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ABSTRACT

Ambient air samples were collected between March 17, 2009 and May 22, 2009 at a highway traffic site located in Sha-Lu, central Taiwan. Atmospheric particulates and particulate bound mercury Hg(p) dry deposition fluxes, concentrations (PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP) were studied. The results indicate that the average ambient air particles dry deposition, PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP concentrations were 145.03 $\mu$g/m$^2$-min and 15.47, 9.50, 65.14 $\mu$g/m$^3$, respectively. And the average dry deposition, PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP bound mercury Hg(p) concentrations were 0.9519 ng/m$^2$-min and 0.1140, 0.0106, 0.0763 ng/m$^3$, respectively. In addition, the average ambient air particles bound mercury Hg(p) compositions for PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP were 3.60, 3.45 and 44.99 ng/g, respectively. The results indicate that both of these two models (Baklanov and Sorensen, 2001; Zhang et al., 2001) are estimated as the measured dry deposition mass flux. The Baklanov model performs better results in the prediction of mass dry deposition flux. In addition, both of these two models slightly underestimate the measured dry deposition mass flux for particle bound Hg(p). Zhang’s model performs better results in the prediction of Hg(p) dry deposition flux.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been an increase in human health and environmental concerns related to mercury emissions because of the toxicity of methylmercury. Methylmercury is commonly produced by methylation of inorganic mercury in aquatic environments and is subsequently bioaccumulated in fish through the food chain. The atmosphere is an important source of mercury for surface waters and terrestrial environments. Understanding the mercury emissions-to-deposition cycle is required for the assessment of the environmental risks posed by methylmercury (EPRI, 1996; Schroeder and Munthe, 1998; Sakata and Asakura, 2007).

These studies as well as studies conducted in other parts of the US have shown elevated Hg concentrations and deposition close to urban/industrial regions, with lower values in rural areas (Dvonch et al., 1998; USEPA, 1998; Liu et al., 2007). It is speculated that the spatial gradients of Hg deposition are largely caused by contributions of Hg emissions from urban/industrial regions, where concentrations of mercury species (Gaseous Eelemental Mercury (GEM), Reactive Gaseous Mercury (RGM), and particulate mercury Hg(p)), particularly concentrations of RGM and Hg(p), are much higher and more variable than in rural areas. There have been only a few studies attempting to locate mercury sources using hybrid receptor models (Poissant, 1999; Lin et al., 2001), and none of them compared the results of different receptor models. This research was undertaken to identify the locations of mercury sources that affect New York State and to determine the contribution of in-state versus out-of-state sources, using several different hybrid receptor models (Han, 2007). Due to its high solubility and surface reactive properties, RGM can be removed from the atmosphere through both dry and wet deposition at rates much faster than GEM (Lin and Pehkonen, 1999; Liu et al., 2001). A large fraction of the Hg(p) is measured in the 2.5 mm size range which, in the absence of precipitation, has slower removal rates and longer resident times than RGM (Schroeder and Munthe, 1998; Liu et al., 2001) and has a much shorter residence time if a few hours to several days before departing the atmospheric cycle(Calvert and Lidberg, 2005). Essential processes in CAM (Gong et al., 2000; Zhang et al., 2001) include particle sources, transport and removal mechanisms. One of the removal processes is the particle dry deposition, which is a complex process depending on physical and chemical properties of the aerosol, the underlying surface characteristics and micro-meteorological conditions. Only a few direct measurements of mercury fluxes and speciation from natural sources are available in the literature (Gustin et
The method/device used in this study is the same as those previous dry deposition related studies (Fang et al., 2006). Knowledge of particle dry deposition is far from complete due to the complex dependence of deposition on particle size, density, terrain, vegetation, meteorological conditions and chemical species. A variety of dry deposition parameterizations have been used in large and regional-scale transport models, and are reported in a review by Ruijgrok et al. (1995). Numerous regional and global-scale modeling studies have been conducted to obtain a better understanding of the relationships between the sources, transport, transformation and fate of the important mercury species (Shannon and Voldner, 1995; Pai et al., 1997; Bullock, 2000; Petersen et al., 2001; Seigneur et al., 2001; Bullock and Brehme, 2002; Ryaboshapko et al., 2002; Cohen et al., 2004; Dastoór and Larocque, 2004; Travnikov, 2005; Gbor et al., 2006).

