Investigating ground-level ozone pollution in semi-arid and arid regions of Arizona using WRF-Chem v4.4 modeling
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Abstract. Ground-level ozone (O₃) pollution is a persistent environmental concern, even in regions that have made efforts to reduce emissions. This study focuses on the state of Arizona, which has experienced elevated O₃ concentrations over past decades and contains two non-attainment areas as designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Using the Weather Research and Forecasting with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) model, we examine O₃ levels in the semi-arid and arid regions of Arizona. Our analysis focuses on the month of June between 2017 and 2021, a period characterized by high O₃ levels before the onset of the North American Monsoon (NAM). Our evaluation of the WRF-Chem model against surface Air Quality System (AQS) observations reveals that the model adeptly captures the diurnal variation of hourly O₃ levels and the episodes of O₃ exceedance through the maximum daily 8 h average (MDA8) O₃ concentrations. However, the model tends to overestimate surface NO₂ concentrations, particularly during nighttime hours. Among the three cities studied, Phoenix (PHX) and Tucson (TUS) exhibit a negative bias in both hourly and MDA8 O₃ levels, while Yuma demonstrates a relatively large positive bias. The simulated mean hourly and MDA8 O₃ concentrations in Phoenix are 44.6 and 64.7 parts per billion (ppb), respectively, compared to observed values of 47.5 and 65.7 ppb, resulting in mean negative biases of −2.9 and −1.0 ppb, respectively.

Furthermore, the analysis of the simulated ratio of formaldehyde (HCHO) to NO₂ (HCHO/NO₂; FNR), reveals interesting insights of the sensitivity of O₃ to its precursors. In Phoenix, the FNR varies from a VOC (volatile organic compound)-limited regime in the most populated areas to a transition between VOC-limited and NOₓ-limited regimes throughout the metro area, with an average FNR of 1.15. In conclusion, this study sheds light on the persistent challenge of ground-level O₃ pollution in semi-arid and arid regions, using the state of Arizona as a case study.

1 Introduction

Ground-level ozone (O₃), or tropospheric O₃, is a harmful air pollutant that affects human health and plants (Anderson, 2009; Reich, 1987; Iriti and Faoro, 2009; Wang et al., 2017; Lippmann, 1989; Manisalidis et al., 2020). O₃ concentrations are affected by meteorological conditions and the concentrations of precursors (Vingarzan, 2004; Wang et al., 2017; Fiore et al., 2002; Jacob, 2000; Monks et al., 2015). Meteorological factors include intensity of solar radiation, temperature (T), relative humidity (RH), winds, pressure, and boundary layer height (Trainer et al., 2000). The precursors of O₃ include nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Besides its significant role in forming O₃, NOₓ, particularly NO₂, is also an important pollutant mainly emitted by human activities.

With projections indicating the expansion of aridity zones due to climate change in the future (Asadi Zarch et al., 2017; Achakulwisut et al., 2019; Straffelini and Tarolli, 2023; Huang et al., 2017), there is an anticipated rise in O₃ levels under more drought and elevated temperature conditions (Achakulwisut et al., 2019), thereby posing potential chal-
lenges to overall air quality, vegetation, and public health. In the face of these projections, there is an undeniable sense of urgency in advancing our comprehension of O₃ production mechanisms and refining forecasting model skills, especially within urban arid regions. This imperative arises from the acknowledgement that urban areas in arid climates face a distinctive set of challenges marked by exceptionally low precipitation, elevated temperatures, and unique vegetation. Gaining such insights is crucial for generating effective strategies to mitigate the negative impacts on air quality, vegetation, and the health of urban populations in response to shifting climatic conditions.

Because of the Clean Air Act, average NO₂ concentrations have decreased substantially in the US since the 1990s (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2012). For example, the annual 98th percentile of daily maximum 1 h average NO₂ was reduced from 42 to 33 ppb with a 21 % decrease in the national average from 2010 to 2022 (EPA, 2023a). VOCs in the atmosphere are generally emitted from two major sources: human activity and biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) produced by plants. In the US, VOC emission data are tracked by the NEI. According to NEI data, in Maricopa County, where the city of Phoenix resides, total estimated VOC emissions from anthropogenic sources, excluding forest wildfires and prescribed burns, decreased by 35 % between 2008 and 2020 (from 0.19 to 0.13 million tonnes). Most anthropogenic emissions reductions were observed among on-road mobile sources and other industrial processes. As a result, O₃ levels have substantially decreased across much of the US (Cooper et al., 2012; Parrish et al., 2022). In 2015, the U.S. EPA lowered the O₃ National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) to 70 parts per billion (ppb). The design value is defined as the annual fourth-highest maximum daily 8h average (MDA₈) O₃ concentration, averaged over 3 years. Any area that does not meet this standard is designated as a non-attainment area (NA)(A). Despite the nationwide decrease of O₃ precursors and O₃ concentrations, there are still areas where O₃ levels exceeded the 2015 NAAQS standard of 70 ppb in 2017 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015). Therefore, for these areas, it is critical to have a detailed understanding of the chemical and meteorological processes influencing O₃ formation so that better pollution control can be put in place to reduce O₃ levels.

Identifying and quantifying the various sources that contribute to the formation of O₃ is challenging due to the complicated nature of atmospheric chemistry and variability of O₃ precursors (Duan et al., 2008; Fang et al., 2021; He et al., 2019; Odman et al., 2009; Yang et al., 2021; Zare et al., 2014; Zhan et al., 2023; Trainer et al., 2000). First, O₃ formation is a complex process that involves the interaction of multiple precursor pollutants, such as NOₓ and VOCs, under the influence of sunlight. The chemistry behind these reactions can be highly nonlinear and dependent on numerous variables (e.g., temperature, moisture, cloud cover, and solar radiation) (Trainer et al., 2000). This nonlinearity makes it challenging to predict how changes in emissions will impact O₃ concentrations. In addition, O₃ is not limited to areas where its precursors are emitted as it can be transported over long distances. This makes it difficult to attribute O₃ levels solely to local sources, as regional and even global factors can influence local concentrations (Vingarzan, 2004; Monks et al., 2015).

In Arizona, the Phoenix-Mesa metropolitan area is currently designated as a moderate NAA for O₃ and has ranked among the top five of most polluted cities for O₃ in the last 5 years (source: https://www.lung.org/research/sota/city-rankings/most-polluted-cities, last access: 20 September 2022). Another NAA is Yuma County. Unlike Maricopa County, Yuma is a rural region that has a much lower population and emissions. With Yuma being located on the border of Mexico to the south and southwest and California to the west, its O₃ levels thus are significantly impacted by both international and inter-state transport. Qu et al. (2021) investigated the sources of O₃ pollution in Yuma, Arizona, and found strong international influences from northern Mexico on 12 out of 16 O₃ exceedance days. They also performed a sensitivity study with the GEOS-Chem model and found that reducing emissions in Arizona alone would have a minimal impact on mitigating O₃ exceedances in Yuma, with only a 0.7 % reduction in MDA₈ O₃. In contrast, reducing emissions in Mexico is estimated to contribute to an 11 % reduction in O₃ during these exceedances, bringing MDA₈ O₃ in Yuma below the standard. Li et al. (2015) applied Weather Research and Forecasting with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) with sensitivity experiments and showed that Arizona emissions have a dominant impact on MDA₈ O₃ concentrations in Phoenix, while southern California’s contributions range from a few ppb to over 30 ppb.

