

Minutes of the NARSTO Executive Assembly Meeting

Washington, DC
January 26, 1999

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by NARSTO's Management Coordinator, Jake Hales, who welcomed the attendees and gave a brief overview of the meeting goals and agenda, as well as a presentation on the 1998/1999 "State of NARSTO."

Ron Patterson discussed the NARSTO Charter revision. He outlined the following eleven points of importance that have been incorporated into the Charter:

1. The revision should be considered an amendment, as opposed to a replacement, of the original version.
2. It incorporates language to reflect PM research and provides increased operational flexibility.
3. It categorizes duties of the Executive Steering Committee in more specific terms.
4. It eliminates the Liaison Teams.
5. It removes the prohibition on membership assessments and places any such assessments under direct control of the Executive Assembly.
6. It specifically states the formal procedure for allocation of NARSTO infrastructure funds.
7. It changes the term "Analysis and Assessment Team" to "Integrated Analysis and Assessment Team".
8. It changes "Science Advisory Council" to "Science Review Council".
9. It changes "Quality Systems and Data Management Conceptual Unit" to the "Quality Systems Science Center, an Operational Unit".
10. It documents NARSTO policy on "Termination and Restoration" of Sponsoring Partner Membership.
11. It documents policy on "Legal Relations and intellectual Property Rights".

General discussion followed on the best method to distribute the revision. The question was raised: "Is it sufficient to send a copy of the revision or is it necessary to have signatures returned?" General consensus was reached that signatures will be requested with a "by" date. Agreement to the revised Charter will be assumed unless other notification is given.

Jake Hales expressed thanks to all the members who took the time to make comments on the Charter Revisions.

Ken Schere reported on the Assessment Document status. Twenty-four manuscripts have been submitted to *Atmospheric Environment*; about half of which have been

accepted for publication. The remaining papers are in various stages of review and revision.

The draft of the NARSTO assessment report was released for review by the National Academy of Sciences and the Executive Assembly in December 1998. Publication is expected in October of 1999.

Discussion of the document followed with several issues being addressed. In particular, concern was expressed about the timeliness of the science being used in the document as well as about how often such a document should be produced. John Bachmann suggested a summary of the document "that is digestible" and expressed concern that the production, by NARSTO, of valuable information may not be recognized. Several attendees expressed the desire to see research done on a continuing basis with use of the most current data available, recognizing that it requires a substantial expenditure of time and money.

Susan Weirman asked if there was a time limit on comments about the document. Ken Schere responded that comments about the document needed to be addressed within the next three months - the time requirement for the NAS review.

Susan Wierman articulated several of her thoughts on the current draft. In particular, she feels that Section 5, addressing "accountability," needs to be upgraded substantially. The concept is good, but the current description does not adequately reflect existing published work in this area, and is superficial in nature. Jake expressed his feeling that the current draft needs a conclusions section to draw a "bottom line" on the document and to assemble and summarize the key, salient points made throughout the text. He requested guidance from the EA on this point. The group generally agreed that a well written conclusions section would improve the document.

Adrian Fernandez Bremauntz reported on a ten-year project recently completed in Mexico and the establishment of a Mexican National Environmental Research Program. Their results are available on their web page. He is looking forward to cooperation with NARSTO in the future.

After a short break, Steve Cadle presented a design preview of the NARSTO Aerosol Workshop being conducted January 27-29.

Briefings were given on major upcoming activities. Peter Mueller described work being done under the NARSTO Model Evaluation Initiative. After lunch, Russ Philbrick described his program to study the occurrence of ozone and fine particles in the Northeastern USA. Ellis Cowling gave a brief on SOS Nashville '99 as well as other SOS activities. Cyril Durrenberger described plans for an ozone/fine-particle study, which is scheduled for Southeastern Texas in 2000. Karen Magliano reported on the California Regional Particulate Matter Regional Air-Quality Study (CRPAQS). Detailed

plans are available on their Web site: <http://sparc2.baaqmd.gov/centralca>. Robert Wendoll provided an overview and update on the Reactivity Research Working Group (RRWG) and mentioned that the initial reports will be finalized this spring. Next meetings of the RRWG are March 24/25, 1999 and June 9/10, 1999. Jim Vickery described plans for the EPA Fine-Particle Supersites and some of the proposed locations for these sites. He also expressed the need for help on planning for the sites and suggested that NARSTO might be an organization that could help in this area.

Michelle Broido introduced the new Executive Steering Committee Public Sector Co-Chair, Don McKay, and the Private-Sector Co-Chair - Elect, Howard Feldman.

Don McKay expressed thanks to outgoing Co-Chair Michelle Broido for her leadership and service to NARSTO. He presented Michelle with a plaque from NARSTO in recognition of her work as the public sector co-chair.

Chairman McKay presented some thoughts on the NARSTO vision and some guiding principles for NARSTO's future thrusts:

1. NARSTO is a tri-national organization.
2. We need to marry the ozone agenda with the PM agenda.
3. Members need to take ownership of the organization.
4. We need to work hard at communicating and getting relevant information out.
5. We need to utilize limited resources to their fullest.

He also articulated his desire for an open-door policy during his chairmanship period. He encouraged any and all interested persons to contact him personally when desired. He also stated his intention to visit member organizations and NARSTO activity sites frequently.

Jake Hales summarized the spending history and current status of the NARSTO infrastructure funding pool, and requested guidance from the Executive Assembly regarding soliciting future funds. Owing to the nature of the infrastructure pool, needs for its funds are often difficult to predict. Currently the pool is solvent, but future needs are likely to deplete it quickly. Peter Mueller moved to solicit funds, on a voluntary basis, by a request letter to the executive membership in a manner similar to that of the previous year. The motion was seconded and carried. The management coordinator will send a letter to supporters to that effect.

Steve Cadle provided an overview on the membership designation of NARSTO Executive Steering Committee (ESC) and showed lists of the current members. He also asked for any guidance the EA had for the ESC and management coordinators. He will make appropriate updates to this list and distribute it to the ESC for confirmation.

Jim Vickery opened discussion on NARSTO's participation in the Supersite planning. Jake Hales expressed concern about the Federal Advisory Committee Act and avoiding associated problems in this context. Jim said the role NARSTO would play is the same as their role now. Terry Keating expressed concern that there might be an impression that there is a conflict of interest. Other participants expressed the same concerns. Jim explained that there is written guidance, which can be given to prospective members of the committee, to avoid this problem. Agreement was reached that EA will set up a committee to help the coordination committee for the Supersite. Directives to the ESC for a timeline were that the monthly conference call would set this committee in motion within the next couple of calls.

A general discussion followed regarding future NARSTO assessments. How often? How extensive? What kind of review process? How to fund? Continual assessment or every 5 years? Assessment tied with workshops?

Peter Mueller moved that the ESC be encouraged or directed to perform assessments on a continuous basis within the NARSTO community. Susan Weirman questioned: "Is the motion to investigate the feasibility of doing this or is the motion to *do* this?"

Don McKay pointed out that we undertook the current Ozone Assessment for a specific purpose. We haven't had time to see if we have accomplished what we set out to do. What was the intent? Did it meet the intent? Are there different mechanisms? We should step back and assess the cost benefit of the product.

Jake Hales questioned whether a formal directive or motion is necessary to move forward with the "progressive assessment" concept? Peter agreed and withdrew his motion.

Jim Vickery withdrew his second. He also expressed agreement that workshops and assessment updates are valuable because they help institutions in their planning processes. Ken Schere concurred that regular workshops and meetings are good vehicles to update the scientific community without giving the full 'blessing' or endorsement of more rigorous researches.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.