0.5-13%, 2-27%, and 1-19% of the total mass, 27 respectively, across all sites and seasons. In addition, few minor sources were exclusively 28 identified at some of the sites (e.g. chlorine sources, sulfate-bearing road dust, and different types 29 of industrial emissions). These sources overall accounted for a small fraction of the total PM 30 31 mass across the sampling locations (1 to 15%, on an annual average basis).

32

#### 33 **1. Introduction**

Exposure to ambient airborne particulate matter (PM) is one of the leading causes of 34 morbidity and mortality, contributing to more than 3 million premature deaths in the world 35 36 annually, based on a recent global burden of disease study (Lim et al., 2013). PM inhalation has been linked to a wide range of adverse health effects, such as respiratory inflammation (Araujo et 37 38 al., 2008), cardiovascular diseases (Delfino et al., 2005;Ostro et al., 2014), and most recently neurodegenerative and neurodevelopmental disorders (Davis et al., 2013b;Davis et al., 2013a). 39 During the past few decades, California has been constantly suffering from high concentrations 40 of ambient PM, among the highest levels recorded within the United States, with estimated rates 41 of PM-related morbidity and mortality exceeding any other state in the country (Fann et al., 42 2012). 43

Ambient PM in California originates from a large number of diverse sources (Hu et al., 44 2014) and is a complex mixture of different chemical components, the composition of which 45 may change drastically with PM size (Hu et al., 2008), location, and season (Cheung et al., 46 2011; Daher et al., 2013). Current PM regulations in California target  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{25}$  (particles 47 with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 and 2.5 µm, respectively) mass concentrations, with 48 PM<sub>2.5</sub> being of major concern due to the higher rate of PM<sub>2.5</sub>-related morbidity and mortality in 49 the state compared to  $PM_{10}$  (Ostro et al., 2006;Woodruff et al., 2006). These regulations only 50 target PM mass concentration, regardless of their sources of emission and/or toxico-chemical 51 52 characteristics. There is, however, strong evidence that the level of toxicity and health-related characteristics of PM are significantly affected by their chemical composition and therefore by 53 their emission sources (Rohr and Wyzga, 2012;Stanek et al., 2011;Zhang et al., 2008;Saffari et 54 al., 2013). Recently, there has been growing interest in using source apportionment data in 55 epidemiological health studies (Sarnat et al., 2008;Özkaynak and Thurston, 1987;Laden et al., 56 2000; Mar et al., 2000; Ostro et al., 2011). These studies have provided significant evidence that 57 exposure to PM from certain sources is linked to mortality. In a recent study in Barcelona, Ostro 58 et al. (2011) found that exposure to several sources, including traffic emissions, sulfate from ship 59 60 emissions and long-range transport, as well as construction dust, is statistically significantly associated with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. Nonetheless, to draw firm conclusions 61 and develop more effective control strategies to reduce population exposure to harmful sources 62 63 of airborne PM, further epidemiological studies that use source apportionment data are warranted. 64

To date, several source apportionment studies have been conducted in California, using source-oriented (Hu et al., 2014;Kleeman and Cass, 2001;Zhang et al., 2014;DeNero, 2012) and

receptor models (Hasheminassab et al., 2013;Hwang and Hopke, 2006;Ham and Kleeman, 67 2011;Kim and Hopke, 2007;Kim et al., 2010;Schauer and Cass, 2000). Source-oriented models 68 focus on the transport, dilution, and transformation of pollutants from the source of emission to 69 70 the receptor site; thereby providing an overall estimation regarding the spatial distribution of source contributions. Receptor models, on the other hand, focus on the behavior of ambient 71 environments at the point of impact (Hopke, 2003). Even though these studies have provided 72 important insights on the characteristics of sources of ambient PM as well as their relative 73 contributions, they have been mostly conducted in a limited number of sampling locations and/or 74 75 within a relatively short period of time. As a result, spatial and temporal variability of the identified sources have not been extensively examined. For instance, Kim et al. (2010) analyzed 76 the PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation data collected between 2003 and 2005 at two sampling sites in southern 77 California (i.e. Los Angeles (LA) and Rubidoux) to identify and quantify major PM<sub>2.5</sub> sources, 78 by application of a PMF model. Using similar source apportionment approach, Hwang and 79 Hokpe (2006) evaluated the sources of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> at two sampling sites in San Jose during a 80 large period of time between 2000 and 2005. In a more comprehensive study, Chen et al. (2007) 81 applied several receptor models to the chemically speciated  $PM_{2.5}$  measurements collected for 82 83 one year (between 2000 and 2001) at 23 sites, all located in California's San Joaquin Valley (SJV), to estimate PM<sub>2.5</sub> source contributions. 84

In this study, positive matrix factorization (PMF), one of the most widely-used receptororiented source apportionment techniques (Paatero and Tapper, 1994), was employed in order to provide a detailed and long-term (from 2002 to 2007) quantification of the contributions of different emission sources to ambient  $PM_{2.5}$  mass concentration in California, at 8 distinct locations spanning southern, central, and northern regions of the state. The association between 90 PM-related mortality and PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentration as well as individual PM<sub>2.5</sub> chemical components has been investigated in previous epidemiological studies in California (Ostro et al., 91 2006;Ostro et al., 2007). The results of this study will be used as an input for future 92 93 epidemiological studies conducted by California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), in order to further expand the current epidemiological knowledge, by establishing the 94 95 relationship between PM-related adverse health effects and specific source contributions. These findings will be crucial in establishing targeted and cost-effective regulations on  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions 96 in the state of California. 97

98

#### 99 **2.** Methodology

100 **2.1. Sampling sites** 

Sampling was conducted at eight Speciation Trends Network (STN) sampling sites, established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), located in distinctly different cities all over California, including El Cajon, Rubidoux, Los Angeles, Simi Valley, Bakersfield, Fresno, San Jose and Sacramento. The studied sampling sites comprise a mixture of urban and semi-rural communities, with El Cajon and Rubidoux being located in semi-rural areas, while the rest of sampling sites being situated in densely developed urban regions of the state. Figure S1 shows the location of all sampling sites.

The Sacramento sampling site is located next to a park in a residential area with commercial establishments and high-density residential homes in the surrounding neighborhood. It is also about 3 km southeast of a major freeway (I-80). The sampling site in San Jose is located 46 km east of the Pacific Ocean and 14 km southeast of the San Francisco Bay. It is also surrounded by primary commercial facilities (Hwang and Hopke, 2006). Cities of Fresno and

113 Bakersfield are located in California's heavily SJV (Zhao et al., 2011). These two cities are relatively far from the Pacific Ocean and are mostly impacted by secondary aerosols formed by 114 emissions from upwind areas (Ying and Kleeman, 2006). Moreover, this part of the state usually 115 suffers from severe particulate pollution, especially during the colder seasons (Kleeman et al., 116 2009). The northern parts of the SJV are dominated by agricultural activities, while the southern 117 regions are mostly impacted by oil production (Held et al., 2004). The sampling site in 118 Bakersfield is located about 6.5 km southwest of downtown, in a residential neighborhood and 2 119 km away from the nearest freeway (State Route (SR) 99). The sampling site in Fresno is about 120 121 5.5 km northeast of the downtown commercial district (Watson et al., 2000), next to a four-lane artery with moderate traffic level. Simi Valley is located 50 km northwest of downtown LA, in 122 Ventura county, and the sampling site in this city is situated 500 m south of SR 118 (Kim and 123 124 Hopke, 2007). Two sampling locations in the South Coast Air Basin were considered in this study; Los Angeles and Rubidoux. The sampling site in downtown LA is surrounded by three 125 major freeways (i.e. I-110, I-5, and US-101) and is 30 km away from the ports of LA and Long 126 127 Beach, both of which are the busiest ports in the U.S. (Minguillón et al., 2008). This sampling site is therefore heavily impacted by primary emissions. Rubidoux is situated 60 km inland from 128 129 downtown LA and is typically subject to aged and photo-chemically processed particulate plumes advected from upwind regions (Sardar et al., 2005). Previous studies have reported high 130 concentration of ammonium nitrate in this region, which is mostly formed by the atmospheric 131 132 reaction of nitric acid with ammonia from Chino dairy farms and livestock in upwind regions (Hughes et al., 1999). Lastly, the El Cajon sampling site is located in an inland valley, downwind 133 of a heavily populated coastal zone, in San Diego County. This site is also impacted by 134 135 emissions from I-8 freeway, situated 500 m to its north.

