Section 2. $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous/FRM Relationships

Introduction

This section represents an initial effort to compile relational analyses between continuous and FRM data. Relationships between $PM_{2.5}$ continuous and FRM monitors are synthesized from a number of sources, including routinely collected data provided by State and local agencies and data from available field studies. The task of comparing $PM_{2.5}$ continuous data with FRMs was accomplished by averaging the hourly continuous mass data between midnight to midnight, to parallel the FRM operations. General information is provided first with a number of analyses presented later in this section. A more detailed set of analysis are presented in Attachment A.

General Summary

Continuous monitors track FRM data with varying degrees of success across the country, with a mix of seasonal and geographical patterns affecting behavior. Analyses to date are somewhat limited by the availability of relatively few formal field studies, and the current (and temporary) situation where only one $PM_{2.5}$ continuous method (the TEOM[2] operated at 50C) has been widely deployed (Figure 2-1). Despite these limitations, there is an emerging understanding that the best $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitor choice may vary from one monitoring agency to the next. TEOMs operated at 50C appear to predict FRM measurements in locations where volatile losses are minimal. Examples include sites with sulfate dominated aerosols in the Southeast (the Carolinas and Georgia) throughout the year and northeastern and upper Midwest (Iowa and Michigan) locations during the summer. The prevalence of winter month underestimates in certain areas suggests that the TEOM operated at 50 C exacerbates volatile losses during cool conditions when the difference between operational and ambient temperature is greatest. Converting the 50C TEOM to a 30C TEOM with a Sample Equilibration System (SES) should reduce cool season volatile losses. Analyses comparing collocated 50 C and 30 C TEOMs with the SES and FRMs at sites in North Carolina and New York State indicate improved comparability to the FRM for the 30 C TEOM with the SES.

---

[2]Manufactured by Rupprecht & Pataschnick.

Figure 2-1 Percent of PM2.5 Continuous Methods used Nationally



The beta attenuation monitor (BAM)[3] is operated at several locations (second in number to the TEOM) throughout the western United States with a limited number of new locations in the east. The California Air Resources Board and other organizations sponsored a field study of several major $PM_{2.5}$ commercially available monitors indicating high performance of the BAM conducted during relatively volatile aerosol conditions.[4] EPA's Environmental Technology Verification Program (ETV) included two test sites; one in Pittsburgh, PA in the summer of 2000; and one in Fresno, CA in the winter of 2000-2001. This verification program included a number of $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitors being deployed by State and local agencies including the BAM, the TEOM operated at 50C, the TEOM operated with the sample equilibration system at 30C, and the CAMMS[5]. While the verification reports do not offer conclusions as to the performance of the monitors, inspection of these reports indicates that the Met One BAM performed consistent at both test sites. The final verification reports from these field studies are available from the U.S. EPA web site.[6]

The Nephelometer is used at many sites in the Pacific Northwest. This monitor can have

---

[3]Manufactured by Met One Instruments.

[4]Reference the CARB report here.

[5]Manufactured by Thermo Andersen.

[6]Environmental Technology Verification Statements and Reports: http://www.epa.gov/etv/verifrpt.htm#07

advantages over PM2.5 continuous methods with respect to its ease of operation. However, Nephelometers can have problems with high humidity and care should be taken to assure sample streams are conditioned so as not to have moisture interfere with the scattering output. There are several manufacturers of Nephelometers, so care also needs to be taken when comparing data from a monitor at one site to another. Although Nephelometers do not provide for a direct output of fine particualte concentration, they can be useful when calibrated against filter based methods to provide for diurnal and day to day signal of fine particulate.

Analysis of the Variety of Relationships for 47 Collocated $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous and FRM Sites

The AIRS database included 11 sites with at least a years worth of collocated $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitoring and FRM data based on a Spring, 2001 retrieval. An additional 36 sites were included for analyses if they had at least 3 quarters of data with at least 11 valid collocated pairs per quarter for a total of 47 sites (Figure 2-2) forming the basis for the analyses presented in this section.

