



**Minutes for Executive Session  
May 3, 2024  
University of Wisconsin and Zoom  
8:30 am to 12:00 pm**

Welcome/Meeting Overview – Mike Bell, Exec Comm Chair

Introductions: See list of participants at the end of minutes.

## Review of the Agenda

1. Introductory Remarks - Jamie Schauer
2. Program Office Report - David Gay
3. Committee and Advisory Reports – Committee Representatives
4. Agency and Stakeholder Reports – Agency Representatives
5. Discuss Site Closures Due to Budgets
6. Discuss How the Program Office Can Assist This Process for the Agencies
7. Discuss Moving from 1 to 2 Week Samples
8. Review 12-point PFAS Network Plan
  - a. A subgroup from Exec has looked through the 12-point plan and provided a few recommendations.
  - b. There has been a conversation with the PFAS group, and it looks like more information is needed to address the questions and concerns.
9. Aaron Pina from USFS will summarize the site operators interviews and provide a better sense of how the operators are feeling about the network and issues they are experiencing in the field.
10. Science Committee Reports – Science Committee Representatives
  - a. TDep Charter is up for Renewal and Approval
11. Discuss Data Gaps and Data Processing Issues

Reports or slides can be email to Catherine Collins NADP Executive Secretary.

There were no questions or additions to the agenda.

### Introductory Remarks- Jamie Schauer

There has been good discussion this week about new activities and budget shortfalls. We need to think strategically about how to address these issues and move forward. Many of these issues will continue into the fall when we gain more understanding about the Federal Government budgets. This is the right group of people to deal with these issues. Thanks to everyone for their participation.

## Financial Review of NADP Program

In the past few months there have been a substantial number of sites that are or will be closing (16 NTN, 4 MDN and 4 AMON sites). This is a fraction of the entire network, but it is significant when compared to the recent past. The Program Office (PO) is going through budget scenarios and will figure solutions and determine how this will affect the network, costs, and staffing.

The NADP budget is in good shape and is currently on track. As of June 30, 2024, it is projected the year will finish \$28,000 in the black. There is a good system at the state lab, and we are able to get accurate revenues and expense numbers at any time during the year. These numbers are accurate to plus or minus \$20,000 for a \$3,000,000 per year program. There will be another 2% raise in July.

Most of the shipping issues have been addressed by switching to Federal Express. NADP is now getting the federal shipping rates which have significantly decreased the shipping costs. For those sites that are still using UPS, the shipping rates are still in flux, but those issues are almost addressed. The PO should start to see the predicted cost savings.

Inflation is better than it has been in the past couple of years. Prices are going up more slowly but are not coming down. Financially it does not look like the inflation situation is going to get any better in the future.

Budget Committee membership is determined by looking at the last full year (2023) of who pays to the NADP program. If an agency pays \$50,000 or is a part of the Federal Agreement, then the agency is on the Budget Committee. (See the red box in the slide presentation). The agency with the greatest contribution to the NADP program is the agency that chairs the Budget Committee which is currently USGS.

## State Agricultural Experimental Station (SAES) Update

In April, David was invited to give a talk at the western states SAES directors planning meeting. SAES provides \$50,000 of funding which allows NIFA to serve as the cooperative funding mechanism for many of the Federal agencies to participate in the NADP networks. The NIFA funding is a very key part to funding the NADP program. The 15-minute overview provided details about what NADP does with SAES' money. The directors were extremely happy with the resulting report, the use of financial resources, and did not have any questions. They were impressed with how a little bit of money goes a long way and commented that it is a good program. It is expected that at the SAES September meeting the 50 directors will decide to continue supporting the NADP programs and approve the next funding request. Doug Bueller who is the Administrative Ag Advisor agrees.

## Meeting Updates

The date for the next NADP Spring Meeting is May 12 – 16, 2025. People can save the date on their calendars. The PO will get the facility contracts signed and reserve the room blocks. The meeting will be in Madison Wisconsin most likely at the Pyle Center but are also looking into the Madison Concourse and Madison Terrace hotels. Having the meeting in Madison saves money. The cost to the PO for the 2024 meeting is approximately \$9300.

The Budget Meeting will be July or August and will be offered in a hybrid format. Ryan McCammon, Budget Chair will be finalizing the dates and will be conducting the PO/Lab Audit at the same time.