136

#### 2.2. Sampling schedule and chemical analysis

137 Time-integrated 24 h PM<sub>2.5</sub> samples were collected between 2002 and 2007 at all sampling sites, except for LA and Rubidoux, at which a combined chemical dataset from 2002 to 138 2013 was used as the input file when running the PMF model (Hasheminassab et al., 2014). In 139 140 the present study, in order to compare the results with those obtained for the rest of sampling sites, we calculated the average source contributions between 2002 and 2007 from the output of 141 the same PMF runs which were originally conducted using the 2002-2013 chemical dataset. By 142 performing a sensitivity analysis, Hasheminassab et al. (2014) showed that the results of the 143 144 PMF model performed on the entire chemical dataset (i.e. 2002-2013) is comparable to the output of the PMF model conducted separately on 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 datasets, in terms 145 of the sources identified (similar number of sources with almost identical compositions) and the 146 absolute source contributions (less than 18% difference in average source contributions among 147 148 all sources). The outcome of the sensitivity analysis thus indicated that the daily-resolved source contributions between 2002 and 2007 are not significantly biased when the chemical data 149 between 2008 and 2013 are also included into the PMF input file. 150

During the studied period (i.e. 2002 to 2007), PM<sub>2.5</sub> samples were collected every third day in Sacramento, San Jose, Fresno, Bakersfield, Rubidoux, and El Cajon sites, while every sixth day in Simi Valley and Los Angeles sites.

Filter weighing and chemical analyses were performed according to the U.S. EPA Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) (EPA-454/R-01-001) adopted for the STN field sampling. According to the QAPP, filters are tested, equilibrated, and weighted in the U.S. EPA contract laboratories, and then they are shipped to the field. After sampling, filters bearing PM<sub>2.5</sub> deposits are promptly shipped back to the laboratories for weight determination and other chemical analyses. PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentration was determined gravimetrically by pre- and postweighing the Teflon filters. Concentration of elements on Teflon filter samples was quantified by
energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence (ED-XRF) (RTI, 2009c). Major ions, including nitrate,
sulfate, ammonium, sodium, and potassium, were measured by Ion Chromatography (IC) (RTI,
2009a, b). Elemental carbon (EC) and organic carbon (OC) were quantified from quartz filters,
using Thermal Optical Transmittance (TOT) NIOSH 5040 carbon method (Birch and Cary,
1996).

166

#### 2.3. Source apportionment

In this study, the EPA PMF receptor model (version 3.0.2.2) was performed at each sampling site separately to identify the major sources of ambient  $PM_{2.5}$  and quantify their relative contributions to total  $PM_{2.5}$  mass. PMF is a factor analysis model that solves the chemical mass balance equations using a weighted least-squares algorithm and by imposing non-negativity constrains on the factors (Reff et al., 2007).

172 **2.3.1**.

# 2.3.1. Data screening

The first step of data screening was correcting the OC data to account for sampling artifacts, caused by adsorption and/or desorption of organic vapors on quartz filters (Chow et al., 2010). For each sampling site, the OC artifact was estimated using the intercept of the linear regression of OC against  $PM_{2.5}$  mass concentration (Kim et al., 2005). OC concentrations were then corrected by subtracting the OC artifact concentrations. The estimated OC artifact values (± standard errors) at each site are presented in Table S1.

To avoid double-counting of species, the linear correlations in each pair of  $S/SO_4^{2^-}$ , Na/Na<sup>+</sup>, and K/K<sup>+</sup> were examined. Depending on the goodness of fit and the percent number of samples below detection limit (BDL) (threshold of 70%), either IC  $SO_4^{2^-}$ , Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> or ED-XRF S,

182 Na, K data were included in the PMF analyses. Measured BDL concentrations were replaced by half of the detection limit (DL) values, and their uncertainties were set as 5/6 of the DL values 183 (Polissar et al., 1998). Missing values were replaced by the geometric mean of the existing 184 concentrations, and their accompanying uncertainties were set as four times this geometric mean 185 concentration. Species with more than 70% BDL values as well as samples with missing mass 186 and/or all of the elemental concentrations were excluded from the model. Lastly, occasional 187 samples with unusually high concentrations of a few chemical species, such as those collected 188 around July 4th and/or New Year eves with extremely high concentrations of K and/or K<sup>+</sup> were 189 190 discarded.

191 **2.3.2. PMF model** 

The uncertainties used in the PMF model were the estimated uncertainties reported in the 192 Air Quality System (AQS) for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> chemical speciation network. The uncertainties reported 193 194 by STN include both the analytical uncertainties and uncertainties associated with the field sampling component (Flanagan et al., 2006). The uncertainties of elements, measured by the ED-195 XRF method, go through a comprehensive calculation procedure that harmonizes the 196 uncertainties between different instruments and accounts for filter matrix effect, in addition to 197 the field sampling and handling uncertainty (Gutknecht et al., 2010). For the other species, 198 uncertainty is estimated as the analytical uncertainty of the instrument, augmented by 5% of the 199 calculated concentration, assuming that this 5% is representing the total "field" variability 200 (Flanagan et al., 2006). 201

Species with a signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio between 0.2-2, as well as those that have BDL values more than 50% of total samples were considered as weak variables and their uncertainties were increased by a factor of 3. In order to directly apportion the total PM mass, PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass

205 concentrations were included in the data matrix as a "total variable" in the PMF model (Lee et 206 al., 2011). To ensure that the inclusion of total PM mass concentration does not affect the 207 resulting PMF solution, their uncertainties were increased by a factor of 3, similarly to a weak 208 variable (Reff et al., 2007). The model was performed in the default robust mode to diminish the 209 influence of extreme values on the PMF solution, and the FPEAK parameter was applied to 210 control rotational ambiguity (Paatero et al., 2002). Furthermore, a value of 5% extra modeling 211 uncertainty was applied.

Uncertainties in the source profiles were estimated by a bootstrap procedure (Norris et al., 2008). 500 runs were considered for the bootstrap analysis in this study, and a solution was considered valid when the occurrence of unmapped factors was less than 10% of the total runs. The final solutions were chosen based on the evaluation of the deduced source profiles and the quality of the chemical species fits by testing different numbers of factors.

217

# 218 **3.** Meteorology

Select meteorological parameters data, including temperature, relative humidity (RH), 219 220 precipitation, as well as vector-average wind speed and direction were acquired from the online database of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Table S2 presents the seasonal 221 222 averages of these parameters at all studied sampling sites. In this study, seasons were defined as spring (March-May), summer (June-August), fall (September-November) and winter 223 (December-February), and seasonal/annual averages of all parameters reported in the following 224 225 sections and shown in the figures and tables were calculated over all 6 years (i.e. 2002 to 2007). 226 In addition, the standard errors accompanying the seasonal averages were calculated based on all daily-resolved source contributions that fall within a given season. Lastly, in all of the figures 227

and tables presented in this study, sampling sites were ranked according to their latitude, fromsouth to north (i.e. from El Cajon to Sacramento).