While long-range transport of precursors and O₃ into Arizona does occur, the primary contributor to O₃ levels remains the in situ production resulting from local emissions. Because most of Arizona is a semi-arid and arid region with a unique southwest natural environment including weather, climate, and desert plants, it is important to understand how the extreme heat, low moisture, and year-round desert shrubs contribute to O₃ production in order to minimize O₃ exceedances and improve air quality forecasting (Sorooshian et al., 2024). Additionally, even though Arizona is a typical desert weather region with high temperatures and low moisture year-round, during the North American Monsoon (NAM) the primary wind flow in Arizona shifts from westerly and southwesterly to southerly and southeasterly, resulting in elevated moisture from the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of California. Furthermore, unlike the other O₃-polluted regions in the eastern US, which are mainly forest ecosystems, most of Arizona experiences little precipitation – less than 25 cm or 25 to 50 cm of rain per year (Paul et al., 2002). The BVOCs are also quite unique in the arid climate region. Geron et al. (2006) found out that in the Mojave Desert and
2 Data and method

This research focuses on the study of \( \text{O}_3 \) in the state of Arizona in the US. In this section, we begin with introducing the available datasets applied to evaluate the WRF-Chem model including observational datasets from EPA AQS and PAMS network, reanalysis using CMAQ modeling, radiosonde measurements, and regional forecasts. A description of the study region is then given, and this is followed by the model description and configurations.

2.1 EPA AQS surface observations

We use the hourly and daily surface in situ observations of \( \text{O}_3 \), \( \text{CO} \), \( \text{NO}_2 \), and meteorological fields such as \( T \), \( \text{RH} \), \( \text{H} \), and winds from the EPA AQS monitoring network (Demerjian, 2000). Sites within each city were selected based on their availability during the study periods for each parameter. For instance, for \( \text{O}_3 \) measurements, 10 sites were selected in Phoenix, 7 in Tucson, and 2 in Yuma. The information for each is listed in Table S2 in the Supplement. For evaluation purposes, we applied quality control to the raw data to exclude any values that were zero or negative before doing further analysis. To calculate the MDA8 \( \text{O}_3 \), any days with more than eight continuous hourly data points missing were excluded from the analysis. Zero and negative values were treated as missing, while values below the method detection limit (MDL) were replaced with \( 0.5 \times \text{MDL} \) (Zhang et al., 2012).

2.2 EPA PAMS VOC measurements

The network of Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) established by the U.S. EPA plays a crucial role in monitoring and understanding ground-level \( \text{O}_3 \) pollution in affected areas providing measurements of various \( \text{O}_3 \) precursors, including VOCs. The list of measurements includes 63 different compounds with some of the most common VOC species like formaldehyde (HCHO), acetaldehyde, acetone, ethanol, and two monoterpenes (\( \alpha \)-pinene and \( \beta \)-pinene; \( \text{C}_{10}\text{H}_{16} \)). The primary objective of these PAMS sites is to create a comprehensive database of \( \text{O}_3 \) precursors and meteorological conditions to better understand local \( \text{O}_3 \) formation, support the development of \( \text{O}_3 \) models, and allow for the tracking of important trends in \( \text{O}_3 \) precursor concentrations over time. The two PAMS monitor sites in Arizona are located in Phoenix (JLG Supersite: 04-013-9997) and Tucson (22nd & Craycroft: 04-019-1011). The sampling frequency for most VOCs is hourly averaged. For formaldehyde, the JLG Supersite uses the EPA’s 3d schedule with three 8h averaged carbonyl samples per day on every third day.

2.3 Radiosonde data

High vertical resolution temperature profiles from radiosondes are applied to determine the planetary layer boundary height (PBLH) for WRF-Chem evaluations. Data from radiosondes launched at three different locations (Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma) were downloaded. The radiosonde launches in Phoenix are active during the monsoon season, starting in mid-June and ending in late September while Tucson and Yuma conduct regular daily balloon launches. The launch times for Phoenix and Tucson are set at 00:00 and 12:00 UT, while Yuma operates two launch sites with schedules at 12:00, 18:00, and 21:00 UT. To estimate the PBLH, we use the bulk Richardson number method. The Richardson number is a dimensionless number used to assess atmospheric stability. The top of planetary layer boundary is marked by when the Richardson number exceeds a threshold of 0.25.

2.4 CMAQ reanalysis

A high-resolution (12 × 12 km\(^2\)) air quality reanalysis over the contiguous US (CONUS) is available from 2005–2018 (https://www.gcseglobal.org/development-air-quality-products, last access: 15 June 2023). This reanalysis is generated using a newly developed chemical data assimilation system that simultaneously assimilates aerosol optical depth (AOD) retrievals from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) and carbon monoxide (CO) retrievals from the Measurement of Pollution in the Troposphere (MOPITT) in the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model. The WRF model provides meteorological input for CMAQ simulations over the CONUS. This dataset offers a suite of air quality products, e.g., \( \text{PM}_{2.5} \), \( \text{PM}_{10} \), \( \text{O}_3 \), and \( \text{NO}_2 \). In this study, beyond the ground-based EPA observations we expand our analysis by incorporating this reanalysis dataset to enhance the evaluation of \( \text{O}_3 \) levels across Arizona.

2.5 ADEQ forecasts

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) produces 5d hourly air quality forecasts for locations across Arizona (https://www.azdeq.gov/forecast, last access: 4 April 2023). Specifically for our study region, forecasts...
are released Monday through Friday and include \( \text{O}_3 \), \( \text{PM}_{10} \), and \( \text{PM}_{2.5} \). The forecast values are for the monitor with the highest MDA8 \( \text{O}_3 \) concentration for a given day within the Phoenix-Mesa NAA and the Tucson area, whereas for Yuma it is a single monitor (Yuma Supersite).

2.6 Description of study region and time period

The climate of the southern and southwestern parts of Arizona (Sonoran Desert) is dry and hot, with much of the region characterized as arid. Our primary interest is in three major cities: Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma. Phoenix, the most populated city, is designated as an \( \text{O}_3 \) NAA by EPA along with the entire metro area; Tucson, which is the second largest city in the state, experiences mild \( \text{O}_3 \) pollution but gets stronger influence from the monsoon and Mexico; Yuma, situated near both California and Mexico, is a representation of an arid section of the Sonoran Desert and also designated as a NAA with clean data determination by EPA.

Shown in Fig. 1 are the monthly mean surface air values of MDA8 \( \text{O}_3 \), \( \text{CO} \), and \( \text{NO}_2 \) and meteorological fields of RH, \( T \), wind speed, and wind direction in the city of Phoenix. These monthly values were derived from averaging the daily EPA AQS data collected over a 5-year period from 2017 to 2022 at the Phoenix JLG Supersite. The MDA8 (Fig. 1a) exhibits peaks during the summer months, spanning from April to September, except for the year 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic began. On the other hand, the monthly \( \text{CO} \), \( \text{NO}_2 \), and RH show an opposite trend, with their lowest values observed during the summer months. RH is the lowest in June and then increases as the monsoon arrives in July, followed by decreases in September after the monsoon ends. Besides the COVID-19 factor, 2020 is ranked as the second driest year in Arizona’s history, with a statewide precipitation level of only 6.63 in. (168.4 mm; NWS Phoenix, 2020). Figure 1d shows that the RH levels during late 2020 (red line) and early 2021 (purple line) were the lowest across the 5-year period. Additionally, the temperature during the summer of 2020 (Fig. 1e) was also the highest. For winds, the windiest seasons are spring and summer, and the wind direction varies throughout the year. The wind direction is determined by taking the inverse tangent of the total zonal and meridional wind components, which are derived from the daily maximum wind speed and its corresponding direction. Summer months exhibit mostly westerly winds, while winter months consist of more easterly winds (Fig. 1f–g). Shown in Fig. 1h is the distribution of monthly \( \text{O}_3 \) exceedance days at the JLG Supersite in Phoenix (site no. 04-013-9997). An \( \text{O}_3 \) exceedance day occurs when the MDA8 \( \text{O}_3 \) is greater than 70 ppb on that day. The exceedance days are mostly recorded from April to September, referred to here as the “ozone season”. In the months of June and July in the year 2020, the MDA8 \( \text{O}_3 \) (Fig. 1a) and exceedance days (Fig. 1h) were substantially lower than in other years, and the reason could be related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic’s stay-at-home period resulted in much lower traffic levels and hence reduced anthropogenic emissions.

