

Funding of Ambient Monitoring 2006-2008
Network Changes in 2007, Including Precursor Gas Monitors, PAMS
Phil Lorang
October 18, 2005

Session Purpose

We need to get Steering Committee input on a number of direction issues at this meeting and the next, so that EPA can draft the FY2007 Grant and Technical Guidance Document.

What You Need to Know About OAQPS Thinking At This Point in Time

We need to establish a backbone network of NCore Level 2 multi-pollutant monitoring sites in both rural and urban areas. We've started on that with FY2005 and FY2006 funding, and we intend to propose a requirement for such sites in December 2005. We're open about exactly how many sites, where, and what measurements to fund and to require.

We should get continuous PM_{2.5} methods approved as equivalent. We will be proposing changes in the equivalency criteria and approval process to make this happen faster where the science is behind it. That should allow reduction in filter-based sampler deployment.

We have recommended that Regional Office discontinue funding for about 50 PM_{2.5} speciation sites in the period funded with FY2006 funds. We are open minded about what happens next.

The carbon sampling and lab analysis in the urban speciation program and the IMPROVE program will be brought into better alignment, by putting IMPROVE-type samplers at urban speciation sites. Also, shipping costs can be reduced by using lighter shipping containers, possibly with some effect on temperature maintenance.

Data that comes from all the monitoring networks must be used for best value. We have to work together to figure out what needs to be done and how to get it done. At present, the monitoring networks most on the table for discussion of data analysis are PAMS, NATTS, and PM_{2.5}.

All monitoring programs should be responsible for an independent demonstration of data quality, through independent audits. We're firm on believing the STAG budget should pay for "it". We're open on exactly what "it" is and who does it. This is not about EPA taking state funds to do exactly what EPA has been doing.

We need to think ahead to PMcoarse, assuming EPA proposes a new NAAQS and that the PM₁₀ NAAQS fades away. The FY2007 budget request has already moved forward without taking this into consideration.

Specific Questions/Issues for Discussion

1. Should the historical PAMS allocation among Regions be reviewed with an eye to equalizing the level of support for "truly necessary" PAMS sites, with the remainder of the funds for discretionary PAMS sites also re-distributed based on some fresh indicator of need/benefit?

2. Will a portion of the 105 funds traditionally allocated to PAMS monitoring be de-linked from PAMS? How much?

If so, how much of the formerly-PAMS funds will be earmarked for collaboratively planned regional/national scale data analysis of NAAQS gases, including PAMS?

How much of the formerly-PAMS funds will be earmarked for QA of NAAQS gases?

If there is formerly-PAMS funding not earmarked in these two ways, how should it be distributed among Regional Offices and/or states, and what should be said about the objectives it should be used to support?

3. When the 3.5 million is put back into state/local operations, should it be put back in the same regional pattern as it was taken out?

4. Should the distribution of PM2.5 103 funds among regions be temporarily frozen, or evolved based on anticipated/desired shifts in monitoring activities?

If there is evolution, should more, the same, or less of PM2.5 103 funds be spent on capital investment in additional precursor gases/NCORE Level 2 sites than in FY2006? Where?

If there is evolution, should more, the same, or less be spent on FRM's, PM2.5 speciation, and continuous monitors as in FY2006? Where?

Should "pricing factors" for PM2.5 activities be changed?

Should funds be invested in more continuous speciation equipment?

5. In what order should PM2.5 speciation sites be re-equipped with IMPROVE-style carbon samplers? What funding can/should be used? Only the savings from more economical shipping? Other funds also?

6. What about funding to create a new PMcoarse network?

Separate session on technical aspects of this on Wednesday morning.