Most intense seasonality in temperature and RH was observed at the inland areas of the 230 231 SJV, in Fresno and Bakersfield. These two sites experience the hottest and driest summertime weather across the state (temperature over 25°C and RH below 40%), while during winter, the 232 mean temperature in these cities is within the lowest levels among all sites (below 10°C) and the 233 RH reaches about 75%, comparable to levels in other sites in the northern region of the state (i.e. 234 San Jose and Sacramento). Unlike northern areas, RH exhibited more moderate seasonality in 235 236 southern California, displaying minima in fall/winter (50-71%) and maxima in spring/summer (59-77%). At all sampling locations, the average of yearly total precipitation was negligible in 237 summer, but greatest in winter. During the studied period, Sacramento showed the highest total 238 239 precipitation in winter, followed by LA, San Jose, and Simi Valley (23.4±7.1, 21.7±17.1, 16.3±3.9, and 14.1±13.0 cm, respectively). Additionally, wind speeds were generally much 240 stronger in summer compared with fall/winter. During spring and summer, wind blows mostly 241 from coast to inland in the southern part of the state (i.e. El Cajon, Rubidoux, LA, and Simi 242 Valley), with a predominant westerly/southwesterly direction, while it shifts in winter and has a 243 244 predominantly northerly origin at all sites, with the exception of El Cajon. In Bakersfield and Fresno, wind constantly blows from northwest throughout the year, except for Fresno in winter, 245 when wind has an easterly direction. Lastly, in Sacramento, the prevailing wind direction is 246 247 southerly/southwesterly throughout the year.

248

# 249 **4. Results and discussion**

#### **4.1. Particulate mass**

251 Seasonal average mass concentration of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> at each sampling site is presented in Table 1. Overall, mass concentrations spanned a broad range of 8.2 to 36.6  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> across the 252 studied sites and all seasons. PM2.5 mass concentration showed a very strong seasonality in 253 254 central and northern parts of the state (i.e. Bakersfield, Fresno, San Jose, and Sacramento), with 2 to 4 times higher concentrations in winter compared with summer. This trend is typical of the 255 California's Central Valley, which usually experiences the most severe particulate pollution 256 during winter in the U.S. (Ying and Kleeman, 2009). In winter, ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass 257 concentrations peaked at Bakersfield and Fresno ( $32.0\pm1.8$  and  $36.6\pm1.5 \mu g/m^3$ , respectively). 258 Severe stagnation periods and decreased mixing height are mostly responsible for elevated 259 260 particulate pollution during winter in this part of the state. As it will be discussed in the following section, secondary ammonium nitrate and emissions from biomass burning were 261 262 mainly responsible for elevated PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations in these two cities during winter. In summer, on the other hand, highest mass concentrations were observed in sampling sites located 263 in the Los Angeles Basin (i.e. LA and Rubidoux). Rubidoux displayed highest mass 264 265 concentration in fall, followed by summer and spring. In addition to local sources, this region of the state is typically subject to transported plumes from upwind regions in west and central LA 266 267 (Daher et al., 2013; Sardar et al., 2005), particularly during the warm seasons when the westerly wind prevails (Table S2). 268

269

#### 4.2. Source characterization and apportionment

270 **4.2.1.** Overview

Between five to nine particle sources were identified at each sampling site. Resolved source profiles along with the explained variation (EV) of each species are shown in Figure S2 ah, for all studied sampling sites. Gray bars represent the normalized concentration of each

274 species to the mass concentration of  $PM_{2.5}$  apportioned to that factor, while the black dots represent the percent of each species apportioned to that factor (Lee et al., 1999). Table 2 275 summarizes the marker species which were used to identify each source profile. Several sources, 276 277 including secondary ammonium nitrate, secondary ammonium sulfate, vehicular emissions, biomass burning, soil, fresh and aged sea salt were commonly identified at multiple sites. Few 278 minor sources were exclusively identified at some of the sites, depending on the site location and 279 nearby emission sources. These sources, however, accounted for a small fraction of the total 280 mass (1 to 15% across the state, on an annual average basis). 281

Table 3 presents the slope, intercept, and  $R^2$  of the linear regressions between dailyresolved measured ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> and estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations, calculated by the sum of PM mass apportioned to each identified factor. It can be inferred that the PMF model was able to effectively estimate the measured PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations at all sites (slope varying from 0.83 to 0.91 and  $R^2$  ranging from 0.85 to 0.96).

Year-to-year variability in the source contributions was overall quite small for almost all 287 identified sources. This can be deduced from the relatively small standard errors in the 6-year 288 seasonal average source contributions, as shown in Table S3 a-d (median relative standard error 289 290 of 8%, across all sites, seasons, and sources). Identified sources, on the other hand, displayed distinct seasonal and spatial variability. The percent contributions from these sources to PM<sub>2.5</sub> 291 mass are presented in Figure 1. Overall, secondary aerosols (including secondary ammonium 292 nitrate and ammonium sulfate) collectively comprised the largest fraction of ambient PM2.5 at all 293 sampling sites (except for San Jose), accounting for 26 to 63% of total mass across all sites, on 294 an annual average basis. Vehicular emissions were the second major contributor to PM<sub>2.5</sub> at all 295 296 sites (11 to 25% annual average contribution, across the state), except for San Jose and Fresno, at which biomass burning was the dominant primary source of  $PM_{2.5}$  (35 and 27% annual average contribution, respectively). "Other sources" in Figure 1 are associated with those sources which were exclusively identified at some specific locations. These contributed to < 15% of the mass, on an annual average basis. The unapportioned mass, which is the difference between the seasonal average  $PM_{2.5}$  mass and the sum of the seasonal average source contributions from each factor, accounted for 3 to 6% of total mass across the state, on an annual average basis. The unapportioned mass represents the fraction that could not be resolved by the model.

304

# 4.2.2. Vehicular emissions

Vehicular emissions source profiles were identified by high concentrations of 305 carbonaceous species (i.e. EC and OC). Elevated loadings of several non-exhaust PM tracers 306 307 (e.g. Fe, Cu, Zn, Pb, Mn) indicate that these sources are affected by particles emitted from brake and tire wear, road surface abrasion, and resuspension of road surface dust (Pant and Harrison, 308 2013;Dall'sto et al., 2014). Only at Rubidoux, the PMF model was able to determine two 309 310 separate source profiles for diesel and gasoline vehicles (Figure S2 b). These source profiles are characterized by high loadings of EC and OC, respectively, with EC/OC ratios being 0.4 in 311 gasoline source profile, while 2.2 in diesel vehicles source profile. These ratios are within the 312 ranges reported in previous studies (Liu et al., 2006; Fujita et al., 1998; Watson et al., 1998; Heo et 313 314 al., 2009). Diesel vehicles operating at very low speed and in stop-and-go traffic usually produce similar EC/OC ratios to typical gasoline vehicles (Shah et al., 2004). As a result, the diesel 315 emissions source profile that was obtained in Rubidoux may represent only diesel vehicles 316 driving in relatively constant speed in fluid traffic conditions and the diesel emissions from stop-317 318 and-go traffic could be apportioned into the gasoline vehicles category. To overcome this uncertainty and also be able to compare the results with those obtained at other sampling sites, 319

the contributions from diesel and gasoline vehicles were combined together at Rubidoux andreferred to as vehicular emissions throughout the discussion.

As can be seen in Figure 2, across the state, estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  mass attributed to vehicular sources (including diesel and gasoline vehicles) displayed highest levels at Rubidoux, LA, and Sacramento, with annual average (±standard error) contributions of  $4.3\pm0.1$ ,  $3.6\pm0.1$ , and  $3.5\pm0.1 \ \mu g/m^3$ , respectively. Spatial pattern of  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions from mobile sources across the state is in a good agreement with the findings of a recent study by Hu et al. (2014), in which they applied a source-oriented air quality model to predict primary  $PM_{2.5}$  source contributions across the state of California between 2000 and 2006.