Based on these monthly results, we choose the month of June (dry summer), when \( \text{O}_3 \) levels, temperature, and winds are high and the moisture level is still low. It is also intended to mitigate the impact of the heavy precipitation that typically accompanies the monsoon. Additionally, since we focus on the desert area, dust storm events can significantly impact the \( \text{O}_3 \) photolysis, hence the concentrations. According to Lader (2016), the highest frequency of dust storm events happens during the active Monsoon season (in July and August). Therefore, we have chosen June as our main study period to reduce the impacts of dust. We apply the WRF-Chem model (v4.4) with state-of-art configurations to simulate the \( \text{O}_3 \) concentrations over Arizona. Numerical simulations were conducted during June between 2017 and 2021 for a total of 5 years. Furthermore, the ozone season in 2017 was also simulated as our base year. The following sections describe the datasets analyzed herein and the configuration used for the WRF-Chem simulations.

2.7 WRF-Chem setup

The Weather Research Forecasting coupled with Chemistry (WRF-Chem) (Grell et al., 2005) model is a fully coupled meteorology–chemistry transport model developed by the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR). This study uses WRF-Chem v4.4 to simulate \( \text{O}_3 \) in Arizona. With our ultimate goal of establishing an operational forecasting and analysis system for Arizona in the future, we have configured the model using the NCAR WRF-Chem forecasting system as a reference (https://www.acom.ucar.edu/firex-aq/forecast.shtml; last access: 15 August 2023). The comprehensive parameterization schemes are provided in the following list. The Model for Ozone and Related Chemical Tracers (MOZART-4, Emmons et al., 2010) is selected for the gas-phase chemistry, coupled with the Goddard Chemistry Aerosol Radiation and Transport (GOCART, Chin et al., 2002) for aerosol chemistry with wet scavenging enabled. The standard MOZART-4 mechanism includes 85 gas-phase species, 12 bulk aerosol compounds, in addition to 39 photolysis and 157 gas-phase reactions. It also includes an updated isoprene oxidation scheme and a better treatment of volatile organic compounds, with three lumped species to represent alkanes and alkenes with four or more carbon atoms and aromatic compounds (called BIGALK, BIGENE, and TOLUENE) (Emmons et al., 2010). The new updated Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible (TUV) photolysis option, based on standalone TUV version 5.3, is employed to calculate the photolysis rates. This new TUV option uses \( \text{O}_3 \) climatology distributed from the model top (~20 km) to 50 km. Initial and lateral boundary conditions are supplied every 6 h from both the Global Forecast System (GFS) with a horizontal grid spacing of 1° for meteorology and the Community At-
mosphere Model with Chemistry (CAM-Chem) (Lamarque et al., 2012; Tilmes et al., 2015) for chemistry. Biogenic emissions are calculated online with the Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature (MEGAN, v2.1) using the simulated meteorological conditions while running WRF-Chem (Guenther, 2007; Guenther et al., 2006). Note that MEGAN v2.1 currently is only compatible with the CLM4 (Community Land Model Version 4, Oleson et al., 2010) land surface model. The anthropogenic emissions used in this study are obtained from 2017 National Emissions Inventories (NEI2017) data provided by the U.S. EPA (https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/2017-national-emissions-inventory-nei-data, last access: 20 June 2022) with a 4 km grid resolution covering the US and surrounding land areas. NEI emissions are then interpolated and regridded to model domain grids. Biomass burning emissions are calculated using the Fire Inventory from NCAR (FINNv2.5) (Wiedinmyer et al., 2023) and the online plume-rise model (Freitas et al., 2007). FINNv2.5 is based on fire counts derived from both satellite MODIS and VIIRS (Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite) active fire detection (Wiedinmyer et al., 2023). We employed the GOCART dust option in accordance with the GOCART aerosol scheme. The following key physics settings are also employed: Morrison double-moment microphysics (Morrison et al., 2009), RRTMG for long and short-wave radiation (Iacono et al., 2008), Eta Similarity for surface layer physics (Monin and Obukhov, 1954), the Unified Noah Land Surface Model (Tewari et al., 2004), the Yonsei University (YSU) planetary boundary layer (PBL) scheme (Hong, 2010), and the Grell–Freitas cumulus parameterization scheme (Grell and Freitas, 2014).

The model is configured with two nested grid domains consisting of 9 and 3 km horizontal grid spacing along with 34 vertical levels. Shown in Fig. 3 is the WRF-Chem domain setup. The parent domain (D01) covers the entire western U.S. with expansion to northern Mexico to better understand the wind shift from Mexico during NAM, while the nested domain (D02, Fig. 2b) focuses on Arizona. Both domains are centered in the Phoenix metropolitan area. D01 features 271 and 394 horizontal grids, while D02 is characterized by 349 and 313 horizontal grids. The topography in Fig. 2b (color contours) shows that Phoenix is located in about the center of a valley, called Salt River Valley. The WRF-Chem run periods are specifically designed to be the month of June between 2017 and 2021, with each run consisting of a total of 33 simulation days, including a 3 d spin-up in late May and 30 d in June.

3 Results and discussion
3.1 Model evaluations

We begin by evaluating the simulated diurnal and monthly variations of meteorological fields and major air pollutants using the AQS monitor site and PAMS observations. Shown

Figure 1. Monthly mean of Phoenix surface (a) MDA8 O$_3$, (b) CO, (c) NO$_2$, (d) relative humidity (RH), (e) temperature ($T$), (f) wind speed, (g) wind direction, and (h) number of exceedance days for years between 2017 and 2021, derived from EPA criteria gases and meteorological daily summary data of a single site (Phoenix JLG Supersite).
Figure 2. (a) WRF-Chem domain setup for outer domain D01 and inner domain D02. (b) Geographic location of three Arizona cities: Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma. Dashed black lines in (b) represent the county borders. Contours denote the elevation in meters over the continent.

Figure 3. WRF-Chem-simulated (red), EPA AQS (blue), and CMAQ reanalysis (black) hourly surface O$_3$ concentrations in June 2017 (a) and 2018 (b) in Phoenix. Results are in universal time.

in Fig. 3 is the time series of Phoenix hourly surface O$_3$ concentrations in June for the years 2017 and 2018. CMAQ air quality reanalysis datasets are also included for evaluation. The AQS observations for a particular city are calculated as the average of hourly or maximum daily 8 h average (MDA8) O$_3$ levels obtained from all selected sites. These observations are subsequently compared with the mean simulated O$_3$ concentration within the corresponding area. The diurnal pattern of O$_3$ concentrations is clearly discernible, with peak levels occurring during the afternoon and reaching their lowest
points at night. In general, the WRF-Chem model effectively captures these daily O\textsubscript{3} concentration patterns. Conversely, the reanalysis dataset notably underestimates O\textsubscript{3} levels during the nighttime. Notably, in June 2017, an extreme O\textsubscript{3} event occurred, characterized by O\textsubscript{3} levels exceeding 80 ppb and lasting for 9 d, starting on 14 June 2017. On 20 June, O\textsubscript{3} levels even reached 100 ppb. The model effectively simulates this exceptional event, while the reanalysis dataset tends to overestimate this peak.

