UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

OCT 31 2016

Dr. Matt Miyasato, Deputy Executive Officer
Science and Technology Advancement
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, California 91765-4178

Dear Dr. Miyasato:

Thank you for your submission of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) *Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan* in July 2016. We have reviewed the submitted document based on the requirements set forth under 40 CFR 58. Based on the information provided in the plan, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approves all portions of the network plan except those specifically identified below.

Please note that we cannot approve portions of the annual network plan for which the information in the plan is insufficient to judge whether the requirement has been met, or for which the information, as described, does not meet the requirements as specified in 40 CFR 58.10 and the associated appendices. EPA Region 9 also cannot approve portions of the plan for which the EPA Administrator has not delegated approval authority to the regional offices. Accordingly, the first enclosure (*A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action*) provides a listing of specific items of your agency's annual monitoring network plan where EPA is not taking action. The second enclosure (*B. Additional Items Requiring Attention*) is a listing of additional items in the plan that EPA wishes to bring to your agency's attention.

The third enclosure (*C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist*) is the checklist EPA used to review your plan for overall items that are required to be included in the annual network plan along with our assessment of whether the plan submitted by your agency addresses those requirements.

The first two enclosures highlight a subset of the more extensive list of items reviewed in the third. All comments conveyed via this letter (and enclosures) should be addressed (through corrections within the plan, additional information being included, or discussion) in next year's annual monitoring network plan.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or the enclosed comments, please feel free to contact me at (415) 947-4134 or Michael Flagg (415-972-3372).

Sincerely,

Gwen M. Yoshimura

Gwen Yoshimura, Acting Manager
Air Quality Analysis Office

Enclosures:

A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action
B. Additional Items Requiring Attention
C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist

cc (via email): Jason Low, SCAQMD
Andrea Polidori, SCAQMD
Rene Bermudez, SCAQMD
Rebekka Fine, California Air Resources Board

A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action

We are not acting on the portions of annual network plans where either EPA Region 9 lacks the authority to approve specific items of the plan, or EPA has determined that a requirement is either not met or information in the plan is insufficient to judge whether the requirement has been met.

- Per 40 CFR 58.11(c), NCore, PAMS, and STN network design and changes are subject to approval of the EPA Administrator. Therefore, we are not acting on these items.

- System modifications (e.g., site closures or moves) are subject to approval per 40 CFR 58.14(c). Information provided in the plan was insufficient for EPA to approve the system modifications listed in the plan per the applicable requirement. Therefore, we are not acting on the following items as part of this year's annual network plan (see Checklist Rows 3):

    - Discontinuation/Relocation of Burbank (shutdown in June 2014)
    - Discontinuation/Relocation of North Long Beach (shutdown in September 2013)
    - Discontinuation/Relocation of Ontario (shutdown in June 2014)
    - Discontinuation/Relocation of Riverside Magnolia (shutdown in March 2015)
    - Discontinuation/Relocation of Van Nuys Airport (shutdown June 2013)

- EPA identified items in your agency's annual monitoring network plan where a requirement was not being met or information in the plan was insufficient to judge whether the requirement was being met based on 40 CFR 58.10 and the associated appendices. Therefore, we are not acting on the following items:

Item	Checklist Row	Issue
Modifications to SLAMS network	3	Insufficient information to judge
Distance from supporting structure	81	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Distance to roadway	77	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Distance to trees	84	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Designation of primary monitor	17	Insufficient information to judge
For low volume PM, distance to all other PM instruments > 1 m	19	Insufficient information to judge
For high volume PM, distance to all other PM instruments > 2 m	20	Insufficient information to judge
$PM_{2.5}$ collocation	25	Insufficient information to judge

Identification of sites not suitable for comparison to the annual NAAQS	27	Incorrect information
Dates of last $PM_{2.5}$ semi-annual flow audits	36	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Dates of last PM_{10} semi-annual flow audits	42	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Dates of last Pb semi-annual flow audits	50	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Dates of last PE audit	52	Not meeting the requirement in some instances
Identification of NO_2 sites as near-road, area wide, or RA40	60	Insufficient information to judge
Parameter occurrence code	68	Insufficient information to judge in some instances
Monitor type/network affiliation	72	Incorrect information, insufficient information to judge in some instances
Scale of representativeness	73	Not meeting the requirement in one instance
Parameter occurrence code	74	Insufficient information to judge in some instances
Method code	75	Insufficient information to judge

Additional information for each of these items may be found for the row listed in column 2, in the third enclosure (*C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist).*

B. Additional Items Requiring Attention

- [Item 23] Table 10 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent design values and population estimates.