Vehicular emissions displayed similar seasonal patterns at all sampling sites, with higher 329 contributions in fall and winter compared to spring and summer. In spring, summer, and fall, 330 highest vehicular emissions source contributions were observed at Rubidoux. In contrast, during 331 winter, when particulate pollution is confined within the emission area due to higher atmospheric 332 stability and lower mixing height, vehicular source contribution exhibited the highest value in 333 334 downtown LA. This trend is typical of the LA Basin, in which downwind "receptor" areas are generally impacted by emissions from upwind "source" regions, when westerly/south-westerly 335 336 onshore winds prevail (Table S2) (Daher et al., 2013). Several previous studies have reported similar trends in the LA Basin (Hasheminassab et al., 2013;Heo et al., 2013). It should be noted 337 that after 2007 until 2012, contributions of vehicular emissions to ambient PM2.5 in the LA Basin 338 statistically significantly decreased by 20 to 25%, following the implementation of major federal, 339 state, and local regulations on vehicular emissions, particularly on diesel trucks (Hasheminassab 340 et al., 2014). 341

342 Among the studied locations in the California's Central Valley, vehicular emissions displayed the highest levels in Sacramento, while lowest in San Jose, accounting for nearly 30 343 and 10% of total mass, respectively, on an average over 6 years. Vehicular emissions were 344 comparable at Bakersfield and Fresno during spring and summer, whereas levels were slightly 345 higher at Bakersfield in fall and winter. Schauer and Cass (2000) conducted a 4-day sampling in 346 Bakersfield during the winter of 1995 to quantify the sources of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, using chemical 347 mass balance receptor model. Average wintertime level of vehicular emissions in our study at 348 Bakersfield  $(3.0\pm0.2 \ \mu\text{g/m}^3)$  was about half of that reported by Schauer and Cass (2000) (6.3\pm0.4) 349  $\mu g/m^3$ ), whereas the percent contributions of this source to total mass were comparable in both 350 studies (10 and 12%, respectively). This finding suggests that vehicular emissions have 351 decreased by almost half after almost a decade in Bakersfield. 352

353

# 4.2.3. Secondary aerosols

Secondary ammonium nitrate source profile was identified by high concentrations of 354  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  (Figure S2 a-h). Its contribution ranged from 0.2 to 16.8  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup>, accounting for 3 355 to 55% of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass, among all sites and seasons, as displayed in Figure 3 and 356 tabulated in Table S3 a-d. Seasonally, the contribution of secondary ammonium nitrate was 357 largest in winter while lowest during summer, with statewide average contribution of 8.4 and 3.2 358  $\mu g/m^3$ , respectively. Elevated concentration of secondary ammonium nitrate during the cold 359 seasons is mainly due to the increased partitioning of ammonium nitrate into the particle phase, 360 favored by lower wintertime temperatures and higher RH (Ying, 2011). This source displayed 361 considerably higher contribution at Fresno and Bakersfield in winter (16.8±1.3 and 15.8±1.0 362  $\mu g/m^3$ , respectively). Ying and Kleeman (2006) stated that diesel engines and catalyst equipped 363 gasoline vehicles are important local sources that contribute to secondary nitrate in the SJV. 364

Unlike all other sites, the seasonal trend of secondary ammonium nitrate was reverse at Rubidoux, with higher concentration in summer compared to winter  $(12.5\pm0.8 \text{ and } 8.9\pm0.8 \text{ } \mu\text{g/m}^3, \text{ respectively})$ . This is probably due to increased advection of ammonia from the upwind Chino area, caused by stronger westerly/southwesterly wind speed during summer in the LA Basin (Hasheminassab et al., 2013) combined with the increased photochemical production of nitric acid in summer, which reacts with fugitive ammonia to produce high concentrations of ammonium nitrate in summer in this area (Hughes et al., 2002;Sardar et al., 2005).

The characterized secondary ammonium sulfate source profiles have high loadings of 372  $SO_4^{2-}$  and  $NH_4^+$  (Figure S2 a-h). This source was identified at all sites, except at Fresno, where 373 sulfate largely partitioned in a source named "sulfate-bearing road dust" along with a few other 374 components, which will be discussed in further detail below. Annual average contributions of 375 this source ranged from 1.3 to 4.6  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> (or 10 to 24% of total mass) among all sites, indicating 376 that this source is a smaller contributor to total mass compared with secondary ammonium 377 nitrate. Secondary ammonium sulfate exhibited a similar seasonal trend at all monitoring sites, 378 379 displaying wintertime minima while summertime peaks due to increased photochemical activity that forms this species. Levels were also overall higher in the southern part of the state, 380 381 compared to the upper regions (Figure 4). As argued by Ying and Kleeman (2006), the majority of secondary aerosols formed in southern California are formed from locally emitted precursors, 382 whereas in the SJV secondary PM is mostly impacted by emissions from upwind areas (i.e. 383 384 regional sources).

385 4.2.4. Biomass burning

386 Identified biomass burning source profiles consisted primarily of EC, OC, and either K or 387  $K^+$  (Figure S2 a-h). Biomass burning includes emissions from wildfires and residential wood 388 combustion. This source showed distinct seasonal and spatial variability, with highest levels observed during winter and also in upper parts of the state. Higher concentrations associated with 389 biomass burning in winter are mainly due to the higher residential wood burning during the 390 colder seasons. Central and northern parts of the state usually experience colder winters 391 compared to southern regions (Table S2), therefore higher biomass burning is expected in these 392 geographical locations, as shown in many previous studies (Hu et al., 2014;Chen et al., 2007). 393 Biomass burning was the major primary source of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> at Fresno and San Jose during 394 all seasons, with levels ranging from 2.4 to 10.4  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> (or 22 to 30% of PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at Fresno and 395 from 2.2 to 8.0  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> (or 22 to 43% of PM<sub>2.5</sub>) in San Jose (Figure 5). This source was also the 396 dominant primary contributor to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> in Bakersfield and Sacramento during winter (12 397 and 31% of PM<sub>2.5</sub>, respectively), consistent with the findings of many previous studies in this 398 area (Chow et al., 2007;Gorin et al., 2006;Schauer and Cass, 2000). 399

400 **4.2.5. Soil** 

Resolved soil source profiles were dominated by crustal elements such as Al, Ca, Fe, Si, 401 and Ti (Figure S2 a-h). These profiles generally lacked the contributions from EC and OC, 402 indicating that they are not majorly impacted by emissions of road dust. As stated above, road 403 dust was partially apportioned in the resolved vehicular emissions source profiles. A distinct 404 source profile attributable to soil was not identified at Fresno. Instead, crustal elements 405 partitioned in a separate source profile, along with high loadings of sulfate, EC, and OC, which 406 was characterized as "sulfate-bearing road dust". Across the state, soil exhibited lower 407 concentrations in northern regions, namely at San Jose and Sacramento (Figure 6). This is likely 408 409 attributed to increased precipitation and higher RH in this part of the state (Table S2), which limit the wind-induced resuspension of soil (Harrison et al., 2001). Soil, in contrast, accounted 410

for a large fraction of  $PM_{2.5}$  at Bakersfield, in concert with the findings of Chen et al. (2007). During summer, in particular, contribution of soil to total mass was near 20% at Bakersfield, which could be mainly due to the lack of precipitation and low RH in this area (Table S2). As discussed by Chen et al. (2007), farm lands, pasture lands, and unpaved roads are major sources of soil and windblown dust in the SJV.

