

Notes from the Oct 18-19 Monitoring Steering Committee Meeting and the Oct. 20 APM
Monitoring Session

Notes recorded by Phil Lorang and Tim Hanley
October 24, 2005

**Action Items (some are as perceived, even if not enumerated as action items during
the meeting)**

Funding

Encourage APMs to let their states know ASAP in at least general terms how they will be affected by the **FY2006 allocation**, especially the 3.5 million re-direction to CASTNET. The concern raised was if one State took most of the hit for a Region.

Pricing factors – AAMG will share our ICR paperwork when it is ready. We will point out how pricing factors have been revised. These can then be discussed in the next meeting if there is interest. We did not agree to re-calculate the FY2006 allocations with revised pricing factors for purposes of seeing what difference it would have made, and we did not reach closure on what factors to use in FY2007.

Share CO, SO₂, etc monitoring cost estimates **from the new ICR**, like we showed for PM₁₀ at the meeting.

Talk seriously to Peter, CAMD, and Jerry S./Kay Holt about FY06 versus FY07 for the **3.5 million for CASTNET**. Peter was clear he thinks CAMD should take the funds in 06 and carry them over, rather than take them in 07. Regions and states may push this issue, however.

Send Dick V the EPA budget request language and/or the **budget enactment language** that keeps EPA from awarding STAG funds to MSO's.

Solve the “**catalog of federal assistance**” language to (1) do better at excluding local health agencies with no real role in air quality planning/regulation and (2) include MSOs.

Investigate with Jerry S, Bill H, and Katherine Moore – can **we get funds to MSOs** by first giving them to the member states, as Region 1-3 do to get funds to MARAMA?

Nudge Pitchford about his process for “**making the IMPROVE program sustainable** in the face of likely budget cuts overall.”

Consider “taking” the **500-600K for NPAP** in FY2007 from 105 generally, rather than from the PAMS states in particular. Could present this as an option for the SC to choose.

General state/local sentiment for holding **FY2007 PM_{2.5} allocations much like FY2006** (but with restoration of the 3.5 million) rather than shifting funds among regions to

accomplish some AAMG-intended or committee-intended evolution of what monitoring gets done.

Region 10 states have already cut back their PM2.5 monitors to what makes sense, and AAMG has reduced the Region 10 allocation in previous years accordingly. If there are overall cuts in FY2007, they can't come out of Region 10 without cutting bone. Other Regions/states still have fat to cut. Updated pricing factors would make it clear that Region 10 has no fat.

Technical Issues that came out during the Meeting:

Have a call to share recent findings/experiences and to get agreement on next steps and longer term direction on **continuous speciation**. Some state people are ready to tell other state people what vendor products are not worth buying. STAPPA agreed to plan this call. AAMG needs to be ready, and to have a recommendation on whether it can be part of a monthly call or is too long for that and should be a separate call.

Continuous Speciation

- Cook county identified that the paper on the pilot is expected by the end of the year.
- Have a S/L call on continuous speciation

Larry Kertcher needs to organize a call on **MARGA evaluation** (cast and objective?).

Joann – How is **ORD** coming on its IG speciation network action items?

George Allen – **NOy samplers** are not giving good data, might as well tell all their owners to turn them off.

Gilroy – asked that we check on IG report on how ORD supports speciation methods.

IMPROVE sites in the East are important parts of the PM2.5 NAAQS infrastructure, not just visibility. So, there really isn't a visibility/attainment tradeoff for those. In the West, they are just for visibility.

QA Issues that came up during the meeting:

Ask Mike Papp – can/should/have we already de-emphasized **QA of CO, SO2, etc** sites showing attainment with a good margin?

Peter T. – Wants to have the option for States to obtain their own “independent” QA.

Concern was raised about how States could pay for independent QA and still call it “independent QA”

PAMS

Have relevant AQSSD and EMAD staff listen to Charlie (NJ) re-present his **PAMS** slides over the phone.

Recommendation for PAMS upper air data to be shared. See NOAA site:
<http://profiler.noaa.gov/npn/profiler.jsp>

Mike G. - States are okay with change; however, they would rather reinvest in other things beyond QA (independent).

Air Toxics and data analysis

Whatever AAMG, George Allen, and Donna Kensky agree on will seemingly get Dick V's support. George and Donna will put time into being “shadow project officers” during work assignment execution. No clear agreement on what to include in the work assignment. Some interest in source oriented analysis. Some interest in developing conceptual, semi-quantitative models of what air toxics communities can expect based on their characteristics (seemingly might work for mobile source pollutants where density or traffic could be a predictive indicator, but not for communities with big point sources).

Discuss – Utility of **nephelometers at NATTS**, given that no other measurements are time-resolved and every day anyway. Would these be more useful at PG sites or PAMS sites? Can we make AT measurements at NATTS more time resolved?

Investigate – Can the aircraft-mounted ASPECT (and similar DOE system) used after Katrina screen a city for non-spill **air toxics hot spots** like the 1,3 butadiene situation found in Louisville?

Air toxics – Dick V wants to re-look at all the available data from a **source orientation**.

Louisville's air toxics monitoring work is a good example of using community monitoring to find and solve a source control problem: 1,3, butadiene from the rubber plants.

New York upset that the most recent Batelle report in **NATTS QA** did not find the Rochester NAATS sites data on AQS even though it was there, and did not acknowledge that the PT samples were in the wrong type of vials for some labs and that this could have affected their ability to get the results to match EPA's values.