Listed in Table 1 are the statistical metrics comparing hourly concentrations from the WRF-Chem to the AQS monitoring sites at three different locations: Phoenix (PHX), Tucson (TUS), and Yuma (YUMA). The statistics include Pearson correlation coefficient ($R$), mean bias (MB), mean error (ME), root-mean-square error (RMSE), normalized mean bias (NMB), normalized mean error (NME), mean normalized bias (MBN), mean normalized error (MNE), fractional bias (MBF), and fractional error (MFE). For hourly O\textsubscript{3}, the correlation ($R$) indicates that all locations show a positive correlation, with PHX having the highest at 0.81, followed by TUS at 0.73, and YUMA at 0.69. The negative MB suggests that in PHX (−2.9 ppb) and TUS (−1.7 ppb) WRF-Chem underestimates the O\textsubscript{3} concentration, while YUMA (5.2 ppb) suggests an overestimate. PHX and TUS generally exhibit smaller biases and errors compared to YUMA. Additionally, YUMA has the highest variability in errors and the highest NME and RMSE values, indicating less agreement with AQS data compared to PHX and TUS.

In addition to the hourly O\textsubscript{3} evaluation, we have also examined the MDA8 (maximum daily 8 h average) O\textsubscript{3}. MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} is a crucial metric used in air quality management and assessment and a good indicator of air pollution. Shown in Fig. 4 are the MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} concentrations for June 2017–2021 in the cities of PHX, TUS, and YUMA. Similar to hourly O\textsubscript{3} in Fig. 3, for the MDA8 O\textsubscript{3}, we employed the CMAQ reanalysis data and AQS observations for our evaluation. Additionally, since the CMAQ reanalysis data is available only up to the year 2018, we incorporated ADEQ forecasts for the years 2019 through 2021. The statistical results of the MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} evaluation against AQS observations can be found in Table 2. Statistics of CMAQ reanalysis and ADEQ forecasts in each individual year are included in Table S3.

Overall, WRF-Chem MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} exhibits a smaller mean bias compared to hourly O\textsubscript{3}, except at Yuma, where the mean bias slightly increases from 5.2 to 6.3 ppb. However, it is worth noting that the correlation coefficients show a slight decrease from 0.81 and 0.73 to 0.66 and 0.62 for PHX and TUS, respectively, compared to hourly O\textsubscript{3}. This reduction in correlation could be attributed to fewer data points available for linear fitting in the case of MDA8 O\textsubscript{3}. Additionally, the RMSE at PHX is reduced from 10.6 ppb for hourly O\textsubscript{3} to 8.6 ppb for MDA8 O\textsubscript{3}. Considering statistics in both Tables 1 and 2, we conclude that WRF-Chem exhibits better performance in capturing the variations of MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} concentrations than hourly O\textsubscript{3}.

Furthermore, when we compare WRF-Chem with CMAQ reanalysis, our findings indicate that WRF-Chem demonstrates smaller biases and higher correlations. For instance, the reanalysis consistently underestimates the MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} at PHX but overestimates them at Yuma during the 4–9 June and 20–28 June periods, as illustrated in Fig. 4.

Besides O\textsubscript{3} evaluations, we examined other air pollutants and essential meteorological parameters. We present in Fig. 5 the daily surface concentrations of CO, NO\textsubscript{2}, isoprene, and formaldehyde (HCHO), along with surface $T$ and RH, for June 2021. CO and NO\textsubscript{2} are two prominent anthropogenic pollutants and serve as O\textsubscript{3} precursors. Isoprene (the simplest five-carbon isoprenoid, C\textsubscript{5}H\textsubscript{8}) and monoterpenes are the dominant BVOC emitted to the atmosphere and accounts for over 50% of the total BVOC emissions (Guenther et al., 2012). Their concentrations are significantly influenced by factors such as temperature, vegetation, and light conditions (Morrison et al., 2016; Kalogridis et al., 2014). It is important to note that observations of VOCs using the PAMS system, in comparison to the well-established AQS monitoring system, remain relatively limited. Currently, the PAMS monitoring network in Arizona only operates during summer months from June to August and only started in recent years. For instance, of the two PAMS sites within Arizona, only two daily measurements of formaldehyde were recorded in June 2019 in Phoenix, and the observation schedule changed from 1 in 6 d to 1 in 3 d since 2018. In Tucson, formaldehyde observations only became available starting in 2021 with a 1 in 3 d schedule. Daily measurements of isoprene became available in both Phoenix and Tucson starting in 2021.

In comparison with the observations, the model appropriately replicated the daily variations of surface $T$ and RH with minimal biases. However, for CO, WRF-Chem failed to capture the elevated episode over PHX during 11–15 June 2021. It is worth noting that during this period there was an active wildfire (Telegraph Fire, situated southeast of Phoenix, https://wfca.com/wildfire-articles/arizona-fire-season/, last access: 16 October 2023) that lasted 1 month and became one of the largest wildfires in the US throughout the 2021 wildfire season. Because of this, the CO levels in both Phoenix and Tucson were significantly impacted by the fire plumes with smoke moving right over Phoenix. The model may not be able to simulate the smoke plumes well. Despite the limited PAMS data, we were able to compare the daily isoprene concentrations with observations in both cities. On average, daily mean isoprene is around 5 ppb in PHX and 1 ppb in TUS. Furthermore, for HCHO concentrations, the model is comparable to the observations, not only in terms of the values, but also in capturing their variations. In conclusion, the online biogenic emission model employed in the WRF-Chem model, MEGAN 2.1, effectively simulates the BVOC levels.

Figure 6a–c presents the spatial plots of monthly mean surface concentrations of MDA8 O\textsubscript{3}, CO, and NO\textsubscript{2} for June. The contour plots are based on hourly model output between the
Table 1. Mean statistics of WRF-Chem hourly O\textsubscript{3} and evaluation with respect to EPA AQS observations in June for years 2017 to 2021. R is the Pearson correlation coefficient, MB is the mean bias, ME is the mean error, RMSE is the root-mean-square error, NMB is the normalized mean bias, NME is the normalized mean error, MNB is the mean normalized bias, MNE is the mean normalized error, MFB is the fractional bias, and MFE is the fractional error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hourly O\textsubscript{3} (ppb)</th>
<th>WRF, AQS (ppb)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>MB (100 %)</th>
<th>ME (100 %)</th>
<th>RMSE (100 %)</th>
<th>NMB (100 %)</th>
<th>NME (100 %)</th>
<th>MNB (100 %)</th>
<th>MNE (100 %)</th>
<th>MFB</th>
<th>MFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHX</td>
<td>44.6, 47.5</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUS</td>
<td>46.2, 47.9</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>46.3, 41.1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. WRF-Chem simulated (red), EPA AQS (blue), CMAQ reanalysis (black triangle), ADEQ forecasts (black circles), and MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} concentrations in June 2017–2021 for three major Arizonan cities: Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma.

year 2017 and 2021. The colored circles represent the AQS surface observations for three cities: Phoenix (PHX), Tucson (TUS), and Yuma (YUMA). Both the WRF-Chem model and the observations indicate that MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} in the Phoenix metro area reaches up to 65 ppb (Fig. 6a). The northeastern area of PHX, which is a downwind region, experiences significant O\textsubscript{3} pollution as the prevailing winds in June are predominantly southwesterly winds (Fig. 6f). The background O\textsubscript{3} level in most of Arizona is around 50 ppb, while western and southwestern Arizona, including Yuma, is substantially influenced by O\textsubscript{3} from California.