- [Item 24] Since the continuous monitors operated by SCAQMD are either non-regulatory (non-FEM) or have been granted a FEM wavier under 58.10 (b)(13), design values from the FRM network should be used in Table 11, consistent with the values in Table 10. Please update for next year's plan.

- [Item 33] In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016) and provide the design values for each monitoring site and the "required" sampling frequency as defined by 58.12.

- [Item 37] Table 13 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Footnote 1 states that the maximum concentration for the San Bernardino and Riverside counties excludes a high concentration of 298 $\mu g/m^3$ measured at Indio. While minimum monitoring requirements continue to be met for the MSA, future ANPs should include *all* data when calculating minimum monitoring requirements. Table 13 should be updated accordingly. Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent data and population estimates.

- [Item 38] In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016).

- [Item 39] In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016) and provide the design values for each monitoring site and the "required" sampling frequency as defined by 58.12.

- [Item 53] Table 9 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent design values and population estimates.

- [Item 62] Please update next year's plan with the most recent population estimates.

C. ANNUAL MONITORING NETWORK PLAN CHECKLIST

(Updated February 10, 2016)

Year: 2016
Agency: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) requires that each Annual Network Plan (ANP) include information regarding the following types of monitors: SLAMS monitoring stations including FRM, FEM, and ARM monitors that are part of SLAMS, NCore stations, STN stations, State speciation stations, SPM stations, and/or, in serious, severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas, and PAMS stations.

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) further directs that, "The plan shall include a statement of purposes for each monitor and evidence that siting and operation of each monitor meets the requirements of appendices A, C, D, and E of this part, where applicable." On this basis, review of the ANPs is based on the requirements listed in 58.10 along with those in Appendices A, C, D, and E.

EPA Region 9 will not take action to approve or disapprove any item for which Part 58 grants approval authority to the Administrator rather than the Regional Administrators, but we will do a check to see if the required information is included and correct. The items requiring approval by the Administrator are: PAMS, NCore, and Speciation (STN/CSN).

Please note that this checklist summarizes many of the requirements of 40 CFR Part 58, but does not substitute for those requirements, nor do its contents provide a binding determination of compliance with those requirements. The checklist is subject to revision in the future and we welcome comments on its contents and structure.

Key:

White	meets the requirement
Yellow	requirement is not met, or information is insufficient to make a determination. Action requested in next year's plan or outside the ANP process (items listed in Enclosure A).
Green	item requires attention in order to improve next year's plan (items listed in Enclosure B).

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS					
1.	Submit plan by July 1st	58.10 (a)(1)	Y	Y	
2.	30-day public comment / inspection period[6]	58.10 (a)(1), 58.10 (a)(2)	Y, p.1	Y	
3.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are not approving system modifications	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10 (b)(5) 58.10(e) 58.14	Y, p.21 - 22 Appendix D	Insufficient Info	The plan discusses the following system modifications: • Discontinuation/Relocation of Burbank (shutdown in June 2014) • Discontinuation/Relocation of North Long Beach (shutdown in September 2013) • Discontinuation/Relocation of Ontario (shutdown in June 2014) • Discontinuation/Relocation of Riverside Magnolia (shutdown in March 2015) • Discontinuation/Relocation of Van Nuys Airport Pb monitoring (shutdown June 2013) EPA approval is required for these system modifications. EPA will not be approving the above modifications as part of the 2016 ANP review
4.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are approving system modifications per 58.14	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10 (b)(5) 58.10(e) 58.14	N/A	N/A	