The objective of this study was to: 1) measure the dry deposition concentrations of ambient air particles and particle bound mercury Hg(p) in PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP; 2) balance the dry particulates (TSP) sampler, and dry deposition plate particle bound mercury Hg(p) using the total suspended mass balance approach to penetration across the atmospheric laminar sublayer, i.e. on molecular rather than turbulent properties. Therefore, this parameter will be different for particles and gases. For particles, according to Zannetti (1990) the surface layer resistance can be expressed as a function of the Schmidt number, Sc = ν/D, and the Stokes number, St:

\[ \eta = (S_c^{-2/3} + 10^{-3} S_t)^{-1} u^* \]  

For particle diameters less than approximately 3.5 μm, for which the airflow around the falling particle can be considered laminar, the gravitational settling velocity \( v_g \), is given by Stokes law (Hinds, 1982):

\[ v_g = \frac{(2C(\rho_p - \rho)gr^2)}{9\eta}, \]  

where \( \rho_p \) and \( \rho \) are the particle and air densities, \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration, \( \rho \) is the particle radius, \( C \) the Cunningham correction factor, \( T \) the temperature, \( k_B \) the Boltzmann constant, and \( \eta \) the dynamic viscosity coefficient (1.8 × 10$^{-5}$ kg/ms).

For particle diameters less than approximately 3.5 μm, for which the airflow around the falling particle can be considered laminar, the gravitational settling velocity \( v_g \), is given by Stokes law (Hinds, 1982):

\[ v_g = \frac{(2C(\rho_p - \rho)gr^2)}{9\eta}, \]  

where \( \rho_p \) and \( \rho \) are the particle and air densities, \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration, \( \rho \) is the particle radius, \( C \) the Cunningham correction factor, \( T \) the temperature, \( k_B \) the Boltzmann constant, and \( \eta \) the dynamic viscosity coefficient (1.8 × 10$^{-5}$ kg/ms).

For particle diameters less than approximately 3.5 μm, for which the airflow around the falling particle can be considered laminar, the gravitational settling velocity \( v_g \), is given by Stokes law (Hinds, 1982):

\[ V = \frac{(u - u_p)^2 + (v - v_p)^2 + (w - w_p)^2}{2}, \]  

where the terms denote the relative velocity of particles, \( u, v, w \) and \( u_p, v_p, w_p \), are the air and particle velocity components, \( \beta \) is the buoyancy effect parameter, \( \beta = (\rho_p - \rho)/\rho_p \), \( C_d \) is the drag coefficient.
coefficient for the static case, and \( Re \) is the Reynolds number, \( Re = 2Vr/\nu \).

20 \( \mu \)m average particle size in TSP was selected in this study to model the particle-bound mercury dry deposition fluxes (Ghose and Majee, 2007). Then calculated dry deposition velocities will be multiplied by the measured ambient air concentrations to obtain calculated dry deposition fluxes for ambient air and particle-bound mercury (Hg(p)). The calculated dry deposition fluxes will then be compared with the measured dry deposition fluxes. The results of the fluxes ratios for calculated/measured dry deposition were then used to evaluate the results over- or underestimate the dry deposition fluxes.

### Zhang's Model

Zhang et al. (2001) have used the same approach as Slinn’s (1982) model for particle dry deposition, but using simplified empirical parameterization for all deposition processes. The dry deposition velocity \( V_d \) can be expressed as

\[
V_d = V_g + 1/(R_a + R_s) \tag{12}
\]

where \( V_g \) is the gravitational settling velocity, \( R_a \) is the aerodynamic resistance above the canopy, \( R_s \) is the surface resistance.

The aerodynamic resistance is calculated as

\[
R_a = \frac{\ln(Z_R/Z_0) - \Psi H}{\kappa u_*} \tag{13}
\]

where \( Z_R \) is the height at which the dry deposition velocity \( V_d \) is calculated, \( Z_0 \) is the roughness length, \( \Psi H \) is the stability function, \( \kappa \) is the Von Karman constant and \( u_* \) is the friction velocity. \( R_s \) depends on the collection efficiency of the surface and is determined by the various deposition processes, the size of the deposition particles, atmospheric conditions and surface properties. In their study (Zhang et al., 2001), \( R_s \) is parameterized as

\[
R_s = 1/[\epsilon_0 u_* (EB + EIM + EIN) R_1] \tag{14}
\]

where \( EB \), \( EIM \), \( EIN \) are collection efficiency from Brownian diffusion, impaction and interception, respectively; \( R_1 \) is the correction factor representing the fraction of particles that stick to the surface. \( \epsilon_0 \) is an empirical constant and is taken as 3 for all land use categories (LUC).