For CO concentrations, the highest simulated surface levels in PHX reach 224.2 ppb, closely matching the corresponding AQS measurement of 221.9 ppb (Fig. 6b). Downwind of Phoenix, CO concentrations range between 100 and 120 ppb. Hotspots in the southeastern direction of both PHX and TUS are associated with wildfire burning events, such as the 2017 Frye Fire (southeastern hotspot of TUS) and the 2021 Telegraph Fire. The observed mean NO\textsubscript{2} level in PHX is approximately 5 ppb and is mostly distributed in populated areas as the main source of NO\textsubscript{2} is anthropogenic emissions. Figure S1 in the Supplement provides monthly mean O\textsubscript{3}, CO, and NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations for individual years.

The aridity of southwestern Arizona is characterized by high temperatures and low RH. Shown in Fig. 6d–f are the mean surface temperature, 2 m RH, and surface winds. Notably, the temperature in PHX is slightly higher than that in TUS as PHX is located in the valley and TUS has a higher elevation (see Fig. 2b). The RH overall is under 20 % in southwestern Arizona, where the Sonoran Desert is located.
Table 2. The same as Table 1 but for MDA8 ozone evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDA8 O₃</th>
<th>WRF, AQS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>NMB (100%)</th>
<th>NME (100%)</th>
<th>MNB</th>
<th>MNE</th>
<th>MFB</th>
<th>MFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHX</td>
<td>64.7, 65.7</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUS</td>
<td>55.9, 56.3</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>59.9, 52.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. WRF-Chem-simulated (red) and EPA-observed (blue) surface concentrations of CO and NO₂, surface temperature (T), 2 m relative humidity (RH), surface concentrations of isoprene and formaldehyde (HCHO) for June 2021. CO, NO₂, T, and RH measurements are obtained through the EPA AQS network. Isoprene and HCHO measurements are acquired from the EPA PAMS networks in PHX and TUS. The mean bias (MB) for isoprene and HCHO are also included.

The climate of the western and southwestern Arizona and other parts of Arizona is distinctive. The monthly mean wind predominantly comes from the southwesterly direction, with an average speed of around 4.5 m s⁻¹ or 10 miles per hour (mph).

Table 3 presents the statistics of CO, NO₂, T, and RH between simulations and observations for PHX and TUS. In general, the simulated values of O₃, CO, and T (temperature) align well with the observations. Temperature shows a small, normalized bias of 2 % and -1.3 % for PHX and TUS, respectively. The model overestimates CO both in PHX and TUS by 7.1 % and 5.75 %, respectively. Additionally, the model overestimates the NO₂ levels in both PHX and TUS. Figure 6g–i also demonstrates three dominant VOC concentrations: isoprene, formaldehyde (HCHO), and monoterpenes (C_{10}H_{16}). Overall, the BVOCs are rather small over the desert region, except at Yuma, where it is largely impacted by agricultural vegetation.

To further investigate the bias between simulations and observations, in Fig. 7 we present the frequency distributions of hourly O₃, the corresponding O₃ bias with respect to the AQS observations, and MDA8 O₃ for June in the 5-year period for Phoenix (top), Tucson (middle), and Yuma (bottom). For O₃ levels higher than 50 ppb (background O₃ level in Arizona), WRF-Chem demonstrates good performance in estimating the distributions in Phoenix and Yuma but tends to overestimate in Tucson, particularly between 50 to 60 ppb. Furthermore, WRF-Chem fails to capture the extremely high
Figure 6. WRF-Chem-simulated monthly mean concentrations of main pollution types (O$_3$, CO, NO$_2$), meteorological fields (temperature, relative humidity, wind), and major VOCs (isoprene, formaldehyde, and monoterpene). Colored circles represent the EPA AQS site observations for comparison.

Table 3. Statistics of WRF-Chem evaluation with respect to EPA AQS monitors. Results represent the average of June across 5 years between 2017 and 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CO (ppb)</th>
<th>NO$_2$ (ppb)</th>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>RH (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AQS</td>
<td>221.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRF</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias (%)</td>
<td>16.2 (7.1 %)</td>
<td>0.5 (5.3 %)</td>
<td>0.5 (2 %)</td>
<td>$-2.8$ ($-15.2$ %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AQS</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRF</td>
<td>150.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias (%)</td>
<td>8.1 (5.7 %)</td>
<td>0.5 (12.8 %)</td>
<td>$-0.3$ ($-1.3$ %)</td>
<td>0.8 (4.9 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O$_3$ observational days exceeding 70 ppb for all three cities. Conversely, for low O$_3$ levels below 50 ppb, which are more associated with nighttime O$_3$, WRF-Chem substantially underestimates the values. Therefore, for bias analysis, we divide the assessment into daytime and nighttime periods to account for the diurnal variability of O$_3$ formation. The middle panel in Fig. 7 presents the fractional bias of hourly O$_3$ between WRF-Chem and AQS observations. In general, during the daytime the mean bias is positive (Fig. 7b, e, h) suggesting an overestimation by WRF-Chem, while a negative mean bias during the night indicates that WRF-Chem underestimates the hourly O$_3$ values in PHX. The MDA8 O$_3$ distribution demonstrates better overall agreement between the model and observations than hourly O$_3$, consistent with the statistics in Tables 1 and 2.

To gain deeper insights into the factors contributing to O$_3$ bias between daytime and nighttime, the distribution of surface NO$_2$ concentration is presented in Fig. 8. For data qual-
ity purposes, surface NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations that are less than 0.5 ppb are discarded for both simulations and observations. Similar to O\textsubscript{3}, the model misrepresents large NO\textsubscript{2} episodes in PHX and TUS when NO\textsubscript{2} is greater than 40 and 15 ppb, respectively. There is a larger diurnal variability in the observations than in simulations. The simulated NO\textsubscript{2} distribution during daytime and night are comparable, while observed distributions are significantly different with distinct slopes (Fig. 8a, d). In PHX, the model overestimates the high NO\textsubscript{2} levels (> 10 ppb) during the night, while in TUS the model underestimates the NO\textsubscript{2} during the daytime. The mean bias for day and night in PHX is 0.2 and 1.9 ppb, respectively. The mean bias for day and night in TUS is −2.4 and 0.5 ppb, respectively. The bias over Tucson suggests that WRF-Chem overestimates the NO\textsubscript{2} during the night.

To address the biases depicted in Fig. 8 during daytime and nighttime, the PBLH is investigated. A higher PBLH allows pollutants and aerosols to disperse and mix with cleaner air over a larger vertical extent, resulting in a reduction of air pollutant concentrations. Consequently, an overestimation of PBLH leads to an underestimation of O\textsubscript{3} and NO\textsubscript{2}, and conversely an underestimation of PBLH may contribute to overestimations of these pollutant levels. Using the radiosonde data, we estimated the PBLH at three cities and compared it with model simulations. The launching times of radiosondes at Arizona sites are at universal time (UT) hours of 12:00, 21:00, and 00:00, which correspond to local time (LT) hours of 05:00, 14:00, and 17:00, respectively.

