

Appendix II – g. Summary of interview responses to Charge #4b
<p>5) What changes or improvements are needed to increase NARSTO’s value? Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted</p>
<p>Changes/Improvements</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be necessary to emphasize Climate Change for future dollars. • Climate will be part of the research/activities of MARAMA members in the near future. • Something once a year is good. Not much contact with the data people. • Make funding more fundamental. • Data archive is useful, keep it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARSTO would clearly benefit from a more stable base funding structure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making NARSTO a more balanced group with representatives of governments, NGOs and industry from all three countries would increase the organization’s influence. • Ideally, the addition of NGOs and industry from Canada and Mexico would be a good addition to the organization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARSTO needs to tell the NARSTO story – in Journals, trade journals etc. Even EPA has a blog. Bob Cassell, (communications ORD, EPA) can give good advice, get stories out. Launch communities of practice – often communities of practice are cross disciplinary – to develop an issue before a NARSTO assessment. Set up best practice “WIKI’s”. • Look for media opportunities – newsworthy – human interest issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look more at implementation and applied issues. • Stove piping and single pollutant focus need to be reconsidered. • Ozone standard setting. Background ozone level challenge vs. lower standards, whether there is no threshold for adverse effects/margin of safety. • How to make choices and implement? •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally NARSTO should be fully funded by government. API has a policy against lobbying for funding for specific activities, although exceptions may be possible as part of a larger coalition effort to advocate a major future initiative or paradigm shift • There is a need to clearly identify and sort out the most important (policy-relevant) future health, environmental and air quality science questions. • Can health and atmospheric science be better integrated? Is there any possibility that NARSTO might form a partnership or

Appendix II – g. Summary of interview responses to Charge #4b
<p>5) What changes or improvements are needed to increase NARSTO’s value? Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted</p>
<p>Changes/Improvements</p>
<p>merge with an organization like HEI? HEI is very “academic”, with little possibility of influence by industry</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that future NARSTO support, funds, should come from ORD and OAQPS – not just the Exposure Lab (Directors budget). NARSTO clearly has value to air quality management activities at OAQPS as well as to ORD research. OAQPS may also have resources and would be helpful in focusing research on practical policy-relevant areas. • It would be useful to get more active participation, and possibly funding, from Canadian and Mexican counterparts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More representatives from Canada and Mexico. Do not know how to do it. Only her from Mexico and one person from Canada. Need more involvement. Probably related to the funding mechanism. • Put membership in NARSTO in specific job specifications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop other QA/QC formats for other data sets. Another way to do this is to actively pursue other data that have been identified as being valuable. This is a very labor intensive activity for NARSTO. • Data related to modeling activities and inter-comparisons could be archived. The models evolve so quickly that it is very hard to keep up. To be useful in the future, models must be carefully and accurately coded/identified and the archived outputs/model runs/results carefully and precisely linked to the correct model version.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a funding mechanism attached as an annex to the agreement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historically, the ORD front office has provided NARSTO core funding but an alternative to consider is for NARSTO to support a priority that has been identified, and to therefore get funding to respond to a specific priority requirement. • Institutional commitment: The people sitting at the table need to be at a high level and have buy-in/shared vision for what NARSTO will be used for. EPA has not asked this question of itself. • Choosing products of a scientific and/or technical nature, avoiding policy contexts and managing the overall process so that it is both transparent and more consistent. • The reactivity working group is a good example of what NARSTO can do. This has been a forum that has been valuable, where the EPA had science questions and both industry and government needed more comfort with the issues. NARSTO provided a place for both the public and private sectors to get together and EPA funded this. Industry also funded it. Really solid work was done. RWG was actually formed outside of NARSTO but then NARSTO gave it a home and rules with which to operate. However, the policy guidance that is now being prepared in the forum is not useful.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARSTO needs to try harder to get other entities to provide support. Perhaps the NARSTO Executive Coordinator should go after funding, to engage other stakeholders and get more fiscal participation. In the past DOE has funded, so people did

Appendix II – g. Summary of interview responses to Charge #4b
5) What changes or improvements are needed to increase NARSTO’s value? Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted
Changes/Improvements
not look at other possibilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The NARSTO Executive Coordinator job should be broadened to go after funding sources on a bigger scale.• NARSTO needs to get some new people involved. Most of the people have been there for a long time. If we make some changes we need some new people to get new ideas and new directions. Maybe we need to involve other people within our institutions.