Regarding the Spring meeting, there has been discussion with a number of people, especially Federal agencies, that they are having trouble justifying the travel costs to 2 meetings a year with the same organization. However, there is a significant

value for being able to meet face to face. Additionally, discussions with those in the academic community find it hard to participate in the Fall meeting because of timing during the semester and may find early in Spring (April) difficult because of finals.

There are a couple of possibilities:

1. Move the business meeting to the Fall and the Science Symposium/meeting to the Spring since travel budgets might be more stable and it might be better for the academic community. If the Science Symposium/Meeting were after the spring finals (e.g., 2nd or 3rd week of May) that might increase academics participation.
2. Not offer a Spring meeting
3. Make one of the meetings entirely hybrid.

An in-person/hybrid meeting costs the program about \$9300. The costs of a virtual meeting are significantly lower. Preparing for these meetings takes quite a bit of work especially for the PO and it is about the same level of effort for an in person/hybrid or virtual meeting. The recent numbers for the meeting are 71 in person and 88 attending virtually for a total of 159 attendees. The trend is that in person attendance is decreasing and the virtual attendance is increasing. Virtual meetings allow for more people participating, but there is a long-standing concern to move the meetings to the virtual platform. This is an issue that Exec should discuss.

#### Methyl Mercury in Precipitation

Methylmercury in precipitation used to be analyzed in the MDN network. This is still stuck at the Frontier lab and NADP is working on getting the samples. Data is available through 2019. The NADP program is still waiting on the last few years data and have been working hard to get the data. Once the data is received it will be put on the website.

#### Minamata Effectiveness Evaluation

The NADP Program has committed to providing effectiveness evaluation and general NADP information to the Minamata Convention. The MDN and AMNet data are ready to provide the data and is on hold until they are ready to receive it.

#### Move to Henry Mall location to Hill Farms

UW is telling NADP that the Henry Mall building on campus is slated to be demolished. NADP has little control over this process. The move would happen in the next 2 to 7 years and the likely location would be Hill Farms which is being built on the west side of Madison and about 1 – 2 miles from where we are now. The planning has already started, and Amy Mager is involved with identifying the NADP needs. There are both positive and negative factors to the move. On the positive side the staff will be all in one place. Being in one location would be valuable for overall efficiency and increase interactivity among staff. The location will be new, designed how NADP wants and a better laboratory space. Items won't need to be shipped between the two buildings which will be a substantial cost savings and could offset some of the building space costs.

On the negative side it is likely to cost more. It is uncertain about building service fees (rent). NADP might have to pick up all, some, or none of the building service fees. Currently, NADP pays \$100,000 for building services. There are going to be costs associated with the move and it will affect the staff in the future. There is going to be a lot of planning and that planning has already started.

#### Data Review

This was covered previously in NOS and QAAG. The PO is on top of the issue, and it should be solved soon.

#### NADP Maps

The current NADP maps include just the Continental United States or Indian Territory and don't include Canada. Currently, there are many NTN monitors in Canada and this data is going to be integrated into future NADP maps.

#### Committee and Advisory Reports – Committee Representatives

##### *Joint/NOS – Mike McHale*

There was one motion.

“Change the NTN Bag Sampling preparation and the Bag Sampling Change-Out SOPs to weigh the bucket with the lid on it with the change to begin on January 1, 2025, after all site operators are informed of the change. This will also require a change to the Field Observers Report Form so the observer can indicate that the lid was included in the bucket weight. Changes to the SOP's and FORF will be made by the Fall 2024 meeting.”

The other discussion topic was to form an ad hoc committee to investigate and consider moving to biweekly sampling for NTN. The committee will be Aaron Pina, Greg Wetherbee, Greg Beachley, John Walker, Melissa Puchalski, Zac Najacht, Nichole Miller, Tim Sharac, and Kristi Morris.

The ad hoc committee will conduct a budget analysis and report the findings at the summer Budget Meeting and provide an update at the Fall Meeting. Much of the work can be done through email and shared documents. Meetings will be held when necessary. The committee will synthesize their work and ensure that updates are provided to Federal partners and stakeholders.

##### *EOS – Beck Dalton / Chris Rogers*

There were no motions.

##### *QAAG – Martin Shafer / Nichole Miller*

There were no motions.

##### *DMAG / IT – Mark Kuether / Zac Najacht*

There were no motions.