[1] Unless otherwise noted.
[2] Response options: NA (Not Applicable), Yes, No, Incomplete, Incorrect. The responses "Incomplete" and "Incorrect" assume that some information has been provided.
[3] To the best of our knowledge.
[4] Assuming the information is correct
[5] Response options: NA (Not Applicable) – [reason], Yes, No, Insufficient to Judge.
[6] The affected state or local agency must document the process for obtaining public comment and include any comments received through the public notification process within their submitted plan.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
5.	Does plan include documentation (e.g., attached approval letter) for system modifications that have been approved since last ANP approval?		N/A	N/A	
6.	Any proposals to remove or move a monitoring station within a period of 18 months following plan submittal	58.10 (b)(5)	Y, p.21-22 Appendix D	Y	
7.	A plan for establishing a near-road $PM_{2.5}$ monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 **(plan was due July 1, 2014)**	58.10(a)(8)(i)	N/A	N/A	$PM_{2.5}$ monitors implemented at Long Beach Route 710 and Ontario Route 60 near-road sites. Approved as part of 2015 ANP
8.	A plan for establishing a near-road $PM_{2.5}$ monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 1 million and ≤ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2017 **(plan due July 1, 2016)**	58.10(a)(8)(ii)	Y, Appendix D	Y	$PM_{2.5}$ monitors implemented at Long Beach Route 710 and Ontario Route 60 near-road sites. Approved as part of 2015 ANP
9.	A plan for establishing a near-road CO monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 **(plan was due July 1, 2014)**	58.10(a)(7) 58.13(e)(1)	N/A	N/A	CO monitors implemented at Anaheim Route 5 and Ontario Etiwanda near-road sites. Approved as part of 2015 ANP.
10.	A plan for establishing a near-road CO monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 1 million and ≤ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2017 **(plan due July 1, 2016)**	58.10(a)(7) 58.13(e)(1)	Y, Appendix D	Y	CO monitors implemented at Anaheim Route 5 and Ontario Etiwanda near-road sites. Approved as part of 2015 ANP.
11.	NO_2 plan for establishment of 2nd near-road monitor by 1/1/2015 **(plan was due July 1, 2014)**	58.10 (a)(5)(iv)	N/A	N/A	NO_2 monitors implemented at all near-road sites. Approved as part of 2014 and 2015 ANPs
12.	Precision/Accuracy reports submitted to AQS	58.16(a); App A, 1.3 and 5.1.1	Y, p. 29	Y	
13.	Annual data certification submitted	58.15 App. A 1.3	Y, p. 29	Y	
14.	Statement that SPMs operating an FRM/FEM/ARM that meet Appendix E also meet either Appendix A or an approved alternative. Documentation for any Appendix A approved alternative should be included.[7]	58.11 (a) (2)	N/A	N/A	

[7] Alternatives to the requirements of appendix A may be approved for an SPM site as part of the approval of the annual monitoring plan, or separately.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
15.	SPMs operating FRM/FEM/ARM monitors for over 24 months are listed as comparable to the NAAQS or the agency provided documentation that requirements from Appendices A, C, or E were not met.[8]	58.20(c)	N/A	N/A	
16.	For agencies that share monitoring responsibilities in an MSA/CSA: this agency meets full monitoring requirements or an agreement between the affected agencies and the EPA Regional Administrator is in place	App D 2(e)	N/A	N/A	
GENERAL PARTICULATE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS (PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, Pb-TSP, Pb-PM_{10})					
17.	Designation of a primary monitor if there is more than one monitor for a pollutant at a site.	Need to determine collocation	Y, p.18	Insufficient info	The plan states that the FRM $PM_{2.5}$ samplers are the primary monitors used for attainment purposes, but the detailed site tables do not appropriately specify which $PM_{2.5}$ monitor is the primary monitor for a particular site. As there are many sites in the SCAQMD $PM_{2.5}$ network, this requirement is especially important to specify in the ANP process.
18.	Distance between QA collocated monitors (Note: waiver request or the date of previous waiver approval must be included if the distance deviates from requirement.)	App. A 3.2.5.6 and 3.2.6.3	Y, Appendix D	Y	
19.	For low volume PM instruments (flow rate < 200 liters/minute), all other PM instruments are > 1 m from the lovol. If no, list distance (meters) and instruments.	App E	Y, Appendix D	Insufficient info	Detailed site information tables only include distances to "collocated" monitors of the same parameter (e.g. PM_{10}, POC 1 & PM_{10}, POC 3) at a particular site. These tables do not include distances to other PM instruments (e.g. PM_{10}, POC 1 & $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1).