Figure 2-2 Map of 47 Sites used in $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous Monitors Analyses



Intercomparisons of FRMs and $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous Monitoring Data:

Of the 11 sites with at least 4 quarters of complete data, 8 sites used TEOM monitors with the factory installed correction factor applied for the entire data set. This factory installed correction factor adds 3 ug to the intercept and 3% to the slope for data coming from a TEOM. A table summarizing the range of concentration values from each of the FRM and continuous monitors at these sites is provided below:

Table 2-1 Concentration Ranges for 8 Sites with Collocated PM2.5 FRM and TEOM Monitors

MSA	Site ID	N	Primary Monitor Type	Concentration Range of Data (μg/m^3)						
				Mean	SD	Min	Q1	Median	Q3	Max
Aiken, SC - Augusta, GA	450370001	144	Continuous	14.50	6.42	1.37	9.85	13.46	18.88	34.75
			FRM	14.49	6.55	2.40	9.75	13.00	18.00	34.20
Davenport, IA - Moline - Rock Island, IL	191630015	453	Continuous	12.00	6.49	2.92	7.26	10.53	15.30	48.81
			FRM	12.81	7.31	2.30	7.30	11.50	16.90	46.70
Winston - Salem, NC	370670022	525	Continuous	16.23	8.05	2.66	10.29	14.45	20.95	64.02
			FRM	16.89	8.70	1.60	10.60	15.00	21.70	69.70
New York, NY	360050110	295	Continuous	15.40	9.26	4.69	8.85	12.85	19.24	85.38
			FRM	15.21	9.17	3.60	8.30	12.30	20.00	53.00
Pensacola, FL	120330004	214	Continuous	14.41	6.74	-17.7	9.90	13.02	17.94	45.83
			FRM	14.03	6.89	1.00	8.60	12.70	18.41	49.30
Pittsburgh, PA	420030064	344	Continuous	16.68	12.00	1.21	7.27	13.19	22.50	68.92
			FRM	20.87	13.39	3.10	11.00	17.20	26.55	78.50
Raleigh-Durham, NC	371830014	389	Continuous	15.02	6.89	2.78	10.00	13.66	18.98	45.88
			FRM	15.59	7.52	3.00	10.10	14.40	20.00	52.80
Seattle, WA	530330057	340	Continuous	13.30	6.39	3.38	9.08	11.87	15.48	44.42
			FRM	12.64	7.25	2.80	7.80	10.95	15.40	46.90

Inspection of Table 2-1 indicates that most of the sites appear to produce similar PM2.5 concentrations regardless of whether an FRM or TEOM is used. Only the Pittsburgh, PA site showed a large discrepancy between the mean of the FRM and PM2.5 continuous monitor. Due to this discrepancy, the Allegheny County monitoring staff were contacted to confirm the operation of the TEOM and use of default corrections factors. While the operation of the instrument was determined to be correctly identified, it was mentioned that the site is located in a community orientated location in close proximity to a large local source.

Scatter plots were produced for each of the 11 sites with at least a years worth of complete data. Data were plotted for each day where both a FRM value and a corresponding average 24-hour continuous $PM_{2.5}$ value were available. Separate plots for linear and log-normal concentrations were plotted for each site. The scatter plots can be separated into several categories: scatter plots with good agreement most of the time - illustrated by most points being on a straight line (Figures 2-3 through 2-6 and 2-9); scatter plots with a small but discernable amount of spread about the best fit line - as illustrated by a mild spread about the best fit line (Figures 2-7 and 2-8); scatter plots with good agreement part of the time and poor agreement in others - illustrated by a large increasing spread with concentration (Figures 2-10 and 2-11); and scatter plots that do not appear to correspond well with any pattern - illustrated by a large spread about the 1:1 relationship regardless of the concentration (Figures 2-12 and 2-13).

These first four figures represent sites in the southeastern United States where the $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitor appears to track the FRM reasonably well:

Figure 2-3 Raleigh-Durham, NC



Figure 2-4 Winston-Salem, NC



Figure 2-5 Aiken, SC - Augusta, GA



Figure 2-6 Pensacola, FL



The following scatter plots represent cities in the Northeast with some discernable spread about the best fit line, but not severely distorted.

Figure 2-7 New York, NY



Figure 2-8 Pittsburgh, PA



The following figure is from a northwest site. The scatter plot shows a good fit about the best fit line.