Presented in Fig. 9 are the PBLH for three cities, PHX, TUS, and YUMA, during June 2018 (additional years’ data are available in the Supplement). The nighttime soundings launched at 05:00 LT are highlighted with red stars, and their corresponding WRF-Chem simulated PBLH values are represented as red dots. Conversely, daytime soundings are indicated by blue markers. Simulated PBLH at all other times without sounding data are labeled with grey dots. It is worth noting that the WRF-Chem model consistently demonstrates an underestimate of PBLH during nighttime (as denoted by the red markers) and an overestimate during daytime (as shown by the blue markers). The mean daytime bias of PBLH between model and observations at Phoenix (17:00 LT), Tucson (14:00 LT), and Yuma (14:00 LT) are 322.0, 18.1, and 602.5 m, respectively. These biases are closely related to the MDA8 O\textsubscript{3} bias listed in Table 2 where bias in Phoenix is larger than Tucson. The nighttime biases are all negative with values of −509.7, −435.4, −55.8 m, indicating an overall
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underestimate. The underestimate of PBLH during the night will cause the shallower vertical mixing of daytime accumulated O$_3$ leading to the positive bias of nighttime O$_3$ observed in Fig. 7.

3.1.1 O$_3$ exceedance

According to the EPA, an exceedance day occurs on each calendar day when the MDA8 O$_3$ concentration is greater than 70 ppb, where 70 ppb is the ground-level O$_3$ standard from the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). A design value, on the other hand, is a statistic that describes the air quality status of a given location relative to the NAAQS level. The O$_3$ design value of the Phoenix–Mesa metropolitan area has increased from 76 ppb in 2017 to 81 ppb in 2022 (refer to Table S1). The rising and persisting O$_3$ levels led to the reclassification of Phoenix–Mesa metropolitan area from a marginal to a moderate non-attainment status for O$_3$ limits by the EPA. In the previous section, we demonstrated that WRF-Chem exhibits good performance in simulating the mean O$_3$ and other precursor parameters. Moreover, the model performs better with the MDA8 O$_3$. To further investigate the issue of O$_3$ pollution in Phoenix, this section focuses on O$_3$ exceedances. As depicted in Fig. 1, O$_3$ exceedances typically first start in April and finally occur in September, with the exception of the year 2019 when exceedances extended into October and the year 2021 when no exceedance was observed in April. Over the 5-year period from 2017 to 2021, in the greater Phoenix area the average annual count of O$_3$ exceedance days was 43. Even in 2020, amidst the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the enforcement of stay-at-home measures, which resulted in reduced concentrations of NO$_x$, O$_3$ exceedances in Phoenix did not exhibit significant reduction. Figure 10c illustrates the boundary of the designated Maricopa County non-attainment area (NAA, depicted by polygons outlined in black), along with the locations of AQS sites equipped for O$_3$ monitoring. In total, there are 29 monitoring sites, with 27 of them situated within the NAA boundary.

Presented in Fig. 10 are the spatial variations of the mean O$_3$, MDA8 O$_3$, and count of O$_3$ exceedance days for June 2017 within the Maricopa County NAA. In the top row (Fig. 10a–c), we depict the monthly mean surface hourly O$_3$ concentrations as derived from WRF-Chem, CMAQ reanalysis, and data from AQS monitor sites. These 27 AQS sites, encompassing a range of urbanization levels, population densities, and downwind/upwind positions, exhibit considerable variability even within the NAA. Figure 10d–f show the monthly mean MDA8 O$_3$ concentrations, with higher levels observed in the northeastern part of the NAA, a pattern
Figure 9. Planetary boundary layer height (PBLH) in June 2018 for three cities: (a) Phoenix, (b) Tucson, and (c) Yuma. Dots and stars represent simulation from WRF-Chem and observation from radiosondes, respectively. Nighttime PBLH estimated from radiosonde data at 05:00 LT are denoted as red stars, with their corresponding simulated PBLH values indicated as red dots. Blue markers represent radiosondes launched during daytime with corresponding WRF-Chem simulations denoted by blue dots.

accurately captured by both WRF-Chem and the reanalysis. Better agreement among model and observations is evident considering both hourly and MDA8 O₃. The reanalysis data substantially underestimates the mean hourly O₃ levels by 10 ppb but captures the MDA8 O₃ spatial distribution pattern. Lastly, the count of O₃ exceedance days is shown in Fig. 10g–i. The exceedance days vary from 2 to 10 d within the area. The regions with the highest population density, particularly the central Phoenix–Mesa region, exhibit the highest counts of exceedance days. Additionally, since the prevailing wind in June is westerly (Figs. 1 and 6), the east side of the valley is observed with higher O₃ levels. In general, the model exhibits strong agreement with the observational data regarding factors such as location, number of days, spatial extent, and spatial variability.

3.2 O₃ source attribution

Source attribution of O₃ is challenging due to the complex processes that control O₃ formation. Tropospheric O₃ levels are influenced by a multitude of factors including (1) meteorological factors, such as T, RH, cloud cover, radiation, wind speed and direction, precipitation, and boundary layer height; (2) O₃ precursors, such as NOₓ, VOCs, and CO, which can originate from biomass burning (wildfire, prescribed fire), biogenic emissions, and anthropogenic emissions; and (3) O₃ transport, such as long-range transport and stratospheric O₃ intrusions. Understanding the relationships between these factors and O₃ levels is essential for discerning their respective impacts on ambient O₃ concentrations. Several analytical methods are available for investigating O₃ source attributions, e.g., backward trajectory analysis (Xiong and Du, 2020; Dimitriou and Kassomenos, 2015; Betito et al., 2024), machine learning algorithms (Cheng et al., 2023; Mishra et al., 2023; Weng et al., 2022), and chemistry models (Butler et al., 2020; Lupașcu and Butler, 2019; Sudo and Akimoto, 2007). In this paper, we employ scatter plots that utilize both model outputs and ground observations. These scatter plots serve as a practical means to delve deeper into the intricate connections between O₃ and its major influencing factors, aiding in the identification and quantification of their contributions to O₃ concentrations in the atmosphere.

Figure 11 presents a series of scatter plots that illustrate the relationships between O₃ concentrations and other key variables, including CO, NO₂, surface T, and RH during daytime hours at the Phoenix JLG Supersite. The data points are color coded, with green denoting simulations and orange representing observations. Each column panel within the figure corresponds to the respective month of June for individ-
Figure 10. Comparison of WRF-Chem simulation (a, d, g), CMAQ reanalysis (b, e, h), and EPA AQS observations (colored circles) overlaid with WRF-Chem results (c, f, i) depicting monthly mean surface hourly and MDA8 O$_3$ concentrations (a–f) and exceedance days (g–i) in June 2017. O$_3$ exceedance is defined as a day when the MDA8 concentration exceeds 70 ppb. The Phoenix–Mesa non-attainment area is bounded by black curves.

The negative correlation between NO$_2$ and O$_3$ (depicted in Fig. 11f–j) reveals that in Phoenix surface O$_3$ levels tend to be higher when NO$_2$ concentrations are lower. When hourly NO$_2$ levels exceed 25 ppb, O$_3$ concentrations generally remain below 60 ppb. Furthermore, the positive correlation between temperature and O$_3$ suggests that in general elevated temperatures are associated with higher O$_3$ levels. It is worth noting that on some extreme hot days, O$_3$ levels can also be low. Conversely, the negative correlation between RH and O$_3$ indicates that increased RH tends to be linked with lower O$_3$ concentrations. These intricate relationships offer valuable insights into the complex interplay between O$_3$ and its influencing factors within the Phoenix JLG Supersite region.