##### *CLAD – Jeremy Ash / Nifer Wilkening*

There was one motion that was approved:

“To nominate Hazel Cathcart as CLAD Secretary.”

##### *TDEP – Amanda Cole / Colleen Baublitz*

TDep Workshop was held this week, and the business meeting was held virtually on April 24, 2024.

There were no motions at the business meeting.

##### *MELD – Colleen Flanagan-Pritz / David Schmeltz*

There were no motions.

*AMSC – Andy Johnson / Selma Isil*

There was one motion that was approved.

“To accept the Fall 2023 AMSC Minutes.”

*Budget – Ryan McCammon, USGS*

The Budget Committee will have a 1 day in-person/hybrid meeting in Madison in the last half of July or the first part of August. A doodle poll will be sent out to the budget committee members to see what works with their calendars. Additionally, the PO/ Lab Audit will be done at the same time either a day or two before or after the budget meeting.

Doug Burns who recently retired will be attending the Fall meeting.

*Committee Report MOTION:*

It was moved by Mike Bell, second by Melissa Puchalski and unanimously approved by the Executive Committee voting members to accept the committee reports.

*Motion from NOS*

Change the NTN bag sampling preparation and Bag Sample Change out SOPs to weigh the bucket with the lid on it and begin in January 2025 after all site operators are informed of the change. This will also require a change to the field observer report form so the observer can indicate that the lid was included in the bucket weight. Changes to the SOP's and the FORF will be made by the Fall 2024 meeting.

It was moved by Mike Bell, seconded by Melissa Puchalski to accept the NOS change of procedure.

**Discussion about the Motion:**

It was suggested that there be a friendly amendment to the motion to include that a new SOP be written for the lid procedures and lid weights. The SOP should be circulated to the site operators and the site operators will be asked if they have input or suggestions. It was agreed that more input from the operators would help in making this decision. Also, it was noted that some operators cannot be as responsive because of access to email, etc. It was suggested that the SOP could be included in the supply boxes that are mailed to the sites and comments returned in the sample box.

**Amended Motion:** It was moved by Kristi Morris and seconded by Ryan McCammon to:

Table the NOS Change of Procedure Motion, have the lab get more information, have internal discussion, and revisit this issue in the fall.

The motion was unanimously approved by the Executive Committee voting members.

## Federal Agency Reports

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – Winston Luke

US Department of Agriculture-National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA)-- Kaushlendra Tingi, National Program Leader in Global Climate Change Division and NIFA-NADP Program Coordinator

Bureau of Land Management

US Fish and Wildlife Service – Nifer Wilkening

National Park Service – Kristi Morris

Environmental Protection Agency – David Schmeltz and Rick Haeuber

US Department of Agriculture: Forest Service – Aaron Pina

US Geological Survey – Ryan McCammon

Maine Department of Environmental Protection – Andy Johnson

Environment Climate Change Canada – Anne Marie MacDonald

LADCO – Angela Dickens

SAES Directors & NSRP-3, SAES, MD DOE, MN PCA, NY DEC, NY SERDA, WI DNR

### MOTION To Approve Agency and Stakeholder Reports

It was moved by Mike Bell, seconded by Mike McHale and unanimously approved by the Executive Committee voting members to accept the Agency and Stakeholder reports.

### Site Operator Survey Work, USFS, Research and Development – Aaron Pina

- Forest Service Structure
  - R&D is responsible for supporting/funding the NADP network. Looking how to tap into other branches funding streams. R&D is the largest forestry research organization managing 5 different research stations and 80 different experimental forests.
  - National Forest System manages 193 million acres of National Forest
  - State, Private and Tribal Forestry – Tribal engagement and communication, Fire management and coordination with the National Interagency Fire Center (budget is billions of dollars)
  - 2/3rd of monitoring sites are on R&D lands, and 1/3<sup>rd</sup> is on National Forest lands.
- Past 15 Year History
  - Current FY24 sites: 30 NTN, 2 MDN, 2 AMon, 1 Litterfall, Total of 35 funded sites.
  - Some sites are on Forest Service lands and the others are located on State lands (e.g. Alaska).
  - Some sites are operated by agencies that pay for the analysis (e.g. EPA or USGS)
- This survey stemmed out of sites in jeopardy and from folks in the National Forests experimental field stations not knowing who to talk to when issues arose.
  - Beginning in March held 32 interviews over a 6-week period to reach out to all of the site operators.
  - Some sites were nearby and had the same site operators (32 different operators)