[8] This requirement only applies to monitors that are eligible for comparison to the NAAQS per 40 CFR §§58.11(e) and 58.30.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
20.	For high volume PM instruments (flow rate > 200 liters/minute), all other PM instruments are > 2m from the hivol. If no, list distance (meters) and instruments.	App E	Y, Appendix D	Insufficient info	Detailed site information tables only include distances to "collocated" monitors of the same parameter (e.g. PM_{10}, POC 1 & PM_{10}, POC 3) at a particular site. These tables do not include distances to other PM instruments (e.g. PM_{10}, POC 1 & $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1).
$PM_{2.5}$ –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
21.	Document how states and local agencies provide for the review of changes to a $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network that impact the location of a violating $PM_{2.5}$ monitor.	58.10 (c)	Y, p.16	Y	
22.	Identification of any $PM_{2.5}$ FEMs and/or ARMs not eligible to be compared to the NAAQS due to poor comparability to FRM(s) [Note 1: must include required data assessment.] [Note 2: Required SLAMS must monitor $PM_{2.5}$ with NAAQS-comparable monitor at the required sample frequency.]	58.10 (b)(13) 58.11 (e)	Y, Appendix C	Y	EPA approved the FEM waiver for the 2015 data year on May 2, 2016 outside of the annual network plan process.
23.	Minimum # of monitoring **sites** for $PM_{2.5}$ [Note 1: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitoring sites, and # required monitoring sites] [Note 2: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D, 4.7.1(a) and Table D-5	Y, p.23	Y	Table 10 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent design values and population estimates.
24.	Requirements for continuous $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring (number of monitors and collocation)	App D 4.7.2	Y, p.24	Y	Since the continuous monitors operated by SCAQMD are either non-regulatory (non-FEM) or have been granted a FEM wavier under 58.10 (b)(13), design values from the FRM network should be used in Table 11, consistent with the values in Table 10. Please update for next year's plan.
25.	FRM/FEM/ARM $PM_{2.5}$ QA collocation	App A 3.2.5	Y, p.28, Appendix D	Insufficient Info	Table 21 does not include collocation requirements for Thermo 2025i samplers (method code 145) that have been deployed throughout the $PM_{2.5}$ network
26.	$PM_{2.5}$ Chemical Speciation requirements for official STN sites	App D 4.7.4	Y, p.24	Y	

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
27.	Identification of sites suitable and sites not suitable for comparison to the annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS as described in Part 58.30	58.10 (b)(7)	Y, p.16, Appendix D	Incorrect Info	$PM_{2.5}$ FEM analyzers in Appendix D state the data are not comparable to the annual NAAQS "unless the manual sampler has missing data". This specific requirement is specific to 58.30 and the exemption of $PM_{2.5}$ data from comparison to the annual NAAQS if the data are "not representative of area-wide air quality, but rather of relatively unique mirco-scale, or localized hot spot, or unique middle scale impact site".
28.	Required $PM_{2.5}$ sites represent area-wide air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)	Y, p.6,.16	Y	
29.	For $PM_{2.5}$, within each MSA, at least one site at neighborhood or larger scale in an area of expected maximum concentration	App D 4.7.1(b)(1)	Y, p. 6 Appendix D	Y	
30.	Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road $PM_{2.5}$ monitor (in CBSA $\geq$ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015	58.13(f)(1) App D 4.7.1(b)(2)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
31.	If additional SLAMS $PM_{2.5}$ is required, there is a site in an area of poor air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)(3)	Y, p.16	Y	
32.	States must have at least one $PM_{2.5}$ regional background and one $PM_{2.5}$ regional transport site.	App D 4.7.3	N/A	N/A	State requirement
33.	Sampling schedule for $PM_{2.5}$ - applies to year-round and seasonal sampling schedules (note: date of waiver approval must be included if the sampling season deviates from requirement)	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(d) App D 4.7 EPA flowchart	Y, p.18	Y	In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016) and provide the design values for each monitoring site and the "required" sampling frequency as defined by 58.12.
34.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual $PM_{2.5}$ monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	Y, Appendix D	Y	
35.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated $PM_{2.5}$ monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Y, Appendix D	Y	
36.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2015** for $PM_{2.5}$ monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Y, Append D	N	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • Long Beach Route 710 FRM, POC 1: only one audit (11/7/2015) • Ontario Route 60 FRM, POC 1: only one audit (11/19/2015), POC 3: no audit dates