As previously discussed in earlier sections, the O$_3$ exceedance in Arizona originates from a combination of various contributing factors, which can be classified into two main categories: local production and transport. Notably, on 13 June 2017, the observed surface O$_3$ levels in both Phoenix and Yuma experienced a substantial increase, with a MDA8 concentration of approximately 90 ppb in Phoenix. This particular event has been successfully captured by both the WRF-Chem model and CMAQ reanalysis, as illustrated in Fig. 4. Shown in Fig. 12 are the simulated vertical profiles of O$_3$, CO, NO$_2$, and HCHO, as well as the surface meteorological parameters, including PBLH, temperature (T), 500 mb height, and RH, during this extreme event. The simulated and AQS observed MDA8 O$_3$ are also included for reference. During the event, both the surface and columnar concentrations of CO, NO$_2$, and HCHO were all elevated, particularly in the boundary layer. In the meantime, PBLH and RH decreased, while temperature and 500 mb height increased, consistent with the correlation relationships observed in Fig. 11. Furthermore, we employed the Hybrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory model (HYSPLIT) (Rolph et al., 2017; Stein et al., 2015) to calculate 48 h back trajectories for the 13 June exceedance event, as illustrated in Fig. S5. As depicted in Fig. 12, at the onset of the extreme events on 13 June 2017, temperatures were lower compared to previous days. However, as the event progressed, a heat episode emerged over Phoenix following a decrease in PBLH. The 48 h back trajectories suggest a potential influence in air masses (O$_3$ or its precursors) originat-
Figure 11. WRF-Chem-simulated (green) and EPA AQS (orange) hourly CO, NO$_2$, surface temperature ($T$), and relative humidity (RH) versus hourly O$_3$ concentration during the daytime.

Figure 12. Vertical profiles of simulated O$_3$, CO, NO$_2$, and HCHO at three cities (contour plots) along with the surface MDA8 O$_3$ (top panel), PBLH, surface temperature ($T$), 500 mb height, and surface relative humidity (RH) in June 2017. An O$_3$ exceedance event on 13 June was observed in all three cities.
ing from California or Asia contributing to the elevated O$_3$ levels observed in Phoenix on 13 June 2017. Subsequently, in the following days, the high O$_3$ concentrations are more associated with local production.

### 3.3 O$_3$-NO$_2$-VOC sensitivity

The O$_3$-NO$_x$-VOC sensitivity is a crucial concept in the fields of atmospheric chemistry and air quality management (Duncan et al., 2010; Sillman, 1995; Sillman and He, 2002; Sillman et al., 2003; Liu and Shi, 2021; Carrillo-Torres et al., 2017; Zaveri et al., 2003). It refers to how the concentration of O$_3$ in the atmosphere responds to changes in the levels of NO$_x$ and VOCs. Understanding this sensitivity is essential for assessing and managing air quality, particularly in regions where O$_3$ pollution is a concern. The sensitivity is often quantified as the ratio of VOC to NO$_x$, an important parameter for characterizing the efficiency of O$_3$ formation in the environment. When this ratio is high, O$_3$ formation is constrained primarily by the availability of NO$_x$, leading to what is defined as NO$_x$-limited or NO$_x$-sensitive chemistry. Consequently, taking measures to reduce NO$_x$ emissions directly correlates with O$_3$ reduction. Conversely, under lower ratios, it is referred to as a VOC-limited or VOC-sensitive regime.

In these scenarios, O$_3$ levels are notably more responsive to reductions in VOCs, and solely decreasing NO$_x$ may not effectively lower O$_3$ concentrations and even worse may increase O$_3$ levels. Ratios between the two regimes are considered transitional, and both NO$_x$ and VOC controls may be effective.

However, it is important to acknowledge that the specific range of ratios used to define VOC and NO$_x$ limitations can vary among researchers and depend on the specific dataset and variables under consideration. Different studies and regulatory assessments may employ distinct criteria for categorizing O$_3$ sensitivity to VOCs and NO$_x$, making it imperative to consider these variations when interpreting and applying sensitivity analyses in different contexts. From an observational perspective, the HCHO concentration has been widely used as a proxy for VOC reactivity as it is a short-lived oxidation product of many VOCs and positively correlated with peroxy radicals (Sillman, 1995), and it is also available in many observational datasets. The concentration of HCHO serves as an indicator for volatile organic compound (VOC) reactivity as it exhibits a positive correlation with proxy radicals (Sillman, 1995). Sillman (1995) identified that elevated HCHO/NO$_x$ ratios typically indicate NO$_x$-limited regimes, whereas reduced HCHO/NO$_x$ ratios are indicative of VOC-limited regimes. Satellite data, like TROPOMI (The Tropospheric Monitoring Instrument), provide daily columnar HCHO and NO$_2$ spatial distributions at a certain time of the day. Thus, satellite data have been widely used in determining the VOC-NO$_x$ sensitivity regimes (Duncan et al., 2010; Souri et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2004). In this study, we also employ the HCHO-to-NO$_2$ ratio (FNR) as a proxy for assessing VOC-NO$_x$ sensitivity. Surface FNRs are usually lower by considering surface or planetary boundary layer number concentrations since the vertical distribution of HCHO and NO$_2$ varies as shown in Fig. 12. HCHO is distributed up to 5 km, whereas NO$_2$ predominantly remains within 0.5 km. Various studies have investigated the FNR threshold for regime determination. Schroeder et al. (2017) defined the transitional regime with FNR values ranging from 0.7 to 2.3, while Duncan et al. (2010) reported a range of 1.0 to 2.0, and Jin et al. (2020) found values of 3.2 to 4.1 using satellite column retrievals. Additionally, Acdan et al. (2023) utilized ground-based PAMS measurements and proposed an FNR range of 0.3 to 1.0 for the transition over the Lake Michigan region. In our study, we follow Duncan et al. (2010), who linked the FNR with surface O$_3$ with model simulation, and their sensitivity regime definition has been used in several studies (Tang et al., 2012; Jin and Holloway, 2015; Souri et al., 2017) by Duncan et al. (2010). When FNR is less than 1, it is classified as VOC-limited; when it falls between 1 and 2, it is considered a transitional regime; and when FNR exceeds 2, it is defined as NO$_x$-limited.

In the previous section, we demonstrated a negative correlation between NO$_2$ and O$_3$, indicating that Phoenix falls within the VOC-limited or VOC-sensitive regime. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of NO$_x$-VOC sensitivity in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area, we calculated monthly FNR values for each year and their respective means. Figure 13 displays spatial maps of FNR across Phoenix and Tucson, highlighting grids with FNR values less than or equal to 4. The Maricopa County non-attainment area (NAA) is outlined in red. Overall, central Phoenix is predominantly characterized as a VOC-limited or transitional regime, with FNR values consistently below 2 and an average FNR of 1.15 across the metropolitan area. The FNR tends to be lower within the more densely populated urban areas. As one moves towards the suburban areas, there is an increase in FNR, marking a transition from the VOC-limited regime to the boundary between VOC-limited and NO$_x$-limited conditions. Additionally, Phoenix exhibits lower FNR values compared to Tucson. Notably, hotspots related to fire activities are evident in different years, such as the eastern region of Phoenix in 2019, the northeastern areas of Phoenix and Tucson in 2020, and the eastern part of Phoenix in 2021. Fire and biomass burning activities typically result in significant emissions of CO, CO$_2$, NO$_x$, VOCs, particulate matter, methane, and more. Consequently, when these fire events occur, they can alter the NO$_x$-VOC sensitivity of the affected areas. The “pop-up” local FNR minima in Fig. 13 (labeled as WF) suggests that wildfire events lead to a reduction in the FNR and a shift in the sensitivity regime towards VOC-limited. Similar results have been reported using satellite observations, where they found that during the fire event, the NO$_x$ values are high near the fire leading to lower FNRs. The varying contours from year to year indicate slight differences in sensitivities between those years, with 2019 and 2020 showing
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lower mean FNR values over the NAA compared to other years.