For Brownian diffusion, there is evidence that is a function of Schmidt number, \( Sc \), given as

\[
EB = Sc - \gamma \tag{15}
\]

The Schmidt number is the ratio of the kinematic viscosity of air, \( \upsilon \), to the particle Brownian diffusivity, \( D \) (\( Sc = \upsilon/D \)). \( \gamma \) usually lies between 1/2 and 2/3 with larger values for rougher surfaces.

The parameter governing impaction process is the Stokes number, \( St \), which has the form \( St = V_g u_* a/A \) for vegetated surfaces (Slinn, 1982) and \( St = V_g u_* 2/a \) for smooth surfaces or surfaces with bluff roughness elements (Giorgi, 1988).

“A” is the characteristic radius of collectors.

Slinn (1982) used a semi-empirical fit for smooth surfaces, for which the collection efficiency by impaction is

\[
EIM = 10^{-3}/St \tag{16}
\]

Zhang et al. (2001) used the following simple form for calculating collection efficiency by interception:

\[
EIN = 1/2(dp/A)2 \tag{17}
\]

The characteristic radius “A” is given for different land use and seasonal categories.

Particles larger than 5 \( \mu \)m may rebound after hitting a surface. This process may be included by modifying the total collection efficiency by the factor of \( R_1 \), which represents the fraction of particles sticking to the surfaces. Slinn (1982) suggested the following form for \( R_1 \):

\[
R_1 = \exp(-St^{1/2}) \tag{18}
\]

### EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

#### Sampling Location

Ambient particles were collected on the roof of the Medical and Industrial Building at Hungkuang University in Taichung County, Taiwan (Fig. 1). The building is eight-stories tall (25 m) and located on the highest point (500 m) of Da Du Mountain. This sampling location is about 100 m away from a highway (Formosa Highway II) and about 10 km from the Taiwan Straits. Taichung Thermal Power Plant (TTPP) was developed on 281 hectares and located along the coast of the west side of sampling site. It is a coal combustion-based TTPP supplies about 4400 MW of electric power to meet the energy needs of central Taiwan. It was located about 10 km west of the Hungkuang University sampling site.

Meteorological conditions at the Hungkuang University site were determined using a Watchdog Weather Station Model 525 (Spectrum Technologies, Inc, USA). This weather station can provide data on wind speed, wind direction, temperature and humidity during the sampling period.

#### Sampling Program

**PS-1 Sampler**

The PS-1 sampler is a complete air sampling system designed to simultaneously collect total suspended airborne particles (Graseby-Andersen, GMW High Volume Air Sampler). The maximum particle size collected with the PS-1 sampler is 100 \( \mu \)m. The sampler’s flow rate was adjusted to 200 liter per minute and a quartz filter (diameter 10.2 cm) was used to filter suspended airborne particles. Prior to use, all filters were conditioned for 24 hours in an electric chamber with humidity set at 35 ± 5% and temperature set at 25 ± 5°C prior to both on and off weighing. Filters were placed in sealed plastic compact disc cases during transport and storage process.
Versatile Air Pollutant Sampler

The Versatile air pollutant sampler (VAPS, URG-3000K, URG Corp., Chapel Hill, NC, USA) was utilized to collect PM_{2.5} and PM_{2.5-10} samples simultaneously. Sampling over a 24-h period was performed 6–10 times per month during the two sampling periods. The VAPS sampler has a single inlet assembly (PM_{10}) and is designed to remove particles with aerodynamic diameters > 10. Flow rate is 32 L/min. Quartz filters with a diameter of 47 mm (ZeflourTM Supported PTFE, PALL) were used to collect ambient particulates.

Dry Deposition Plate

The dry deposition plate (DDP) used in this study has a smooth, horizontal, surrogate surface and provides a lower bound estimate of the dry deposition flux. The DDP consisted of a smooth surface plate made of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) that measured 21.5 cm long, 8.0 cm wide and 0.8 cm thick. The DDP also contained a sharp, leading edge that was pointed into the prevailing wind. All filters were maintained in a condition of 50% relative humidity and temperature of 25°C for over 48 h. Prior to sampling use, all filters were weighed to 0.0001 gram significant digits.

