

**Appendix III-b10. Responses to question # 19 of the questionnaire**

**19. Provide any additional comments or criticisms for consideration by the NARSTO Review Panel.**

**Responder Comment(s)  
Number**

Q # 7 It is very important for NARSTO to continually involve new people in their activities. The workshops that I've been aware of tend to be small groups of "old boys" who are very comfortable with certain approaches. It would be good to widen the participation to include more young people, perhaps university students, etc.

Q # 22 There are many organizations working at many levels of partnership and coordination addressing air quality science issues in North America - none with NARSTO's unique comprehensive cross-cutting, international approach. NARSTO is a highly respected science body, that has no trouble bringing the best names in air quality science to its assessments and forums. With little direct funding it is able to accomplish a great deal that would not be done otherwise, or would cost immense sums.

Q # 23 Keep up and expand the good work !

Q # 24 NARSTO fills a unique niche in attempting to promote private-public partnerships across the 3 nations, and synthesizing current air quality science issues at a level consumable by the air quality management community. NARSTO is a bridge between peer reviewed journals and the very large thematic messages provided by the National Academy of Sciences. We should value that contribution.

Q # 25 It will be necessary to link the next round of studies to climate change, since that will be the primary emphasis of most funding sources, but is critical to maintain a focus on criteria pollutants, since their near-term impacts on public health are well demonstrated to be unacceptable and will only be exacerbated by the long-term effects of climate change. Perhaps the overriding question is how to keep making expeditious progress toward meeting health standards for PM and ozone (and other pollutants) while addressing climate change.

Q # 29 If NARSTO folds there will be a large void in the atmospheric science community. NARSTO is needed to bring governments industry any academics together to work on the three country atmospheric issues.

Q # 31 I have been very happy in my past association with NARSTO and its individual members

Q # 34 It is important to determine at short, medium an large time periods which will be products that Narsto shuld be generate in order to improve the air quality.

Q # 35 I think Narsto should be maintained as an organization. It is the only tri-national organization, to my knowledge, that is well equipped to do unbiased scientific studies related to air issues. Future air issues need participation from many countries. Narsto is a perfect model for other countries as well. To dissolve Narsto at this stage will be a loss given its past success.

Q # 42 Despite paying lip service to the importance of archiving data, too many Principle Investigators and organizations do not follow through. The result is that data are not available for use by researchers in the future.

Q # 46 In my opinion, it would be best to steer clear of global climate issues and health effects research.

Q # 50 While high confidence in NARSTO's coordinator is essential and currently well-placed, the public and the private sector chair persons should be obliged to exercise more proactive leadership than has been exhibited for a number of years. Question 5 forcing rankings seems to be inane. Even the labeling seems ambiguous. There are numerous examples. What is the difference between reports and assessments, or reports and workshops, i.e., reports of what? The assessments are reports so I ranked them high. I ranked reports low because I don't know what's intended. Several of the items have equal value. Also how would one interpret the meaning of a ranking. The value of the concept for the model inter-comparison is huge and a really serious effort was made by many competent groups in the US and Canada. Getting it implemented and completed was frustrating so I ranked it on the low end. But that situation is inimical of factors influencing the modeling community that in this case NARSTO executives could not overcome. It's not clear what's meant by measurement methodologies. There has been sharing of hardware across field studies. There have been enlightening and influential evaluations of observational methods in Fresno, Atlanta, etc., that deserve a ranking among the top. But also they were not strictly nor officially NARSTO. But it was the networking and supersite program initially enabled by NARSTO that stimulated and encouraged the extraordinary confluence. What's really important for preserving the value of NARSTO accomplishments into the future is to find the resources and means to create indices of all of the assessment reports. They all represent an extraordinary peer group accomplishment and distillation of knowledge and understanding at the time they were created that does not need to be relearned. Anyone seeking information and enlightenment on specific topics needs an index to find what was laid out in these unique text books that should also serve teaching in academia and enlightenment for consultants. Perhaps persuading the Google company is one way to accomplish this highly important chore. PS: A similar effort is needed for the 4 volume NAPAP [National Acid Precipitation Program] report.

Q # 51 NARSTO has played an important role in facilitating the interactions and collaborations among the three North American countries. The assessment reports have been very useful as references, esp. for the Mexican investigators. Other services provided by NARSTO, e.g., data archiving, symposiums, etc. are useful for the scientific community.

Q # 52 NARSTO should provide clear added-value for members to want to consider participating. Need to increase funding base, including private sector members. This may not be a good economic climate though for expansion.

Q # 54 Excellent organization, extremely valuable. It should continue!