

**Appendix II – c. Summary of interview responses to Charge Question #1**

<b>1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.</b>			
<b>Comments</b>			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
<b>Current</b>		<b>Past</b>	
<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>
	<p>Membership is useful on a personal basis to help with contacts and topical speakers.</p> <p>Membership provides insights/alerts to meetings of relevance.</p> <p>Membership presents opportunities to input directly into timely and relevant topics.</p> <p>Inventory assessment put attention on Inventories, if not more money.</p> <p>Inventory Assessment may be useful, jury is still out?</p>	<p>Influenced the weight-of-evidence approach which was good.</p>	<p>Place to meet numerous individuals who are beneficial to your work.</p> <p>NARSTO 1995 NE field study and assessment were useful.</p> <p>Model inter-comparison was useful.</p> <p>Helps to insure more Canadian/US/Mexican discussion.</p> <p>Makes people more aware of what is happening in other countries.</p> <p>Ozone document was also helpful.</p> <p>Model inter-comparison was useful.</p>
	<p>NARSTO provides an important service to NOAA by opening opportunities to collaborate with top researchers in other institutions and promoting links to the private sector and to academic research communities in Canada and Mexico that would not otherwise be available.</p>		<p>The various NARSTO Assessments have been especially valuable, crown jewels, of this unique collaboration in communicating with our management and alerting them to issues of current and emerging importance.</p> <p>NARSTO has been valuable to NOAA in planning and conducting our research and coordinating research agendas with many disparate and complementary NARSTO</p>

<b>1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.</b>			
<b>Comments</b>			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
<b>Current</b>		<b>Past</b>	
<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>
			members
	Emissions inventory and multi-pollutant effects assessment outcomes are not as clear as earlier assessments with respect to consequences.	Domestic Environment Canada assessments have relied on NARSTO work in particular with respect to acid rain.	Outcomes of NARSTO assessments are fairly effectively communicated to senior management.  The Canada-U.S. Air Quality Committee used conclusions from NARSTO PM and O3 assessments which influenced U.S./Canada decisions to negotiate on ozone and PM.
	The new NARSTO needs to think outside the CAA box.		NARSTO's value is not in producing data but in organizing it and presenting it.  NARSTO has been useful in addressing requirements of the U.S. Clean Air Act. NARSTO has dealt with episodic O3 and PM events.
		The caliber of people involved in the NARSTO process is very high.	The value of NARSTO is high based on casual reactions by NAS Committee participants. NARSTO reports have been used by the committee and relied upon to a certain extent.
The data archive still exists and has value to the general air quality community.	As OTAG ended, and subsequent policy decisions were made, NARSTO focus shifted to other timely AQ topics e.g. PM, Reactivity, Emissions Inventory, multi-pollutant management. Fewer field studies are being conducted and the Assessments seemed to become	Most of the standing committees stopped functioning.	Initially, NARSTO was exclusively focused on ozone. It flowed from OTAG and had a similar structure, including: collaborative studies; an archival site for data, reports and assessments; and a number of productive standing working committees.

1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.			
Comments			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
Current		Past	
Quality	Value	Quality	Value
	<p>somewhat less policy-driven.</p> <p>Private sector participation and support has declined substantially, as industry decisions have become less science-driven, and more policy-driven, and almost entirely focused on the short-term “bottom line”.</p> <p>Private sector interest in NARSTO is currently more focused on the question of whether Government takes NARSTO Assessments seriously, and if so, than Industry remains interested. Industry research is increasingly viewed as “tainted” or of suspect credibility.</p> <p>The NARSTO Reactivity and Emissions Inventory reports have also been useful. However, NARSTO Ozone and PM Assessments did not appear to have much influence on recent NAAQS reviews for Ozone and PM, as these are conducted under a separate EPA staff / CASAC review process.</p>		<p>NARSTO field studies and data analyses – especially in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic and Southeast – did have some beneficial influence on the OTAG process and outcome.</p> <p>The NARSTO Reactivity and Emissions Inventory reports have also been useful.</p> <p>However, NARSTO Ozone and PM Assessments <b><u>did not appear to have much influence</u></b> on recent NAAQS reviews for Ozone and PM, as these are conducted under a separate EPA staff / CASAC review process.</p>
High quality Emissions inventories are important.	<p>Currently not much interest in multi-pollutant accountability.</p> <p>DOE has moved on from air quality to aerosols and climate change and therefore</p>	NARSTO has produced quality products, has quality personnel and has	DOE has been active in participating in NARSTO and is pleased with the resulting products, e.g. ozone and PM 2.5. Both of these issues were in the mission of DOE at the time.

