

**Summary Minutes of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC)
Ambient Air Monitoring & Methods Subcommittee (AAMMS)
Public Meeting on February 24-25, 2010
SAB Staff Office Conference Center, Washington, DC**

Panel Members: Dr. Armistead (Ted) Russell, Chair
Mr. George Allen
Dr. Judith Chow
Mr. Bart Croes (by phone)
Dr. Kenneth Demerjian
Dr. Delbert Eatough
Mr. Henry (Dirk) Felton
Dr. Philip Hopke (February 24th only)
Dr. Rudolf Husar
Dr. Kazuhiko Ito
Mr. Richard L. Poirot
Dr. Jay Turner
Dr. Warren H. White
Dr. Yousheng Zeng

Unable to Attend: Dr. Donna Kenski
Dr. Thomas Lumley
Dr. Kimberly Prather
Dr. Barbara Zielinska

SAB Staff: Ms. Kyndall Barry
Dr. Vanessa Vu

EPA Staff: Tim Hanley and Lewis Weinstock

Public Participants: Marc Pitchford, NOAA; Tom Moore, PM Panelist; John Jansen, Southern Co.; Aaron Flynn, Hunton & Williams

Purpose: To provide advice on options for an urban visibility indicator, and methods and equipment for its direct measurement as presented in the Agency white paper.

Attachments:

The meeting agenda, charge questions, presentations, public comments and preliminary review comments from the panel members may be found on the meeting website:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/MeetingCal/AF61937FAEC78DB3852576B000522F58?OpenDocument>.

Meeting Summary

The discussion followed the issues and general timing as presented in the agenda posted at the above-stated URL.

Wednesday, February 24, 2010

Ms. Kyndall Barry convened the meeting and explained that the CASAC AAMMS will operate under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). She also announced that there would be a conference call on March 26, 2010, for the CASAC to review and approve the Subcommittee's letter to the EPA Administrator concerning the proposed urban visibility indicator. Dr. Vanessa Vu thanked the Subcommittee for their hard work and EPA staff for their participation. Dr. Armistead (Ted) Russell commended EPA staff on the timing of soliciting advice on the monitoring issues related to an urban visibility indicator as the PM NAAQS review is on-going. Dr. Russell then reviewed the agenda, stated the purpose of the AAMMS meeting was to develop a consensus report of advice and recommendations to the Agency, and the members of the Subcommittee were introduced.

Mr. Lewis Weinstock of EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) introduced Mr. Tim Hanley (OAQPS) and Dr. March Pitchford (NOAA) and thanked the Subcommittee for their service to the Agency. In his introductory presentation, Mr. Weinstock described the NAAQS review process. In the current PM review, EPA is considering a secondary standard to protect against visibility based welfare effects, which is the purpose of the meeting with AAMMS. Mr. Weinstock discussed future meetings with AAMMS to discuss a new Federal Reference Method (FRM) for lead measurements and issues on near-roadway monitoring related to the proposed NO₂ rule. Mr. Tim Hanley and Dr. Marc Pitchford walked the Panel through the presentation entitled, "PM Light Extinction Monitoring for a Possible Secondary PM NAAQS Based on Visibility-Related Welfare Effects." They previewed the proposals for direct measurement of light extinction as a new urban visibility indicator for the PM NAAQS. It was noted that EPA is also considering a mass-concentration indicator. The Panel engaged EPA staff in discussions of the monitoring goal and advantages and disadvantages in the different measurement approaches. Some members questioned the exclusion of climate in the secondary NAAQS review process. Members sought clarification on the Agency's definition of daylight, the light extinction goal versus light pollution, and haze.

Dr. Russell led the Subcommittee through a discussion of the charge questions. Members voiced support for the feasibility of the urban visibility indicator based on the current technology and promising instruments on the horizon. Smart heaters and inlet dryers were two solutions offered to address impacts of relative humidity on measurements. AAMMS cautioned the Agency not be overly prescriptive in setting performance standards for instruments in the early stage of rulemaking: doing so would potentially prohibit the Agency from capitalizing on advancing technology and development of future instruments. Members also felt performance-based standards would maximize vendor innovation in instrument development, but would need to be tailored to the specific measurement approach (e.g., b_{scat} , b_{abs} , b_{ext} , etc.).

There was overwhelming support to deploy a pilot, light-extinction monitoring network. Discussions of monitor citing identified benefits in collocating light extinction monitors with NCore sites and PM mass and speciation monitors for their proximity to urban environments and "hot spots." AAMMS further recommended the use of existing PM_{2.5} monitoring data as an interim approach to assess fine-mode visibility until such time that data from light-extinction measurements are available.

Thursday, February 25, 2010

Ms. Barry reconvened the meeting of the CASAC AAMMS and the Subcommittee devoted the second day to the discussion of draft responses to the charge questions. The Chair and the DFO compiled the language submitted from the workgroups into a single letter, which was projected onto the screen and discussed by the Subcommittee. By the end of the session, consensus was reached on the major points as required by FACA and the Subcommittee approved the intent of the letter. Editorial changes to the letter would be handled by the Chair and the workgroup leads. The DFO noted that draft letter with final review comments will be posted on the meeting website prior to the final review and approval by the statutory CASAC on March 26th.

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/

Ms. Kyndall Barry
Designated Federal Officer

Certified as True:

/s/

Dr. Ted Russell, Chair
CASAC Ambient Air Monitoring &
Methods Subcommittee

NOTE AND DISCLAIMER: The minutes of this public meeting reflect diverse ideas and suggestions offered by committee members during the course of deliberations within the meeting. Such ideas, suggestions, and deliberations do not necessarily reflect definitive consensus advice from the panel members. The reader is cautioned to not rely on the minutes to represent final, approved, consensus advice and recommendations offered to the Agency. Such advice and recommendations may be found in the final advisories, commentaries, letters, or reports prepared and transmitted to the EPA Administrator following the public meetings.