416

# 4.2.6. Fresh and aged sea salt

Sources with high concentrations of Na<sup>+</sup> and Cl<sup>-</sup> were characterized as fresh sea salt 417 418 (Figure S2 a-h). Aged sea salt source profiles, on the other hand, were dominated by loadings of  $Na^+$ ,  $SO_4^{2^-}$ , and  $NO_3^{-}$ . Unlike fresh sea salt, chlorine has a negligible or near-zero contribution to 419 420 aged sea salt source profile. Chlorine is typically depleted due to reactions of sea salt with acidic 421 gases during the long range transport of sea salt aerosols from the point of emission (Song and Carmichael, 1999). Aged sea salt overall accounted for a lager fraction (2 to 27%) of ambient 422 423 PM<sub>2.5</sub> compared to fresh sea salt (1 to 13%), in all sites and seasons (Figures 1, S3, and S4). 424 Aged sea salt showed a clear seasonal pattern at all sites, with higher concentrations in summer, consistent with increasing onshore winds (Table S 1), while lowest during winter. 425

It is also noteworthy that the PMF model did not apportion a separate factor for ship emissions or a source related to ocean goods transport. However, high loadings of Ni and V (tracers of ship emissions (Arhami et al., 2009)) in secondary ammonium sulfate and aged sea salt source profiles for the sampling sites in the LA Basin, suggest that these sources are affected in part by emissions from ships serving the ports of LA and Long Beach (Hwang and Hopke, 2007).

432

# 433 **4.2.7.** Other sources

434 As noted above, few sources were exclusively identified at some sites, with relatively low annual contributions to total mass (1 to 15%, across the sites). At Rubidoux, a source profile was 435 deduced with high loadings of Zn, Pb, EC, and OC (Figure S2 b), which is most likely attributed 436 437 to local "mixed industrial" emissions in the surrounding areas. A similar source profile was also obtained in previous studies in this area (Kim and Hopke, 2007;Kim et al., 2010). At San Jose, a 438 source profile dominated by Ni was identified, which likely indicates the contribution from 439 nearby Ni-related industrial sources. Hwang and Hopke (2006) reported similar findings at the 440 same sampling location, by application of the PMF model on STN data, collected between 2002 441 442 and 2005. This source, nonetheless, accounted for less than 2% of the total mass, on an annual average basis. Copper smelters source profile, with a very high loading of Cu (>80%) and a 443 slight contribution of EC, was identified in El Cajon and Bakersfield sampling sites (Figure S2 444 a,e). This source accounted for about 1 and 4% of total mass, over all years, in Bakersfield and 445 El Cajon, respectively. 446

Figure 7 shows the seasonal trends of industrial emissions in locations where these 447 sources were identified. In El Cajon and Rubidoux, contributions of the identified industrial 448 449 sources peaked in winter, while in Bakersfield and San Jose, maximum emissions from copper 450 smelters and Ni-related sources were observed in summer. It is important to note that although the contributions from the identified industrial sources to total PM mass were overall trivial 451 (<4%), these sources and the related elements may be important contributors to the overall 452 particle toxicity (Toledo et al., 2008;von Schneidemesser et al., 2010;Dall'osto et al., 453 454 2008;Saffari et al., 2013).

455 At Fresno, a source profile with a high loading of sulfate along with road dust tracers, 456 such as OC, EC, Fe, Ca, Mn, Si and Ti, was resolved (Figure S2 f). These road dust tracers most

457 likely originate from the re-suspension of deposited soil and road dust enriched with vehicular emissions and lubricating oils (Pant and Harrison, 2013;Dall'sto et al., 2014). This source was 458 therefore named "sulfate-bearing road dust" (Katrinak et al., 1995). As mentioned above, 459 separate source profiles for secondary ammonium sulfate and soil were not identified at Fresno. 460 Nonetheless, the relatively high loadings of sulfate and a few crustal elements (e.g. Al, Ca, Fe, 461 Si), along with the modest contribution of ammonium, suggest that these two sources are 462 partially apportioned into this source profile. On an average basis over all 6 years, "sulfate-463 bearing road dust" accounted for about 15% of total mass at Fresno and its contribution was 464 highest in summer among all seasons  $(2.7\pm0.1 \ \mu g/m^3)$ . 465

Relatively similar source profiles, with high loadings of chlorine, were obtained at Fresno, Bakersfield, and Sacramento, with annual average contributions of about 5, 2, and 1% to total mass, respectively (Figure S2 e, f, and h). This source, which was denoted as "chlorine sources", was mostly detected during fall and winter at Fresno and Bakersfield, in the SJV, while it displayed the maximum seasonal average value in summer at Sacramento (Figure 8).

471

472 **5.** Summary and conclusions

Source apportionment analyses were conducted using PMF receptor model applied on chemical speciation datasets, obtained from 8 different STN sampling sites throughout the state of California, between 2002 and 2007. Five-to-nine major sources contributing to ambient  $PM_{2.5}$ were identified at each site, with several of which being common in multiple locations. Overall, secondary aerosols (including secondary ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate) were collectively the main contributor to  $PM_{2.5}$  mass at all sampling sites. Annual average source

contribution of secondary ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate ranged from 3.1 to  $12 \mu g/m^3$ 479 (or 16 to 50% of total mass) and 1.3 to 4.6  $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup> (or 10 to 23% of total mass) across the state, 480 respectively. On an annual average basis, vehicular emissions (including both diesel and gasoline 481 vehicles) were the largest primary sources of PM<sub>2.5</sub> at all sampling sites in the southern part of 482 the state (i.e. El Cajon, Rubidoux, LA, and Simi Valley), with 17-18% contribution total PM 483 484 mass. In Fresno and San Jose, on the other hand, biomass burning was the dominant primary source of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, contributing to 27 and 35% of total mass, on average over all years. In 485 Bakersfield and Sacramento, biomass burning and vehicular emissions equally contributed to 486 PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass with near 12 and 25% annual contributions, respectively. Other sources commonly 487 identified at all sites were minor contributors to PM<sub>2.5</sub>, including aged and fresh sea salt as well 488 as soil, which contributed to 0.5-13%, 2-27%, and 1-19% of total mass, respectively, across all 489 sites and seasons. Furthermore, a few sources (including chlorine sources, sulfate-bearing road 490 dust, and different types of industrial emissions), which overall accounted for a small fraction of 491 total mass (1 to 15%, on an annual average basis), were solely identified at some of the sites. 492

493

# 494 Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA),
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) (award number 12-E0021).