<b>1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.</b>			
<b>Comments</b>			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
<b>Current</b>		<b>Past</b>	
<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>
	has less intrinsic interest in NARSTO's products.  Most recent products e.g. multi-pollutants and human health implications not as relevant to D.O.E.	managed its' activities very well.	
			The Ozone assessment and related work on Reactivity was especially useful.  The PM assessment also provided a good comprehensive review of the issue. NARSTO products have likely been of at least as much value to the regulatory sections of EPA as they have to the research side.
			Emissions inventory assessment was very useful. The emissions inventory action plan action plan was very useful. Group in Mexico was good. They used the action plan and it helped with budget requests.
		NARSTO requires QA documentation and data format planning before you can add your data. From the site you can obtain both data and meta-data reports.	From a quality systems science centered perspective, the most important product is the data archive. The largest amount of data in the archive is the EPA supersite data, for which there is currently no alternative repository.
	I was very supportive of NARSTO getting into the multi-pollutant initiative.		Historically we used NARSTO as means for exploring issues as most agencies do not have

1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.			
Comments			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
Current		Past	
Quality	Value	Quality	Value
	We are using preliminary results from this work, even as the final report is still in progress.		<p>the same or comparable level of experience that NARSTO was able to draw on.</p> <p>Through membership in NARSTO, member and participating agencies could obtain results that would have likely cost millions to acquire through other more traditional means, e.g. the National Academy of Sciences.</p> <p>The NARSTO reports were used to help the decision makers decide what to do.</p>
	NARSTO data management has been exemplary. Another example of excellent collaboration is the work of the reactivity working group.		<p>NARSTO has played a very significant role with respect to the understanding of air quality issues in Canada. The products are timely, relevant and credible for public policy formulation and acceptance.</p> <p>NARSTO products have clearly enriched Canadian science.</p> <p>The ozone and PM work were very instrumental in Canadian policy formulation and promotion. The products clearly enumerated the local, regional and international dimensions of the issues.</p>
	For the most recent assessment, I am not sure how useful the product will be. NARSTO has moved away from science		The value depends on the product. For PM, Ozone and Emissions inventories the NARSTO products were important reference

1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.			
Comments			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
Current		Past	
Quality	Value	Quality	Value
	<p>to policy, therefore less</p> <p>Not clear that the archive is relevant any longer. At one time, EPA and DOE required data to be archived with NARSTO but this is no longer the case.</p> <p>GEOSS on the other hand is working toward integrated, interoperable information systems. NARSTO could have played an important role in this, but not if the requirement is to have all data in the NARSTO format. This is old school thinking. Distributed archives, where data is shared and available in its native format, is the way data should be handled. There is little incentive to put data in the NARSTO archive now. for EPA</p> <p>The current product will likely not be as useful as the PM and Ozone products. No confidence in how the multi-pollutant assessment will contribute or how NARSTO can contribute in the future.</p> <p>Unlike the NEI /NRC, to which EPA refers frequently and to which EPA management will pay attention,</p>		<p>documents for EPA, not the sole reference documents for rule making, but still important. This was especially true for emissions inventories in particular.</p> <p>The Data base management concept was good originally and there was lots of buy-in. How it has played out in practice has not been as good. The group brought in to implement the archive was more interested in QA/QC than in accommodating the easy entry of data into the archive.</p> <p>The assessment products, e.g. ozone and PM were useful.</p> <p>The Ozone assessment was done to respond to questions that had been raised about the US government work. The PM work brought together various disciplines.</p> <p>NARSTO is somewhat unique in that it does cover the transboundary aspects and it could be useful to build on this. However the transboundary aspects of the NARSTO assessments have not been used by EPA. NARSTO assessments that were useful pulled together a lot of information in one place. The timing of the consolidation was helpful as a reference.</p>

<b>1) Assess the quality and value to its constituencies of past and current NARSTO activities.</b>			
<b>Comments</b>			
Each row below corresponds to the comments of a particular interviewee whose names have been redacted.			
<b>Current</b>		<b>Past</b>	
<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Value</b>
	NARSTO is not used much by EPA now.		
			<p>The very comprehensive NARSTO assessments have been relied on from time to time to aid in the formulation of policies and practices.</p> <p>The opportunity to interact with Mexican and Canadian colleagues was another very valuable dimension of the NARSTO partnership</p>