In Fig. 14, we present scatter plots illustrating the relationship between hourly surface concentrations of NO\(_2\) and HCHO in three cities: Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma, as simulated by WRF-Chem. The color gradients in these scatter plots correspond to the respective O\(_3\) concentrations (panels a–c) and FNR values (panels d–f).

When we compare Fig. 14a with 14d, in Phoenix we observe that elevated O\(_3\) concentrations are linked to lower NO\(_2\) levels (as also seen in Fig. 11) and high HCHO concentrations, falling within the range of 0.5 to 1.2 in terms of FNR. Conversely, the lowest O\(_3\) levels occur when NO\(_2\) levels are relatively high. In Tucson, NO\(_2\) levels are approximately half of those observed in Phoenix, and O\(_3\) occurrences are less frequent. Higher O\(_3\) concentrations in Tucson are primarily associated with FNR values greater than 1. Yuma, on the other hand, exhibits the lowest levels of NO\(_2\), but it has the highest HCHO concentrations, which are also accompanied by high O\(_3\) levels. Notably, the mean FNR in Yuma is also the highest among the three cities, as indicated by the prominent red color in Fig. 14f.

Understanding these correlations between HCHO, NO\(_2\), and O\(_3\) levels is crucial for formulating effective regulatory strategies aimed at mitigating O\(_3\) pollution in urban settings resulting from localized O\(_3\) production. The transitional regime observed in the Phoenix metropolitan area suggests that while additional reductions in NO\(_2\) levels could potentially decrease O\(_3\) design values, there exists the possibility of concurrent increases in daily mean O\(_3\) levels due to the intricate interplay of diurnal complex O\(_3\) production. In Yuma, where higher HCHO levels prevail, reducing VOC emissions may serve as a viable approach to lowering O\(_3\) concentrations.

4 Conclusion

In this study, our primary objective was to gain a comprehensive understanding of surface O\(_3\) pollution in an arid and semi-arid climate region, with a specific focus on the state of Arizona as a representative case study. To achieve this, we employed WRF-Chem simulations to simulate O\(_3\) and various other gases, examining the month of June within a 5-year period spanning from 2017 to 2021. Our model’s performance was assessed by comparison with surface observations from the EPA AQS and PAMS monitoring networks, as well as a CMAQ reanalysis product. Our analysis primarily focused on three major cities within Arizona: Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma. We calculated statistics for both hourly and MDA8 O\(_3\) concentrations. We also examined additional monthly mean fields, including key meteorological parameters (\(T\), RH, wind) and air pollutants (NO\(_2\), CO, VOCs). Results show that WRF-Chem demonstrated better performance in simulating MDA8 O\(_3\) compared to hourly O\(_3\). The model exhibited a tendency to overestimate nighttime NO\(_2\) levels, resulting in larger biases during the night; the model
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also shows an overestimate of surface NO\textsubscript{2} in Phoenix and an underestimate of NO\textsubscript{2} in Tucson. Among the cities examined, Yuma displayed the highest mean error and a positive bias, whereas Phoenix and Tucson showed closer agreement with observations, featuring smaller errors and negative biases. Furthermore, our evaluation indicated minimal biases in the representation of meteorological parameters. However, for VOCs, the model underestimated their surface concentrations.

O\textsubscript{3} exceedances were also investigated and evaluated at all available AQS monitoring sites in Maricopa County. Our model exhibited strong agreement with site measurements regarding both the magnitude and the number of days on which an O\textsubscript{3} exceedance occurred considering factors such as location, number of days, spatial extent, and spatial variability. The analysis of an O\textsubscript{3} exceedance case beginning on 13 June 2017, along with the back trajectories, suggests that Arizona can also be affected by long-range transport from interstate or continental sources.

To better understand the O\textsubscript{3} formation in this arid and semi-arid region, we examined the correlation between O\textsubscript{3} and other factors influencing O\textsubscript{3} production. In Phoenix, the scatter plots exhibited overall negative correlations between O\textsubscript{3} and CO, NO\textsubscript{2}, and RH, while positive correlations were strongly observed with T and HCHO. These correlations suggest that O\textsubscript{3} levels are higher when NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations are generally lower and HCHO concentrations are higher, indicating that central Phoenix falls within the VOC-limited regime. Additionally, our spatial maps of the FNR confirm that in the most densely populated urban areas, the region predominantly falls within the VOC-limited regime, with FNR less than 1. Moving outward from this area the FNR values increase, indicating a shift to a transitional and NO\textsubscript{x}-limited regime. This analysis significantly contributes to our understanding of O\textsubscript{3} dynamics in arid and semi-arid regions and has implications for air quality management and policy in such environments.

In terms of the uncertainties associated with the approaches in this study, they are largely dependent on the bias and uncertainty inherent in the emissions data used for our model simulations. In the case of anthropogenic emissions, our utilization of NEI2017 data for years other than the reference year introduces potential errors due to variations in emissions over time. This particularly affects the representation of precursor pollutants, notably NO\textsubscript{x}. Moreover, the underestimation of HCHO and other biogenic emissions simulated from MEGAN 2.1 may also contribute to a negative bias in the FNR, leading to the bias in regime determination. Additionally, dust events are particularly common in Arizona, especially in the southwestern region where the Sonora...
Desert is situated. The presence of dust can significantly impact ozone photolysis dynamics by interacting with sunlight. Dust particles can scatter and absorb solar radiation, thereby altering the photolysis rates of ozone molecules in the atmosphere. Consequently, these events may introduce bias to our findings. However, according to Lader et al. (2016) and Ardon-Dryer et al. (2023), dust storm events are most frequent during the monsoon season (in July and August), typically peaking around 18:00–19:00 LT, when photolysis rates are at their lowest. Focusing on the dry summer month of June in this study helps alleviate the bias caused by these dust events.

However, a better performance of the model can be pursued through various strategies. While achieving a higher spatial resolution, such as 1 km, is desirable, it remains constrained by the available computational resources and the resolution of input datasets, for instance, the NEI currently operating at 4 km resolution. A potential remedy involves employing a finer-resolution emission dataset, such as the Neighborhood Emission Mapping Operation (NEMO) proposed by Ma and Tong (2022). Additionally, refining simulations of nighttime chemistry, crucial for accurate predictions, necessitates a more precise estimation of the PBLH, which, if improved, can contribute to reducing the O\textsubscript{3} bias during nocturnal hours. This improvement can be achieved by assimilating PBLH estimates obtained from radiosonde and ceilometer data.

For future work, we aim to continue investigating the contributions of individual sources of O\textsubscript{3} to total O\textsubscript{3} levels. We will adopt a tagging technique developed by Emmons et al. (2012) and Butler et al. (2018). This tagging technique uses the WRF-Chem model with the MOZART gas chemistry mechanism to attribute the sources contributing to tropospheric O\textsubscript{3}. We will focus on the contributions from anthropogenic, fire, and biogenic emissions and also use the model to trace the transport of O\textsubscript{3} and its precursors (NO\textsubscript{x}, VOC) from their source.
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