



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 6

1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

SEP 11 2008

2008 SEP 17 AM 11:30
OFFICE OF AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT

IN

Mr. Ken Lienemann
Supervisor
Air Quality Division
Environmental Health Department
City of Albuquerque
11850 Sun Set Garden, SW
Albuquerque, NM 87121

Dear Mr. Lienemann:

Region 6 has evaluated the annual review proposal of your Ambient Air Monitoring Network. We are pleased to inform you that your sampling plan meets the minimum requirements of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 58.

1. The tables 1, 1A and 1B show the incorrect parameter code for the particulate matter (PM) 2.5 FRM operating at the NCore site 35-001-0023 (2ZM). The correct parameter code should be 88101 instead of 68101. These tables also depict parameter code 88101 for your PM2.5 TEOM continuous monitors. The appropriate parameter codes for PM2.5 TEOM monitors are 88500, 88501, or 88502 depending on the data objective. Enclosed is a copy of the parameter codes for your reference. However, upon a review of the AMP450NC report in AQS, we find parameter code 88502 for sites 0019, 0023, 0027, 0029, and 1013.
2. According to the table 1A, you have proposed changing the sampling frequency for PM2.5 FRM monitors operating at sites 350010023 (2ZM) and 350010024 (2ZN) from everyday to 1-in-3 day. We have reviewed the data in AQS and estimated their design values (DV) to be 18.7 ug/m3 (53%) and 16.5 ug/m3 (47%) respectively for 2005-2007. Since DVs are low when compared with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), we agree with your proposal to reduce the sampling frequency. Please make a note that the manual PM2.5 samplers at the NCore site 350010023 (2ZM) must operate on at least a 1-in-3 day sampling frequency per 40 CFR, Part 58.

3. According to your document, you anticipate operating PM2.5 TEOM samplers as Special Purpose Monitors (SPM). We have no objections on their use as SPMs since they are in excess of the required number of samplers. According to 40 CFR, Part 58, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has the option of using the data for NAAQS comparison if you operate SPMs for more than two years.
4. Based on the data in AQS for 2005-2007, we agree that the PM10 sampler at sites 350010019 (2ZE) and 350010028 (2ZU) have measured low concentrations when compared with the PM10 standards. Therefore, we concur with your proposal to discontinue the PM10 sampling at sites 2ZE and 2ZU. We also have no objections with your proposal to convert the PM10 monitor from site 350010019 (2ZE) to make it a PM2.5 sampler. Once converted, the PM2.5 sampler will be moved to site 350011012 (2ZF) and operate as SPM. Could you please provide additional information as to why you have decided to monitor PM2.5 at monitoring site 350011012 (2ZF)?
5. According to your proposal, you plan to discontinue the entire monitoring site 350011014 (2ZL). Currently, you are sampling for O3, carbon monoxide (CO) and PM10 (collocated) at this location. A review of PM10 data in AQS shows the overall 2005-2007 concentrations are below the NAAQS. We have therefore no objections with your recommendation to stop monitoring for PM10 at site 350011014 (2ZL). We also understand that this site is not part of any maintenance plan that requires collecting ambient data for O3, CO and PM10.
6. You have stated in your proposal that PM2.5 TEOM/FDMS and PM10 TEOM at site 350010029 (2ZV) do not meet siting criteria. We understand the Bernalillo County is making improvements to the property where the site 350010029 (2ZV) is located. When do you expect to have these improvements completed so the site can be in compliance with the siting criteria?
7. We have no objections with your proposal to establish a site (2ZW) at 11850 Sunset Gardens due to urban development. This site will be collecting concentrations of O3 and PM10 (TEOM). For the time being, you have designated this site as a special study. What is the time frame to designate this site as SLAMS?
8. We have no objections with your proposal to discontinue monitoring for visibility and EC/OC from sites 350010023 (2ZM) and 350010029 (2ZV). According to table 1, there was no Nephelometer and/or Aethalometer that operated at site 350011013 (2ZH). Also, you have collected the visibility

data at site 350010023 (2ZM) and proposed to initiate the same at site 350011013 (2ZH). Do you have any plans to use the visibility observations to estimate the particulate concentrations?

9. We have no problems with your proposal to delete ozone monitoring from sites 350010019 (2ZE) and 350011014 (2ZL) and add at site 2ZW. We also concur with your plan to add CO monitoring at site 350011013 (2ZH) and delete from sites 350011014 (2ZL) and 350010024 (2ZN). In addition, we have no objections to your removal of sampling for NO₂ from site 350010024 (2ZN).
10. Please make a note that the final NCore plan (with recommended completed checklist) is due with your annual network proposal by July 1, 2009. Region 6 and the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards will jointly review and act upon that plan. We believe EPA has previously provided the adequate NCore funding in the Section 103 grants. The city of Albuquerque will need to purchase the high sensitivity CO, sulfur dioxide and NO_y monitors for the NCore site during the next fiscal year (FY-2009).

Region 6 appreciates your partnership in conducting the ambient air monitoring. We look forward to working with you to continuously improving the quality of ambient air in Albuquerque. If you have any questions or comments regarding this network review, please contact Jim Afghani at (214) 665-6613.

Sincerely yours,



Maria L. Martinez
Chief

Air Quality Analysis Section

Enclosure

cc: Fabian Macias
Manager
City of Albuquerque