

**Environmental Chemistry**  
**Written Response 5**  
**Due Tuesday, October 20, 2009** (at the start of class)

Texts: Baird and Cann (**BC**) Chapter 5, pp. 175-194 (top)  
Spiro, Purvis-Roberts, and Stigliani (**SPS**) Chapter 5, Section 5.2

- As before, please identify strengths (what was clear, interesting, and/or intriguing?), weaknesses (what was unclear, boring, or missing?), and additional comments or questions. You may write neatly on this page (front and back) or type your comments separately. Please provide some specifics.
- As you will see, the coverage of our two textbooks is not exactly an apples-to-apples comparison. **SPS** covers in Chapter 5 what **BC** covers in both Chapters 3 and 5. **SPS**'s coverage of mechanistic tropospheric chemistry is therefore a lot terser than **BC**'s. Does **SPS**'s abbreviated coverage work? Is **BC**'s coverage (and my lectures for the next several classes!) belabored? You be the judge!
- I really like how I was able to bring your written responses into my lectures on stratospheric ozone depletion. I think that was more productive than trying to talk about the material. (Some topics and texts just don't lend themselves to discussion.) I plan on using what you write for this assignment as departure points for lecture as well, although your comments may not start impacting classes until after Fall Break.