Formula and Calculation

After exposure in the atmosphere for equilibration, the procedures were divided into following steps:
1. Wash the cut surrogate surface (44 cm²).
2. Coat the adsorbent (silicone grease or apenzon L grease).
3. Weigh filter after moisture equilibrium (24hrs) (W0).
4. Expose the filter in the field and record sampling day and sampling time (t) (24hrs and 48 hrs).
5. Reweigh filter after the moisture equilibrium (W1), and store until Hg analysis.

The following equations were used to determine particle concentration and dry deposition flux:

Concentration = \frac{(w1 - w0)}{[t(min)] \times Q(liter/min)]}  (19)

Flux = \frac{(w1 - w0)(ug)}{[Area(m²) \times t(min)]}  (20)

Vd(cm/sec) = \frac{Flux(\mu g/m²-min)}{TSP(\mu g/m³)}  (21)

Chemical Analysis

Concentrations of Hg from each sample (quartz filter, overhead projection film) were analyzed by a direct Hg analyzer (DMA-80 Milestone, Inc., Shelton, CT, USA). Approximately 30 mg of the filter sample was loaded directly into the DMA and analyzed using methods described previously (Basu et al., 2009).

The methodology is based on a thermal decomposition of the sample and collection of the Hg vapor on a gold amalgamator. The filter samples were placed into a sampling boat and transferred to a combustion tube containing a catalyst. The sample is first dried at 200°C prior to combustion at 615–650°C in an oxygen atmosphere. The Hg vapor is collected in a gold amalgamator and after a pre-defined time at 170°C the gold amalgamator is heated up to 900°C. The released Hg is transported to a heated cuvette at 125°C and then analyzed by atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS) using a silicon UV diode detector. The operation conditions were: drying for 30 sec at 200°C, decomposition for 90 sec at 650°C, and combustion for 90 sec at 650°C.

Analytical accuracy and precision were monitored through the use of Standard Reference Materials (SRMs), and intermittent analysis of duplicate samples and blanks.
SRMs included National Research Council of Canada (NRCC) DOLT-3 (dogfish liver) and TORT-2 (lobster hepatopancreas). Average accuracy was within 10% of certified values for all analyses; similarly analytical precision (% Relative Standard Deviation of replicate samples) averaged < 10% for all analyses. All values were back-calculated and presented as an estimated concentration of total Hg on the entire filter.

**Quality Control**

Analytical accuracy and precision were determined through the use of Standard Reference Materials (DOLT-3 and TORT-2 from National Research Council of Canada) and intermittent analysis of duplicate samples. Average recovery rates of DOLT-3 and TORT-2 for total mercury (Hg) were within the certified values (±10%). The detection limit for the direct Hg analyzer (DMA-80 Milestone, Inc., Shelton, Connecticut, USA) was 0.025 ng and ranged from 0.022 to 0.030 ng.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This sampling information (average temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, and prevailing wind) about ambient air (total, fine and coarse) particulate concentrations are displayed in Table 1. In general, the wind was blowing mainly from the north during March 17 to May 22 of 2009. The average values for temperature, relative humidity and wind speed were 27.0°C, 67.6% and 2.6 m/sec, respectively at this near-highway traffic sampling site. The prevailing wind was blowing directly from the southeast wind during the sampling period in this study.

Table 1 also describes the average total suspended particulate (TSP) concentrations, fine particle (PM$_{2.5}$) and coarse particle (PM$_{2.5-10}$) concentrations at this near highway traffic sampling site during March 17 to May 22 of 2009. The average total suspended particulate concentration was 65.14 μg/m$^3$. In addition, the average PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{2.5-10}$ concentrations at this near-highway traffic sampling site were 15.47 μg/m$^3$ and 9.50 μg/m$^3$, respectively. Moreover, the average total suspended particulates concentrations were about 4.21 times as that of fine particulates concentrations and the average fine particulates concentrations were about 1.62 times as that of coarse particulates concentrations at this traffic sampling area.

Table 2 shows the average PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and PM$_{10}$ concentration by using Versatile Air Pollutant Sampler (VAPS) at the sampling site. The ranges for PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and PM$_{10}$ particulates were 5.78–29.57 μg/m$^3$, 3.89–30.39 μg/m$^3$ and 9.67–51.84 μg/m$^3$, respectively. The average ratio of fine-to-coarse particulate matter was 1.82 during the sampling period at the sampling site.