- Interviews were 30 minutes.
  - Participants: Site Operators and Site Operator Supervisors, R&D-Brian and Aaron, and National Forest System – Linda and the Air Specialists
- Interview topics: (asked the same questions for each interview)
  - Introductions
  - Clarify contact information for site operator and site supervisors.
  - Updated co-located monitor site information (IMPROVE, CASTNET, PFAS, etc.)
  - Identified who to talk to if there are issues.
    - Equipment issues
    - How and when to contact the NADP Program Office
    - How and when to contact Forest Service Supervisor
  - Wanted to understand challenges and barriers at their sites.
  - Feedback
  - How is the collected data used for decision making (e.g., National Forest Plans/strategy documents)
  - Motivation for monitoring
  - Effects of 2019 Budget Modernization
  - Site Access Issues
  - Is the site co-located with other monitors (e.g. IMPROVE, CASTNET, PFAS, etc.)?
  - Do they want more updates from the NADP Program Office?
  - Do they want more information on annual reports, findings and ecological applications?
  - Do they want more direction from the National or Regional Offices?
  - Do they need more budget direction?
  - Do they need more contact with the air specialists or atmospheric scientists?
- Summary of Interviews
  - The interview data has been recently aggregated.
  - Sites
    - Missing Alaska AK01(located on State lands), CA28 (inactive), Puerto Rico (PR20)
  - Motivation
    - Continue the legacy of 40 plus years.
    - Continue to do good work.
    - Do this out of the goodness of their hearts.
    - Supervisor tells them that they need to do this work.
    - Recognize the importance of long-term data and network.
  - Data Use
    - Using locally – air, health and water quality
    - Using for forest plans and monitoring
    - The operators like the annual maps and knowing that they are a part of the larger network.
    - Would like to hear more from the FS WO or NADP PO about how things are going and directions for the future.
    - Would like to know more about what the end users are doing with the data by drilling down to the local or regional areas.
    - Aaron and Linda are looking into writing reports for specific regions or forests that would describe the status and impacts.
  - Maintenance Hotline
    - Fast, reliable and helpful
  - Challenges and Barriers
    - Budget modernization in the USFS – 2019
      - Used to be a specific NADP line item in the budget but now there is no line item for any operators at any of the sites.
      - Important to know how the money is allocated.
    - Access issues – site changes

- CA28 – relocation of site
- Colorado – ski area and trees needing to be removed.
- Data Completeness
  - Used 3 criteria and annualized data.
  - Operators only know the minimum criteria for data completeness.
    - 75% valid sample collection for time period
  - Good news is getting a bit better with time.
  - Number one issue was collection criteria (75% of the time period with valid samples)
    - Issues with high altitude sites
    - Ran statistical analysis with elevation.
    - Significant trend that the higher elevation the less likelihood that all criteria are met.
      - Not just site access
      - Could be environment factors (lighter snow, less dense snow)
      - Hypothesize that this might be true across all NADP sites.
      - Mismatched observations and sample weights
        - May be due to dry snow where buckets are open for a longer period of time than needed.
        - It is important to know how to get and who to ask for equipment (e.g., electrical heaters – NADP Program Office, collection and payments – FS Washington Office R&D, other ancillary costs – FS Monitoring Unit or FS WO R&D)
- Shipping Costs
  - Applies to individual units.
  - Newer supervisors are not as familiar with the monitoring program.
- Continuous Power
  - Wintertime and sites out west
- Summary Report of Findings
  - Assessment report will be sent to management.
    - Used to prioritization or investment of sites.
  - Looking at different routes of communication and finding money to support the monitoring efforts.
  - Work to connect more with the operators collecting data.

**Action Item:** Develop a list and specific products that would help to prioritize sites that could be circulated to the agencies.

- Site Reports, data completeness, research/abstracts, fact sheet.
- The 2023 research data is currently on the website – tag it with the agency.

### TDep Charter Reauthorization – Amanda Cole

A copy of the Total Deposition Science Committee (TDep) 2024 Request for Charter Renewal was submitted to Exec electronically.

