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Study Objectives and Approach

• Objectives
  – Assess the operational characteristics and performance of the R&P 5400C, 8400N, and 8400S carbon, nitrate, and sulfate monitors for application for routine use at Speciation Trends Sites; and
  – Evaluate the use of an automated point data collection system for data processing and integration with visualization tools for real time display and reporting.

• Approach
  – Develop and implement consistent operating SOPs;
  – Assess inter- and intra-site comparisons of 24hr average monitor readings with corresponding Speciation Trends Filter-Based Sampler results;
  – Develop monitor auditing protocols and perform independent performance evaluation of monitor data output to evaluate consistency among operating sites and sampler performance; and
  – Phased installation and operation of Information Processing Systems and MeteoStar LEADS data acquisition/visualization tools.
Schedule and Output

• Test Sites: Seattle, WA; Phoenix, AZ; Deer Park, TX; Chicago, IL; and Indianapolis, IN.
• Study Period: July, 2002-July 2003
• Implementation: SOPs in place at start-up; All sites report standardized monthly data summaries in Excel format. EPA Montgomery Lab perform periodic performance evaluation audits. Automated data collection systems installation staggered over initial project period.
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Total Carbon Comparison - Chicago - Com Ed
May, 2002 - Jan, 2003
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Total Carbon Comparison - Beacon Hill
May 2002 - Jan 2003
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Nitrate Comparison Beacon Hill
May 2002 - Jan 2003

\[ y = 0.782x + 0.2029 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.8911 \]
Sulfate Comparison Beacon Hill  May 2002- Jan 2003

$y = 1.2183x + 0.2832$

$R^2 = 0.8851$
Sulfate Time Series-Beacon Hill

Date

ug/m³

Filter
Continuous
Results of Performance Evaluation Audit #1

1. Prepare 5 blind aqueous spike audit solution concentrations using KNO$_3$ and (NH$_4$)$_2$SO$_4$
2. Verify concentrations by ion chromatography analysis
3. Use constant volume spike for each solution 0.5ul for NO$_3$ and 0.2ul for SO$_4$ to maintain constant aqueous volume deposited on flash strip of each monitor.
4. Each site to analyze local aqueous blank, local 100ng/ul nitrate and 300ng/ul sulfate standards and triplicates of each of the 5 audit solutions.
Total Carbon Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>1.5-9µg/m³</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6/02-1/03</td>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9/02-12/02</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>+1.67</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>12/02-2/03</td>
<td>3-22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>+0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y=mx+b where y=R&P5400conc. and x=Speciation Trends Network(STN) Sampler

Findings to date:
R&P5400 consistently measures lower than STN sampler across concentration range at all sites
In most cases, average monitor response correlates well with STN measurements.
Nitrate Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9/02-12/02</td>
<td>0.2-2µg/m³</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.2-5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.2-12</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.2-14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>+0.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>9/02-2/03</td>
<td>0.2-15</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y=mx+b where y=R&P8400Nconc., and x=Speciation Trends Network(STN) Sampler

**Findings to date:**
R&P8400 24hr-average concentrations are lower than corresponding STN 24hr-average concentrations across measured range. There is better agreement at lower nitrate levels and diverge as concentrations increase. With exception of Texas site, response correlation is good.
# Sulfate Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.5-5µg/m³</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9/02-12/02</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>+1.65</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.5-21</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7/02-1/03</td>
<td>0.5-21</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Y=mx+b$ where $y=$R&P8400S conc., and $x=$Speciation Trends Network (STN) Sampler

**Findings to date:**

R&P8400S 24-average concentrations compare favorably with STN average concentrations at sulfate levels below ~5µg/m³ and increasingly are lower than STN values at higher concentrations. Response correlation is good.