**Table 1. Meteorological conditions for ambient air total suspended particulates, fine and coarse particulates concentrations at a near high way traffic area during March to May of 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Sample date</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>WS (m/sec)</th>
<th>RH (%)</th>
<th>PWD</th>
<th>Total suspended particulate (μg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ particulate concentration (μg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5-10}$ particulate concentration (μg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$ particulate concentration (μg/m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>86.41</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>24.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>67.25</td>
<td>29.57</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>46.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>94.77</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>51.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>59.58</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>64.81</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>29.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>68.64</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>31.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>75.26</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>58.54</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>28.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>75.26</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>83.28</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>53.66</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>15.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>WNW</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average 27.0 2.6 67.6 65.14 15.47 9.50 24.94**

**Standard deviation 1.6 1.0 8.2 16.30 7.08 6.38 12.11**

Table 3 shows the atmospheric particulates for PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5}$–PM$_{10}$, PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) particulates concentrations and ratios for fine/coarse Hg particulate. The ranges of Hg(p) for PM$_{2.5}$ particulates were from 0.0016 to 0.0557 ng/m$^3$ while the ranges of Hg(p) for PM$_{2.5}$–PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) particulates were from 0.0006 to 0.0305 ng/m$^3$. And the ratios for fine/coarse Hg(p) particulates were about 1.07. The ranges for PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) particulates concentrations were from 0.0022 to 0.862 ng/m$^3$.

Table 4 displayed the comparison of various ambient air particle bound pollutants dry deposition velocity during year of 1981–2009. The results indicated that the above mentioned ambient air particle bound pollutants dry deposition velocity were ranged from 0.16 cm/sec to about 5.2 cm/sec in the PCBs. And the ambient air particle bound PAHs pollutants dry deposition velocities were ranged from 4.5 ± 3.1 to 6.7 ± 2.8 cm/sec. And the average ambient air particle bound PCDD pollutants dry deposition velocities were 0.723 cm/sec. In addition, the average particle bound mercury Hg(p) dry deposition velocity was

Table 2. PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5}$–PM$_{10}$, PM$_{10}$, total suspended particle mass concentrations and their ratios for all the samples collected in this study. (µg/m$^3$) (N = 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulates sizes</th>
<th>Total suspended particulate concentration (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ particulate concentration (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$<em>{2.5}$–PM$</em>{10}$ particulate concentration (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$ particulate concentration (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Ratios for fine/coarse particulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling period</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.45–94.77</td>
<td>65.14</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>24.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0245–0.1503</td>
<td>0.0016–0.0557</td>
<td>0.0006–0.0305</td>
<td>0.0022–0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
<td>0.1140</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Atmospheric particulates for PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5}$–PM$_{10}$, PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) particulates concentrations and Ratios for fine/coarse Hg(p) particulates. (N = 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulates sizes</th>
<th>Total suspended particulate Hg(p) concentration (ng/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Hg(p) concentration (ng/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$<em>{2.5}$–PM$</em>{10}$ Hg(p) concentration (ng/m$^3$)</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) concentration (ng/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Ratios for fine/coarse Hg particulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling period</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0245–0.1503</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
<td>0.1140</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of various ambient air particle bound pollutants dry deposition velocity (cm/sec) during of 1979–2009.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Velocity (cm/sec)</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCB-1242</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Eisenreich et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB-1016</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Eisenreich et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^1$PCB</td>
<td>1.1$^e$ 5.9$^d$</td>
<td>Lee (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^1$PCB</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>Lee et al. (1996a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^3$PCB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Holsen et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.13</td>
<td>Swackhammer et al. (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Doskey and Andren (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Holsen et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Atlas et al. (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Lee et al. (1996b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDD</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>Lee et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Tasdemir et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Tasdemir et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>4.4 ± 7.2</td>
<td>Franz et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>1.26 ± 1.86</td>
<td>Cindoruk and Tasdemir (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^1$PAH</td>
<td>6.7 ± 2.8</td>
<td>Odabasi et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^1$PAH</td>
<td>4.5 ± 3.1</td>
<td>Vardar et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg(p)</td>
<td>3.49 ± 2.0</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^e$Greased dry deposition plates, $^f$For fine particles, $^g$For coarse particles.
3.49 ± 2.0 cm/sec. In general, the average dry deposition velocities order for ambient air particle bound pollutants was PAHs > Hg(p) > PCBs > PCDD.