Figure 2-9 Seattle, WA



These figures, using data from sites in the upper mid-west, represent a clear spread with concentration. This is likely an effect of seasonal aerosol changes.

Figure 2-10 Davenport, IA



Figure 2-11 Grand Rapids, MI



These figures represent data from air sheds where the TEOM and FRM do appear to correspond well.

Figure 2-12 El Paso, TX



Figure 2-13 Boston, MA



Correlation between $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous Monitors and FRMs

Another way to look at the data is to evaluate the goodness of fit between a model using $PM_{2.5}$ continuous data to explain FRM measurements. The map below (Figure 2-14) illustrates the correlation coefficient (R^2) at each of the available 47 sites. All 47 sites are able to be used because a linear model will not affect the correlation regardless of whether a site specific model is used, the standard correction factors are applied or no model is used at all. The map also indicates that geographical area plays a large role in how high a correlation coefficient is observed. This is likely due to the aerosol encountered at specific sites, the concentration of fine particulate and an effect of the season. Areas exhibiting high correlation include the Southeast, Northwest and selective locations of the Northeast. Areas with poor correlation are likely the result of either regional scale winter time volatilization as demonstrated in Iowa and Kansas or micro-scale to urban-scale influences of local sources such as in Boston and El Paso.

Figure 2-14 Correlation between FRMs and $PM_{2.5}$ Continuous Monitors



Bias by Season

In many air sheds across the United States the species and concentration of the aerosol encountered varies by season. Changes in the species and concentration of the aerosol can lead to changes in performance of a $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitor. In the illustration below the spread of bias is presented for those sites with at least 4 quarters of complete data. Bias data were calculated by comparing the FRM and collocated continuous monitoring data for days when both instruments produced a valid 24 hour value. Since some monitoring agencies choose to use a standard correction factor in the reporting of their data while others did not, each set of data was first fit to it's own linear model and then the bias were calculated by quarter. Additional graphics depicting the bias by quarter for those sites without 4 complete quarters are available in attachment 1. The tighter the fit between season the better the opportunity to use that continuous instrument to produce FRM-like measurements. Generally, cooler quarters produced the largest negative biases. This is likely due to the larger difference between the operating temperature of the TEOM and the ambient temperature of the atmosphere. The relatively high operating temperature of the TEOM during these cooler months leads to evaporation of a portion of the aerosol that are collected on a filter based sampler.

Figure 2-15 PM2.5 Bias Data for TEOM Monitors by Quarter



Analysis of the Acceptability of the Relationship relative to the Data Quality Objective Process and Class III equivalency.

In the section above, a few of the sites appeared to have $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitors that are replicating the FRM measurements very well with other sites not performing well and many sites in between. A site may be expected to replicate the FRM very well by virtue of having a scatter plot close to unity, a high correlation coefficient and a low bias. But with a variety of performances across sites, at what level should a site be considered acceptable? In this section data from 160 collocated FRM/FRM sites and 47 collocated $PM_{2.5}$ continuous/FRM sites are compared to various levels of the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process and the equivalency criteria. For the DQO criteria, precision and bias statistics are determined for each site and results are presented as a function of the percentage of sites that satisfied the criteria. For the equivalency criteria, linear regression is performed for each site and results are presented as a function of the percentage of sites that satisfied the criteria.

Table 2-2 Percentage of Collocated Sites meeting individual DQO and Equivalency Criteria

Criteria	**160 Collocated FRM/FRM (% of sites meeting criteria)**	**47 Collocated FRM/Continuous Sites (% of sites meeting criteria)**
Data Quality Objective		
Bias 5%	86.9	34.0
Bias 10%	97.5	53.2
Precision 5%	28.1	0.0
Precision 10%	68.8	12.8
Precision 20%	NA	61.7
Equivalency		
Slope (1±0.05)	77.5	91.5
Intercept (±1 µg)	82.5	97.9
Correlation ($0.97)	66.2	10.6

Interpreting Table 2-2 leads to several observations:

- Evaluations of the collocated FRM/FRM sites against the existing goals of ±10% bias and ±10% precision, indicate that precision is the limiting factor. Most (97.5%) of the sites meet the bias goal and 68.8 % meet the precision goal. As will be demonstrated in section 6, bias strongly influences the uncertainty of a 3 year mean, while precision has little effect due to the large number of samples in 3 years of data. Therefore, we have confidence that the FRM network is performing well, as indicted by 97.5% of the sites meeting the bias statistic.