Could provide more specificity to the desired source categories on methods development.

Two shadow project officers for AT; Donna K. and George A.

PM data analysis

Neil Frank needs to develop a small group to develop a specific proposal (including at least Rich Poirot, Puget Sound, George Allen, NJ). Overall approach should be to use part of the available funds to get data ready for analysis (account for blanks, adjust STN to be comparable to IMPROVE as best as possible, add uncertainties, and whatever) and part should go to MSOs for states to work collectively on their own data analysis needs. Need closure in one month.

Field trials of next **generation of continuous PM2.5 instruments** – general support for it to get underway, and that it will take STAG funding. Ambiguity on whether this comes at expense of data analysis or of lab services for NH3 denuder analysis. Need to settle within AAMG. Agreed to put on agenda for a monthly call to drum up participants. Tim tried to get S/L side to take responsibility for selecting participants, but I don't think this stuck to them so far.

Gilroy - Cleaning up the speciation data is very good

Dick V. – There's general agreement on the PM methods work. Tell people what were looking for.

Status of the National Monitoring Strategy

Peter T. – Identified that he is fighting a battle internally to gather support for the NMS; he is doing his part to sell the NMS within EPA on its merits, even for things that better benefit the States rather than EPA; he expects the SC members to do the same in gathering support from other states on the NMS.

NMS Document

- Request from Mike G. to see new NMS document.
- Contractor to update to read better, include other programs, edit dates and recent changes that have been agreed to.
- Peter T. – We see the NMS as a living document.

NPRM – Gilroy request for table on all pollutant network requirements.

NPRM – Gilroy concern about provisions for **organizational separation** of “internal” QA functions.

NPRM – What do we say towards defining “**adequate, independent QA audits**” in the rule, preamble, or later guidance? Mixture of support for clarity versus flexibility.

NPRM – Need to clarify **P&A audit and data submission requirements for continuous methods**. (or was it need to correct them?)

NPRM (**Special Purpose Monitors**) – Peter wants us to ask for comment on our belief that the CAA does not allow us to ignore valid data. Peter also seeking ways to get more monitors.

NPRM – Gilroy and APMs supported **good QA for SPMs**, and data submission to AQS.

NPRM – APMs supported proposing requirement for submitting **field blank data** to AQS. S/L committee input was more mixed, but seemed to accept proposal to get wider reactions. George Allen wanted a real field blank, even if at a lesser frequency.

NPRM – Monitoring network changes. APM's agreed that monitoring plan/assessment should "be made **available to the public** for inspection and electronic downloading" without mentioning comment process explicitly. OK to require states to consider other data users, and to consider whether the proposed monitoring network provides adequate ability to characterize air quality in areas with relatively high populations of susceptible persons, but not mentioning **EJ** explicitly.

NPRM – Rules **for automatic approvals** of monitoring removals/moves need to consider the 1992 policy on maintenance plans. It might be necessary to amend the policy to make sense. Need to discuss with Tom Helms & Co.

Conference.

Program committee = at least Zeldon, Dick V, and Gilroy
Professional group (?)
Target monitoring practitioners and data analysts.
Dick V. – wants interaction and not lectures.
De-emphasize keynote address
How is data used?
New methods of monitoring and of data analysis
Technology transfer, new methods, new equipment, presented by agencies who are using it, not just by vendors
Separate day for vendor show-and-tell?
Separate day for classes, e.g., on non-standard samplers, data acquisition, basic data analysis and interpretation and outlier identification
Panel discussion (with audience participation) – good
Should be interactive, chance to have a discussion
Presentations need to be at level of the agency staff planning and doing monitoring, not at the academic AAAR level. Should deal with types of monitoring they might be doing themselves over the next 2 years.
At least 50/50 state & local vs EPA podium time
Poster session – good

Get RPOs to present their relevant work
Include air toxics, NH₃, monitoring to investigate odor complaints
Gilroy – short courses on use of a nephelometer or something else by S/L's.
- could do monitoring in response to odor complaints.
Bruce L. – Recommends session on data acquisition hardware.
Dick V. – Session on NH₃ monitoring. – session on data systems such as VIEWS.
Interact with Paul S. on emerging technologies.

PMcoarse

Probe height issue
State/locals want fewer sites in east, more in west.
Lower the required number of sites in areas that are well below the proposed standard. The minimum number for areas near or above the standard looks about right.
State/locals want opening for RA to adjust minimums based on good evidence of greater or lesser need.

Charter.

Mel Zeldin will do another version. Consensus section should be retitled “Collaboration” and should clarify that it is addressing only the situation in which EPA brings a written proposal and asks for a written reaction. Add requirement for action items from each meeting. Add relationship to larger s/l monitoring committee and community (inform them, bring their input, advocate for committee outcomes). Charter should be signed by Steve Page and Bill Becker.

Other Notes and Points Made

Discuss composition and attitude of the **IMPROVE steering committee** with Pitchford.

Tribal professional to be a member of Steering Committee? – Get advice from Julie McClintock and Annabelle Allison on whether a tribal representative makes sense, and who it could be.

Next Meeting

AAMG has to host the **next NAAMSC meeting**, in January 2006, in Atlanta. Need to pick date and confirm that Region 4 can provide the meeting room. Agenda should emphasize QA and FY2007 funding/direction issues.

It would be useful if the next meeting could be scheduled at a point where we could discuss the 2007 Presidents budget request.

Discussion on Tampa as a site, where Tom Tamanini (not present) could host.