#### 497 **References**

- Araujo, J. A., Barajas, B., Kleinman, M., Wang, X., Bennett, B. J., Gong, K. W., Navab, M.,
  Harkema, J., Sioutas, C., Lusis, A. J., and Nel, A. E.: Ambient Particulate Pollutants in
  the Ultrafine Range Promote Early Atherosclerosis and Systemic Oxidative Stress,
  Circulation Research, 102, 589-596, 2008.
- Arhami, M., Sillanpää, M., Hu, S., Olson, M. R., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Size-Segregated
   Inorganic and Organic Components of PM in the Communities of the Los Angeles
   Harbor, Aerosol Science and Technology, 43, 145-160, 2009.
- Birch, M. E., and Cary, R. A.: Elemental Carbon-Based Method for Monitoring Occupational
   Exposures to Particulate Diesel Exhaust, Aerosol Science and Technology, 25, 221-241,
   1996.
- Chen, L. W. A., Watson, J. G., Chow, J. C., and Magliano, K. L.: Quantifying PM2.5 Source
  Contributions for the San Joaquin Valley with Multivariate Receptor Models,
  Environmental Science & Technology, 41, 2818-2826, 2007.
- Cheung, K., Daher, N., Kam, W., Shafer, M. M., Ning, Z., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Spatial
  and temporal variation of chemical composition and mass closure of ambient coarse
  particulate matter (PM10-2.5) in the Los Angeles area, Atmospheric Environment, 45,
  2651-2662, 2011.
- Chow, J. C., Watson, J. G., Lowenthal, D. H., Chen, L. W. A., Zielinska, B., Mazzoleni, L. R.,
  and Magliano, K. L.: Evaluation of organic markers for chemical mass balance source
  apportionment at the Fresno Supersite, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 7, 17411754, 2007.
- Chow, J. C., Watson, J. G., Chen, L. W. A., Rice, J., and Frank, N. H.: Quantification of PM2.5
  organic carbon sampling artifacts in US networks, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 5223-5239, 2010.
- Daher, N., Hasheminassab, S., Shafer, M. M., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Seasonal and
   spatial variability in chemical composition and mass closure of ambient ultrafine
   particles in the megacity of Los Angeles, Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts,
   15, 283-295, 2013.
- Dall'osto, M., Booth, M. J., Smith, W., Fisher, R., and Harrison, R. M.: A Study of the Size
   Distributions and the Chemical Characterization of Airborne Particles in the Vicinity of
   a Large Integrated Steelworks, Aerosol science and technology, 42, 981-991, 2008.
- Dall'sto, M., Beddows, D. C. S., Gietl, J. K., Olatunbosun, O. A., Yang, X., and Harrison, R. M.:
  Characteristics of Tyre Dust in Polluted Air: Studies by Single Particle Mass
  Spectrometry (ATOFMS), Atmospheric Environment, 2014.
- Davis, D. A., Akopian, G., Walsh, J. P., Sioutas, C., Morgan, T. E., and Finch, C. E.: Urban air
  pollutants reduce synaptic function of CA1 neurons via an NMDA/NO pathway in vitro,
  Journal of Neurochemistry, 127, 509-519, 2013a.
- Davis, D. A., Bortolato, M., Godar, S. C., Sander, T. K., Iwata, N., Pakbin, P., Shih, J. C.,
  Berhane, K., McConnell, R., Sioutas, C., Finch, C. E., and Morgan, T. E.: Prenatal
  Exposure to Urban Air Nanoparticles in Mice Causes Altered Neuronal Differentiation
  and Depression-Like Responses, PLoS ONE, 8, 2013b.
- Delfino, R. J., Sioutas, C., and Malik, S.: Potential Role of Ultrafine Particles in Associations
   between Airborne Particle Mass and Cardiovascular Health, Environmental Health
   Perspectives, 113, 934-946, 2005.

- 542 DeNero, S. P.: Development of a source oriented version of the WRF-Chem model and its
   543 application to the California Regional PM10/PM2.5 air quality study, UNIVERSITY OF
   544 CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, 2012.
- Fann, N., Lamson, A. D., Anenberg, S. C., Wesson, K., Risley, D., and Hubbell, B. J.:
  Estimating the National Public Health Burden Associated with Exposure to Ambient
  PM2.5 and Ozone, Risk Analysis, 32, 81-95, 2012.
- Flanagan, J. B., Jayanty, R. K. M., Rickman, E. E., Jr., and Peterson, M. R.: PM2.5 Speciation
  Trends Network: Evaluation of Whole-System Uncertainties Using Data from Sites with
  Collocated Samplers, Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 56, 492-499,
  2006.
- Fujita, E. M., Watson, J. G., Chow, J. C., Robinson, N. F., Richards, L. W., and Kumar, N.:
  Northern Front Range Air Quality Study. Volume C: Source apportionment and simulation methods and evaluation. Prepared for Colorado State University. Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere. Ft. Collins, CO, Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV., 1998.
- Gorin, C. A., Collett, J. L., and Herckes, P.: Wood Smoke Contribution to Winter Aerosol in
  Fresno, CA, Journal of the Air & Management Association, 56, 1584-1590,
  2006.
- Gutknecht, W., Flanagan, J., McWilliams, A., Jayanty, R. K. M., Kellogg, R., Rice, J., Duda, P.,
  and Sarver, R. H.: Harmonization of Uncertainties of X-Ray Fluorescence Data for
  PM2.5 Air Filter Analysis, Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 60,
  184-194, 2010.
- Ham, W. A., and Kleeman, M. J.: Size-resolved source apportionment of carbonaceous
   particulate matter in urban and rural sites in central California, Atmospheric
   Environment, 45, 3988-3995, 2011.
- Harrison, R. M., Yin, J., Mark, D., Stedman, J., Appleby, R. S., Booker, J., and Moorcroft, S.:
  Studies of the coarse particle (2.5-10μm) component in UK urban atmospheres,
  Atmospheric Environment, 35, 3667-3679, 2001.
- Hasheminassab, S., Daher, N., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Source apportionment and organic
  compound characterization of ambient ultrafine particulate matter (PM) in the Los
  Angeles Basin, Atmospheric Environment, 79, 529-539, 2013.
- Hasheminassab, S., Daher, N., Ostro, B. D., and Sioutas, C.: Long-term source apportionment of
  ambient fine particulate matter (PM2.5) in the Los Angeles Basin: A focus on emissions
  reduction from vehicular sources, Environmental Pollution, 193, 54-64, 2014.
- Held, T., Ying, Q., Kaduwela, A., and Kleeman, M.: Modeling particulate matter in the San Joaquin Valley with a source-oriented externally mixed three-dimensional photochemical grid model, Atmospheric Environment, 38, 3689-3711, 2004.
- Heo, J., Dulger, M., Olson, M. R., McGinnis, J. E., Shelton, B. R., Matsunaga, A., Sioutas, C.,
  and Schauer, J. J.: Source apportionments of PM2.5 organic carbon using molecular
  marker Positive Matrix Factorization and comparison of results from different receptor
  models, Atmospheric Environment, 73, 51-61, 2013.
- Heo, J. B., Hopke, P. K., and Yi, S. M.: Source apportionment of PM2.5 in Seoul, Korea, Atmos.
  Chem. Phys., 9, 4957-4971, 2009.
- Hopke, P. K.: Recent developments in receptor modeling, Journal of Chemometrics, 17, 255 265, 2003.