- Evaluating the FRM/FRM sites against the existing criteria for Class III equivalency[7] indicates that correlation is the limiting factor with 66.2% of the sites passing. That's

[7] 40 CFR 53

important since we believe we have a well-operating $PM_{2.5}$ FRM network; however, over one-third of the sites would fail the Class III equivalency testing criteria. If a collocated network of FRM cannot largely meet the equivalency criteria, it will be very difficult for a network of FRMs collocated with $PM_{2.5}$ continuous monitors to meet this criteria.

- Evaluations of the collocated FRM/continuous sites against the existing goals of ±10% bias and ±10% precision indicate that precision is also the limiting factor with 53.2 % of the sites meeting the bias goal and only 12.8 % meeting the precision goal. As mentioned above and demonstrated in section 6, bias strongly influences the uncertainty of a 3-year mean, while precision has little effect due to the large number of samples in 3 years of data. If the precision goal could be reduced to ±20%, then 61.7% of the sites in the analysis would have satisfied this criteria. Although an even less stringent precision goal could potentially be chosen, bias has now become the limiting factor for performance of the continuous monitors. While precision could potentially be relaxed and we would still have a high degree of confidence in the 3 year annual mean, the need to monitor for other monitoring objectives necessitates controlling precision to some degree. A detailed explanation of the DQO process will be explained in section 6.

- Evaluating the FRM/continuous sites against the existing criteria for Class III equivalency indicates that correlation is the limiting factor with 10.6% of the sites passing. If it can be demonstrated that the continuous monitors are producing FRM-like measurements that meet the goals established in the DQO process rather than the equivalency criteria, than the correlation criteria becomes irrelevant.

Note: In addition to this analysis the EPA has produced assessments of the quality of the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring program for the currently operating FRMs for calendar year 1999 and 2000. The calendar year 1999 report is final and can be reviewed on-line at the EPA web site: http://www.epa.gov./ttn/amtic/. The calendar year 2000 report is in review and a draft copy can be obtained from the same web address.

Analysis of Collocated TEOMs with a FRM

In New York State two sites have operating collocated TEOMs with a FRM. Additionally, a site in Raleigh North Carolina also has two TEOMs and a FRM. At each site one of the TEOMs is run with an operational temperature of 50C, while the other is operated at 30C and utilizing a Sample Equilibration System (SES). Data are compared to the operating FRM at the sites, which for all 3 locations is a R&P 2025 FRM. The site with the longest record of data is located at Pinnacle State Park in Addison, NY. This site is located in a rural area of New York's Southern Tier. The illustration below provides some indication of the improvement a TEOM operated at 30 degrees C with a SES can have over operating the conventional TEOM at 50 C. The improvement is most pronounced in the cold weather months of November through March. A table summarizing regressions for all 3 sites by month is available in attachment A.

Figure 2-16 Slope of TEOM/FRM at Pinnacle State Park, NY



Data courtesy of New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and University of Albany, Albany NY.

Conclusion

Although this analyses is very limited it's becoming clear that some areas of the country may already be operating PM continuous monitors that produce data with similar quality to that of the FRM. If a mechanism to approve the use of these continuous monitors could be made where the performance of the instrument is defined to be acceptable than a large resource savings may be gained by divesting of some of the FRM operations. Other areas of the country may not be producing PM2.5 continuous data that could be used to replace the FRM. For these areas, agencies may need to pursue improvements to their instrumentation or new technologies altogether. Comparing the performance of sites that have a collocated FRM/FRM pair with a collocated FRM/continuous pair to the expected equivalency criteria revels that the correlation statistic (r^2 \$0.97) would be the limiting factor for either FRMs or continuos monitors to meet equivalency. If this is the case than an evaluation of the expected statistical criteria for equivalency of a continuos monitor should be made. Section 6 of this document examines the performance standards of PM2.5 continuous monitors in detail.