Fig. 2 displays the particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions variations in PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP. In general, the highest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in PM$_{2.5}$ were 16.85 ng/g and the lowest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in PM$_{2.5}$ were 0.55 ng/g. And the highest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in PM$_{2.5-10}$ were 9.58 ng/g and the lowest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in PM$_{2.5-10}$ were 0.22 ng/g. Finally, the highest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in TSP were 77.60 ng/g and the lowest particle-bound mercury Hg(p) compositions in TSP were 15.50 ng/g. The compositions variations for Hg(p) in PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{2.5-10}$ and TSP are varied. The average compositions ratios for TSP/Fine and TSP/Coarse were 13.46 and 16.39 for 19 sampling groups in this study, respectively.

Fig. 3 displayed average concentration ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/coarse in particle bound mercury Hg(p) during the 19 sampling groups. The results indicate that the average concentration ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/coarse in particle-bound mercury Hg(p) were 13.46 and 16.40, respectively. In general, the highest concentration ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/course were 36.38 and 97.01, respectively. The lowest concentration ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/course were 2.51 and 3.30, respectively.

The average dry deposition mass fluxes were 145.04 $\mu$g/m$^2$-min. Fig. 4 displays the calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) and Zhang et al. (2001) models for the 19 sampling groups. The results indicate that the average calculated/measured...
mass dry deposition flux ratios value by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) model was 4.65 while the average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios values by Zhang et al. (2001) was 7.16. Both of these models overestimate the measured dry deposition mass flux. The Baklanov model performed better results in the prediction of mass dry deposition flux.

In addition, the measured dry deposition fluxes for ambient air particulates were ranged from 31.68–380.11 ng/m²-min for the 19 sampling groups. The average dry depositions mass fluxes were 0.95 ng/m²-min. Fig. 5 displays the calculated/measured mass dry deposition for particle bound Hg(p) flux ratios by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) and Zhang et al. (2001) models for the 19 sampling groups. The results indicate that the average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios value by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) model was 0.52 while the average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios values by Zhang et al. (2001) was 0.81. Both of these two models slightly underestimate the measured dry deposition mass flux for particle bound Hg(p). Zhang’s model performed better results in the prediction of Hg(p) dry deposition flux.

In addition, the measured dry deposition Hg(p) fluxes for ambient air particulates were ranged from 0.4218–1.6447 ng/m²-min for the 19 sampling groups.

CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions for this study was listed as followed:

1. The average total suspended particulate concentration was 65.14 μg/m³. In addition, the average PM_{2.5} and PM_{2.5-10} concentration at this near-highway traffic sampling site were 15.47 μg/m³ and 9.50 μg/m³, respectively.

---

**Fig. 4.** The average calculated/measured particulates dry deposition flux at a traffic sampling site.

**Fig. 5.** The average calculated/measured particulates dry deposition flux for particulates bound mercury Hg(p) at a traffic sampling site.
2. The ranges of Hg(p) for PM$_{2.5}$ particulates were from 0.0016 to 0.0557 ng/m$^3$ while the ranges of Hg(p) for PM$_{2.5}$–PM$_{10}$ Hg(p) particulates were from 0.0006 to 0.0305 ng/m$^3$. And the ratios for fine/coarse Hg(p) particulates were about 1.07. The ranges for Hg(p) in PM$_{10}$ particulates concentrations were from 0.0022 to 0.862 ng/m$^3$.

3. The average composition ratios for TSP/Fine and TSP/Coarse were 13.46 and 16.39 for 19 sampling groups in this study, respectively. The results also indicate that the average concentration ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/coarse in particle bound mercury Hg(p) were 13.46 and 16.40, respectively. In general, the highest concentrations ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/coarse were 36.38 and 97.01, respectively. The lowest concentrations ratios for TSP/fine and TSP/coarse were 2.51 and 3.30, respectively.

4. The average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios value by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) model was 4.65 while the average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios values by Zhang et al. (2001) was 7.16. Both of these two models overestimate the measured dry deposition mass flux. The Baklanov model performed better results in the prediction of mass dry deposition flux.

5. The average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios value by Baklanov and Sorensen (2001) model was 0.52 while the average calculated/measured mass dry deposition flux ratios values by Zhang et al. (2001) was 0.81. Both of these two models slightly underestimate the measured dry deposition mass flux for particle bound Hg(p). Zhang’s model performed better results in the prediction of Hg(p) dry deposition flux.
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