- Hu, J., Zhang, H., Chen, S., Ying, Q., Wiedinmyer, C., Vandenberghe, F., and Kleeman, M. J.:
  Identifying PM2.5 and PM0.1 Sources for Epidemiological Studies in California, Environmental Science & Technology, 48, 4980-4990, 2014.
- Hu, S., Polidori, A., Arhami, M., Shafer, M. M., Schauer, J. J., Cho, A., and Sioutas, C.: Redox
  activity and chemical speciation of size fractioned PM in the communities of the Los
  Angeles-Long Beach harbor, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 6439-6451, 2008.
- Hughes, L. S., Allen, J. O., Kleeman, M. J., Johnson, R. J., Cass, G. R., Gross, D. S., Gard, E. E.,
  Gälli, M. E., Morrical, B. D., Fergenson, D. P., Dienes, T., Noble, C. A., Liu, D.-Y.,
  Silva, P. J., and Prather, K. A.: Size and Composition Distribution of Atmospheric
  Particles in Southern California, Environmental Science & Technology, 33, 3506-3515,
  1999.
- Hughes, L. S., Allen, J. O., Salmon, L. G., Mayo, P. R., Johnson, R. J., and Cass, G. R.:
  Evolution of Nitrogen Species Air Pollutants along Trajectories Crossing the Los
  Angeles Area, Environmental Science & Technology, 36, 3928-3935, 2002.
- Hwang, I., and Hopke, P. K.: Comparison of source apportionments of fine particulate matter at
   two San Jose speciation trends network sites, Journal of the Air & Waste Management
   Association (1995), 56, 1287-1300, 2006.
- Hwang, I., and Hopke, P. K.: Estimation of source apportionment and potential source locations
  of PM2.5 at a west coastal IMPROVE site, Atmospheric Environment, 41, 506-518,
  2007.
- Katrinak, K. A., Anderson, J. R., and Buseck, P. R.: Individual Particle Types in the Aerosol of
   Phoenix, Arizona, Environmental Science & Technology, 29, 321-329, 1995.
- Kim, E., Hopke, P. K., and Qin, Y.: Estimation of Organic Carbon Blank Values and Error
  Structures of the Speciation Trends Network Data for Source Apportionment, Journal of
  the Air & Waste Management Association, 55, 1190-1199, 2005.
- Kim, E., and Hopke, P. K.: Source characterization of ambient fine particles in the Los Angeles
   basin, Journal of Environmental Engineering and Science, 6, 343-353, 2007.
- Kim, E., Turkiewicz, K., Zulawnick, S. A., and Magliano, K. L.: Sources of fine particles in the
   South Coast area, California, Atmospheric Environment, 44, 3095-3100, 2010.
- Kleeman, M. J., and Cass, G. R.: A 3D Eulerian Source-Oriented Model for an Externally Mixed
   Aerosol, Environmental Science & Technology, 35, 4834-4848, 2001.
- Kleeman, M. J., Riddle, S. G., Robert, M. A., Jakober, C. A., Fine, P. M., Hays, M. D., Schauer,
  J. J., and Hannigan, M. P.: Source Apportionment of Fine (PM1.8) and Ultrafine
  (PM0.1) Airborne Particulate Matter during a Severe Winter Pollution Episode,
  Environmental Science & Technology, 43, 272-279, 2009.
- Laden, F., Neas, L. M., Dockery, D. W., and Schwartz, J.: Association of fine particulate matter
   from different sources with daily mortality in six U.S. cities, Environmental Health
   Perspectives, 108, 941-947, 2000.
- Lee, E., Chan, C. K., and Paatero, P.: Application of positive matrix factorization in source
   apportionment of particulate pollutants in Hong Kong, Atmospheric Environment, 33,
   3201-3212, 1999.
- Lee, H. J., Gent, J. F., Leaderer, B. P., and Koutrakis, P.: Spatial and temporal variability of fine
   particle composition and source types in five cities of Connecticut and Massachusetts,
   Science of The Total Environment, 409, 2133-2142, 2011.
- Lim, S. S., Vos, T., Flaxman, A. D., Danaei, G., Shibuya, K., Adair-Rohani, H., AlMazroa, M.
  A., Amann, M., Anderson, H. R., Andrews, K. G., and others: A comparative risk

- assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor
  clusters in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of
  Disease Study 2010, The lancet, 380, 2224-2260, 2013.
- Liu, W., Wang, Y., Russell, A., and Edgerton, E. S.: Enhanced source identification of southeast
  aerosols using temperature-resolved carbon fractions and gas phase components,
  Atmospheric Environment, 40, Supplement 2, 445-466, 2006.
- Mar, T. F., Norris, G. A., Koenig, J. Q., and Larson, T. V.: Associations between air pollution
  and mortality in Phoenix, 1995-1997, Environmental Health Perspectives, 108, 347-353,
  2000.
- Minguillón, M. C., Arhami, M., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Seasonal and spatial variations of
  sources of fine and quasi-ultrafine particulate matter in neighborhoods near the Los
  Angeles-Long Beach harbor, Atmospheric Environment, 42, 7317-7328, 2008.
- Norris, G. A., Vedantham, R., Wade, K., Brown, S., Prouty, J., and Foley, C.: EPA positive matrix factorization (PMF) 3.0 fundamentals & user guide. Prepared for the US
  Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, by the National Exposure Research Laboratory, Research Triangle Park., 2008.
- Ostro, B., Broadwin, R., Green, S., Feng, W.-Y., and Lipsett, M.: Fine Particulate Air Pollution
  and Mortality in Nine California Counties: Results from CALFINE, Environmental
  Health Perspectives, 114, 29-33, 2006.
- Ostro, B., Feng, W.-Y., Broadwin, R., Green, S., and Lipsett, M.: The Effects of Components of
  Fine Particulate Air Pollution on Mortality in California: Results from CALFINE,
  Environmental Health Perspectives, 115, 13-19, 2007.
- Ostro, B., Tobias, A., Querol, X., Alastuey, A., Amato, F., Pey, J., Pérez, N., and Sunyer, J.: The
   Effects of Particulate Matter Sources on Daily Mortality: A Case-Crossover Study of
   Barcelona, Spain, Environmental health perspectives, 119, 1781-1787, 2011.
- Ostro, B., Malig, B., Broadwin, R., Basu, R., Gold, E. B., Bromberger, J. T., Derby, C.,
  Feinstein, S., Greendale, G. A., Jackson, E. A., Kravitz, H. M., Matthews, K. A.,
  Sternfeld, B., Tomey, K., Green, R. R., and Green, R.: Chronic PM2.5 exposure and
  inflammation: Determining sensitive subgroups in mid-life women, Environmental
  Research, 132, 168-175, 2014.
- Özkaynak, H., and Thurston, G. D.: Associations Between 1980 U.S. Mortality Rates and
  Alternative Measures of Airborne Particle Concentration, Risk Analysis, 7, 449-461,
  1987.
- Paatero, P., and Tapper, U.: Positive matrix factorization: A non-negative factor model with
   optimal utilization of error estimates of data values, Environmetrics, 5, 111-126, 1994.
- Paatero, P., Hopke, P. K., Song, X.-H., and Ramadan, Z.: Understanding and controlling
   rotations in factor analytic models, Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems,
   60, 253-264, 2002.
- Pant, P., and Harrison, R. M.: Estimation of the contribution of road traffic emissions to
   particulate matter concentrations from field measurements: A review, Atmospheric
   Environment, 77, 78-97, 2013.
- Polissar, A. V., Hopke, P. K., Paatero, P., Malm, W. C., and Sisler, J. F.: Atmospheric aerosol
  over Alaska: 2. Elemental composition and sources, Journal of Geophysical Research:
  Atmospheres, 103, 19045-19057, 1998.