The TDep Mission Is to improve estimates of atmospheric deposition by advancing the science of measuring and modeling atmospheric wet, dry, and total deposition of species such as sulfur, nitrogen and mercury by providing a forum for the exchange of information on current and emerging issues within a broad multi-organization context including atmospheric scientists, ecosystem scientists, resource managers, and policy makers.

The renewal document summarizes the TDep activities and accomplishments, and changes to the working group structure over the last 4 years. Currently there are 3 working groups: Stakeholders, Measurement Model Fusion, and the new



Measurements and Monitoring. Also included is a list of the working group leadership teams for each of these groups over the last 4 years.

TDEP's accomplishments include:

- Producing the TDep maps which are widely used by the critical loads and other communities.
- Creating new animated trend movies.
- Overhauling of the scripts to modernize and convert to Python and ArcPy.
- Conducting an agricultural workshop.
- Developing agricultural stakeholder engagement plan that includes a webinar series.
- Completing the "Improving Total Nitrogen Deposition Budgets" factsheet summarizing the 2019 white paper.
- Conducting the TDep Measurement Workshop during the Spring 2024 NADP meeting (30 in-person and 30 online participants).
- Holding sessions to reach out to other groups.
  - Ozone Deposition – CLAD Working Group.
  - Multi-Agency discussion on network optimization.
  - Other networks that have complimentary goals.
- On Going Research Project across multiple agencies and the academic sector.
- Continuing to have an active membership that attends meetings and workshops.

TDEP's future plans include:

- Improving mapping products.
- Research Products – listed in the renewal document.
- Outreach and Stakeholder engagement in coordination with EOS.

**Discussion:** The work that TDep has completed has been enhanced by workgroup structure, modeling and monitoring efforts, the application to critical loads, and outreach that was developed during this time period,

#### [MOTION To Approve the TDep Charter for an Additional 4 Years](#)

It was moved by Mike Bell, second by Melissa Puchalski and unanimously approved by the Executive Committee voting members to renew the TDep Charter for an additional 4 years.

#### [PFAS Network and 12-Point Plan Review](#)

During the Fall Exec Team meeting the PFAS network was approved to move into a provisional transitional phase starting January 1, 2024. A 12-point plan committee was formed (Mike Bell, Linda Geiser, Greg Wetherbee, John Walker, Zac Najacht, and Emily Sellers). The review committee is ensuring that the necessary information is included and is offering suggestions on plan improvements. Acceptance of the plan will be voted on at a future meeting. The status of the PFAS network was discussed during the Joint session.

The team met with Melissa Puchalski and John Offenber to discuss the feedback and sent out a review report. In summary, the review committee felt that the science is sound and that this will be an important addition to the monitoring network portfolio. The review committees' recommendations focused on ensuring the SOPs are clear and in place prior to full acceptance. Also, the committee wanted to identify the burden on the lab for the processing time, data reporting, and incorporation into the NADP Meetings, Amy Mager presented figures on the current way the PFAS data is being analyzed and how it would be processed as an official network.

There have been conversations on cost. The costs outlined in the plan are breakeven numbers because of the uncertainty in the number of sites and the costs for data product development and database management. It is suggested to look at increasing the cost per site to be able to provide adequate funding support for the lab and the network. Additionally, it is recommended to look for collaborations or added funding (e.g. NSF Fellows or people to help with the transition of the network or NSF-Science Technology Centers funding).

There were comments from the pilot sites for password protected data by users versus federally funding and being publicly accessible.

Melissa Puchalski has been working on the comments and will be working with the PO to talk through data and resources. From the discussion in Joint it was suggested to engage some of the advocates that can do outreach to other groups and Federal agencies that don't currently participate in NADP but might benefit by having a PFAS site or add PFAS to a multiple site.

### [Working Together to Address Field Issues](#)

Earlier it was mentioned as an example how the PO was responsive to issues in the field. If an operator needed a new motor box, the operator would call the PO and the motor box would be sent overnight. This results in only one week of missed data which helps in meeting the data criteria qualifications versus checking a box and sending it back with the samples resulting in an extra week or two of missing data. During this meeting we have listed many items where we have asked the PO for help, but if there are ways, we can help out the program office or there are ways to do our jobs better, please let the agencies know. Telling the operator to call the PO for the motor box is a good example of how to make the process more efficient.

### [MOTION To Adjourn](#)

It was moved by Mike Bell, seconded by Ryan McCammon and unanimously approved by the Executive Committee voting members to adjourn.