

Appendix III-b7. Responses to question #16 of the questionnaire

16. Any comments regarding your response to Question #15:

15. Did the broadening of NARSTO's focus away from a sole emphasis on tropospheric ozone change your support of NARSTO?

**Responder Comment(s)
Number**

Q # 7 Wider focus is appropriate given that ozone is not the only air issue.

Q # 9 No.

Q # 14 Concentrating solely on ozone was, in retrospect, somewhat myopic. Besides being an important criteria pollutant itself, ozone has been used tacitly as a surrogate for the general health of the atmosphere. Expanding NARSTO's scope was a healthful modification which acknowledged the importance of other pollutants.

Q # 16 Yes, because the air quality and climate mitigation programs need a “whole atmosphere” scientific foundation.

Q # 18 I think there was more “enthusiasm” for NARSTO activities in its early years, with a specific focus on tropospheric ozone. However, I think the relative loss of enthusiasm in more recent years is not so much due to a dilution of focus as to a reduction of “urgency” in the science topics being addressed. With ozone, there was a clear potential to influence the OTAG process. With PM, it is less clear whether the NARSTO assessment really influenced (or could influence) policy (at least in the US - maybe not so in Canada or Mexico). The emission inventory work is very useful, but will have more of a long-term payoff and is not so “urgent”.

Q # 19 The key problem is when NARSTO wants to broaden outside it's core competency and constituency. While many of the same scientists, regulators, etc. are the same for ozone and PM, there are whole different communities for health, mercury, and climate.

Q # 22 It extended and broadened the interest in and support for NARSTO by EPA. It provided the latitude for EPA to put forward difficult air quality management issues beyond tropospheric ozone to be assessed by the combined public and private North American science community.

Q # 23 None. See response to #13 part 3.

Q # 24 The early focus on ozone and extension beyond is logical and needed. Not to do so would be a severe constraint on performing any modern day science assessment.

Q # 25 The current approach favored by EPA and most states is a multi-pollutant approach that addresses several pollutants.

Q # 28 Increased importance.

Q # 29 I felt that it helped NARSTO. The atmosphere can not be examined one pollutant at a time. It must be examined as a multi-pollutant issue.

Q # 31 The interlinking of air quality issues means that NARSTO was very wise to broaden its focus.

Q # 33 That was a highly desirable move.

Q # 34 The ozone is an indicator of a complex air pollution process, However particles and VOCs are important to understand sources and behaviour and consequently control of different pollutants

Q # 35 My support to Narsto is based on my belief that this is the only organization that can do an objective assessment that will have credibility amongst most stake holders if not all.

Q # 38 Many of the AQ issues (e.g., ozone and PM) and climate change are linked. Therefore, a strategic broadening to include linked issues makes sense and improves the program.

Q # 39 This encourages the participation of researchers from other areas (particles, VOCs).

Q # 40 It increased my interest and support in NARSTO. Important air quality issues transcend the tropospheric ozone issue.

Q # 45 This is a necessary evolution and needs to continue as alluded to in my responses in question #14.

Q # 46 Our specific interest relates to the impact of anthropogenic VOC emissions on air quality. As NARSTO has moved further away from its original focus on ozone, we have become more involved in alternative research venues that better address our specific interest.

Q # 52 Tropospheric O₃ was a good initial focus. NARSTO should not get too diluted across many issues though. For example; suggest staying away from global climate issue; too many other groups trying to coordinate that one. Focus on issues most pressing to reaching AQ standards in North America.

Q # 54 NARSTO has remained relevant and valuable. It keeps increasing the value of NYSERDA's participation.