- Reff, A., Eberly, S. I., and Bhave, P. V.: Receptor Modeling of Ambient Particulate Matter Data
  Using Positive Matrix Factorization: Review of Existing Methods, Journal of the Air &
  Waste Management Association, 57, 146-154, 2007.
- Rohr, A. C., and Wyzga, R. E.: Attributing health effects to individual particulate matter
   constituents, Atmospheric Environment, 62, 130-152, 2012.
- RTI: Standard Operating Procedure for PM2.5 Anion Analysis. Research Triangle Park,NC.,
   2009a.
- RTI: Standard Operating Procedure for PM2.5 Cation Analysis. Research Triangle Park,NC.,
   2009b.
- RTI: Standard operating procedure for the X-ray fluorescence analysis of particulate matter
   deposits on Teflon filters. Research Triangle Park,NC., 2009c.
- Saffari, A., Daher, N., Shafer, M. M., Schauer, J. J., and Sioutas, C.: Seasonal and spatial
  variation in reactive oxygen species activity of quasi-ultrafine particles (PM0.25) in the
  Los Angeles metropolitan area and its association with chemical composition,
  Atmospheric Environment, 79, 566-575, 2013.
- Sardar, S. B., Fine, P. M., and Sioutas, C.: Seasonal and spatial variability of the size-resolved
   chemical composition of particulate matter (PM10) in the Los Angeles Basin, Journal of
   Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 110 (D7), D07S08., 2005.
- Sarnat, J. A., Marmur, A., Klein, M., Kim, E., Russell, A. G., Sarnat, S. E., Mulholland, J. A.,
  Hopke, P. K., Tolbert, P. E., and others: Fine particle sources and cardiorespiratory
  morbidity: an application of chemical mass balance and factor analytical sourceapportionment methods, Environmental Health Perspectives, 116, 2008.
- Schauer, J. J., and Cass, G. R.: Source Apportionment of Wintertime Gas-Phase and Particle Phase Air Pollutants Using Organic Compounds as Tracers, Environmental Science &
   Technology, 34, 1821-1832, 2000.
- Shah, S. D., Cocker, D. R., Miller, J. W., and Norbeck, J. M.: Emission Rates of Particulate
   Matter and Elemental and Organic Carbon from In-Use Diesel Engines, Environmental
   Science & Technology, 38, 2544-2550, 2004.
- Song, C. H., and Carmichael, G. R.: The aging process of naturally emitted aerosol (sea-salt and mineral aerosol) during long range transport, Atmospheric Environment, 33, 2203-2218, 1999.
- Stanek, L. W., Sacks, J. D., Dutton, S. J., and Dubois, J.-J. B.: Attributing health effects to
   apportioned components and sources of particulate matter: An evaluation of collective
   results, Atmospheric Environment, 45, 5655-5663, 2011.
- Toledo, V. E., Júnior, P. B. d. A., Quiterio, S. L., Arbilla, G., Moreira, A., Escaleira, V., and
  Moreira, J. C.: Evaluation of levels, sources and distribution of toxic elements in PM10
  in a suburban industrial region, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Environmental Monitoring and
  Assessment, 139, 49-59, 2008.
- von Schneidemesser, E., Stone, E. A., Quraishi, T. A., Shafer, M. M., and Schauer, J. J.: Toxic
  metals in the atmosphere in Lahore, Pakistan, Science of The Total Environment, 408,
  1640-1648, 2010.
- Watson, J. G., Fujita, E. M., Chow, J. C., Zielinska, B., Richards, L. W., Neff, W., and Dietrich,
  D.: Northern Front Range Air Quality Study. Final report. Prepared for Colorado State
  University. Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere, Fort Collins, CO,
  Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV., 1998.

- Watson, J. G., Chow, J. C., Bowen, J. L., Lowenthal, D. H., Hering, S., Ouchida, P., and Oslund,
   W.: Air quality measurements from the Fresno Supersite, Journal of the Air & Waste
   Management Association, 50, 1321-1334, 2000.
- Woodruff, T. J., Parker, J. D., and Schoendorf, K. C.: Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Air
   Pollution and Selected Causes of Postneonatal Infant Mortality in California,
   Environmental Health Perspectives, 114, 786-790, 2006.
- Ying, Q., and Kleeman, M. J.: Source contributions to the regional distribution of secondary particulate matter in California, Atmospheric Environment, 40, 736-752, 2006.
- Ying, Q., and Kleeman, M.: Regional contributions to airborne particulate matter in central
   California during a severe pollution episode, Atmospheric Environment, 43, 1218-1228,
   2009.
- Ying, Q.: Physical and chemical processes of wintertime secondary nitrate aerosol formation,
  Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering in China, 5, 348-361, 2011.
- Zhang, H., DeNero, S. P., Joe, D. K., Lee, H. H., Chen, S. H., Michalakes, J., and Kleeman, M.
  J.: Development of a source oriented version of the WRF/Chem model and its application to the California regional PM10 / PM2.5 air quality study, Atmos. Chem.
  Phys., 14, 485-503, 2014.
- Zhang, Y., Schauer, J. J., Shafer, M. M., Hannigan, M. P., and Dutton, S. J.: Source
  Apportionment of in Vitro Reactive Oxygen Species Bioassay Activity from
  Atmospheric Particulate Matter, Environmental Science & Technology, 42, 7502-7509,
  2008.
- Zhao, Z., Chen, S.-H., Kleeman, M. J., Tyree, M., and Cayan, D.: The impact of climate change
  on air quality-related meteorological conditions in California. Part I: present time
  simulation analysis, Journal of Climate, 24, 3344-3361, 2011.
- 746
- 747

# **Tables and Figures**

Table 1. Seasonal average mass concentration ( $\pm$  standard error) ( $\mu$ g/m<sup>3</sup>) of ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> at the 8 sampling sites in the period between 2002 and 2007.

	El Cajon	Rubidoux	Los Angeles	Simi Valley	Bakersfield	Fresno	San Jose	Sacramento
Spring	$12.0 \pm 0.5$	23.6 ± 1.3	18.1 ± 1.5	12.8 ± 0.8	$11.8 \pm 0.5$	$16.4 \pm 1.1$	9.7 ± 0.4	8.2 ± 0.3
Summer	$13.1 \pm 0.4$	25.6 ± 0.9	20.2 ± 0.7	15.9 ± 0.5	13.5 ± 0.4	9.7 ± 0.3	9.6 ± 0.4	9.2 ± 0.4
Fall	14.5 ± 0.5	27.4 ± 1.5	20.8 ± 1.2	14.4 ± 0.9	24.6 ± 1.7	13.7 ± 0.6	14.8 ± 0.8	15.1 ± 0.9
Winter	17.1 ± 0.7	20.0 ± 1.1	20.4 ± 1.6	9.8 ± 0.8	32.0 ± 1.8	36.6 ± 1.5	18.6 ± 1.2	23.5 ± 1.2

Table 2. Summary of the marker species for identified  $PM_{2.5}$  sources, resolved by the PMF model.

Source	Marker species		
Vehicular emissions	EC, OC, Fe, Cu, Zn, Pb, Mn		
Secondary ammonium nitrate	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>+</sup> , NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		
Secondary ammonium sulfate	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> , NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		
Soil	Al, Si, Ca, Fe, Ti		
Fresh sea salt	Na⁺, Cl⁻		
Aged sea salt	Na <sup>+</sup> , NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>+</sup> , SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>		
Biomass burning	ЕС, ОС, К/К⁺		
Copper smelters	Cu, EC		
Mixed industrial	EC, OC, Zn, Pb		
Chlorine sources	Cl⁻		
Sulfate-bearing road dust	EC, OC, SO4 <sup>2-</sup> ,Fe, Ca, Mn, Si, Ti		
Ni-related industrial sources	Ni, Mn, Mg		

	R <sup>2</sup>	Slope	Intercept (µg/m³)
El Cajon	0.85	0.91 ± 0.02	0.89 ± 0.26
Rubidoux	0.96	$0.91 \pm 0.01$	1.30 ± 1.22
Los Angeles	0.86	0.88 ± 0.02	1.58 ± 0.47
Simi Valley	0.91	$0.91 \pm 0.02$	0.84 ± 0.23
Bakersfield	0.95	$0.91 \pm 0.01$	0.95 ± 0.24
Fresno	0.94	$0.91 \pm 0.01$	1.01 ± 0.23
San Jose	0.88	0.85 ± 0.01	1.35 ± 0.23
Sacramento	0.91	0.83 ± 0.01	1.47 ± 0.18

Table 3. Summary statistics of the linear regressions between daily-resolved measured ambient  $PM_{2.5}$  and estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  mass concentrations obtained from the PMF model. Errors correspond to one standard error.



Figure 1 a-d. Seasonal variation in the percent contribution of identified sources to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site.



Figure 2. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of vehicular emissions to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 3. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of secondary ammonium nitrate to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 4. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of secondary ammonium sulfate to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 5. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of biomass burning to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 6. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of soil to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 7. Seasonal average source contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of industrial emissions to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.



Figure 8. Seasonal average contribution  $(\mu g/m^3)$  of chlorine sources to ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub>, by site. Error bars correspond to one standard error.