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
PM_{10} –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
37.	Minimum # of monitoring sites for PM_{10} [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D, 4.6 (a) and Table D-4	Y, p.25	Y	Table 13 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Footnote 1 states that the maximum concentration for the San Bernardino and Riverside counties excludes a high concentration of 298 µg/m^3 measured at Indio. While minimum monitoring requirements continue to be met for the MSA, future ANPs should include *all* data when calculating minimum monitoring requirements. Table 13 should be updated accordingly. Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent data and population estimates
38.	Manual PM_{10} method collocation (note: continuous PM_{10} does not have this requirement)	App A 3.3.1	Y, p.9, 28	Y	In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016)
39.	Sampling schedule for PM_{10}	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(e) App D 4.6	Y, p.8-10	Y	In next year's plan, please include the most recent data year (e.g. the 2017 plan should reference data from 2014-2016) and provide the design values for each monitoring site and the "required" sampling frequency as defined by 58.12.
40.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual PM_{10} monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	Y, Appendix D	Y	
41.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated PM_{10} monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Y, Appendix D	Y	
42.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2015** for PM_{10} monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Y, Appendix D	Y	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • Mecca (Saul Martinez) FRM, POC 1 & FEM, POC 3: no 2015 audit dates

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
Pb –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
43.	Minimum # of monitors for non-NCore Pb [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D 4.5 58.13(a)	Y, p.27	Y	
44.	Pb collocation: for non-NCore sites	App A 3.3.4.3	Y, P. 12 Appendix D	Y	
45.	Any source-oriented Pb site for which a waiver has been granted by EPA Regional Administrator	58.10 (b)(10)	N/A	N/A	
46.	Any Pb monitor for which a waiver has been requested or granted by EPA Regional Administrator for use of Pb-PM_{10} in lieu of Pb-TSP	58.10 (b)(11)	N/A	N/A	
47.	Designation of any Pb monitors as either source-oriented or non-source-oriented	58.10 (b)(9)	Y, p.6	Y	
48.	Sampling schedule for Pb	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(b) App D 4.5	Y, Appendix D	Y	
49.	Frequency of flow rate verification for Pb monitors audit	App A 3.3.4.1	Y, Appendix D	Y	
50.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2015** for Pb monitors	App A 3.3.4.1	Y, Appendix D	N	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • SA Recycling: no 2015 audit dates
GENERAL GASEOUS MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
51.	Frequency of one-point QC check (gaseous)	App. A 3.2.1	Y, Appendix D	Y	
52.	Date of Annual Performance Evaluation (gaseous) conducted in **CY2015**	App. A 3.2.2	Y, Appendix D	N	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • Banning Airport NO_2 and O_3: no 2015 audit date • Indio O_3: no 2015 audit date

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
O_3 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
53.	Minimum # of monitoring sites for O_3 [Note 1: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitoring sites, and # required monitoring sites] [Note 2: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.] [Note 3: monitors that do not meet traffic count/distance requirements to be neighborhood or urban scale (40 CFR Appendix E, Table E-1) cannot be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements]	App D, 4.1(a) and Table D-2	Y, p.23	Y	Table 9 should include the most recent concentration data from the last 3 years (i.e. the 2016 plan should reference data from 2013-2015). Also, please update next year's plan with the most recent design values and population estimates
54.	Identification of maximum concentration O_3 site(s)	App D 4.1 (b)	Y, p.6 Appendix D	Y	
55.	Sampling season for O_3 (Note: Waivers must be renewed annually. EPA expects agencies to submit re-evaluations of the relevant data each year with the ANP. EPA will then respond as part of the ANP response.)	58.10 (b)(4) App D, 4.1(i)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
NO_2 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
56.	Minimum monitoring requirement for single near-road NO_2 monitor (in CBSA $\geq$ 1 million) by 1/1/2014. [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	58.13(c)(3) App D 4.3.2	Y, Appendix D	Y	
57.	Minimum monitoring requirement for second near-road NO_2 monitor (in CBSA $\geq$ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 [9] [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	58.13(c)(4) App D 4.3.2	Y, Appendix D	Y	
58.	Minimum monitoring requirements for area-wide NO_2 monitor in location of expected highest NO_2 concentrations representing neighborhood or larger scale (operation required by January 1, 2013) [9]	App D 4.3.3	Y, p.25	Y	

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
59.	Minimum monitoring requirements for susceptible and vulnerable populations monitoring (aka RA40) NO_2 (operation required by January 1, 2013)[9]	App D 4.3.4	Y, p. 11	Y	
60.	Identification of required NO_2 monitors as either near-road, area-wide, or vulnerable and susceptible population (aka RA40)	58.10 (b)(12)	N	Insufficient Info	Network affiliations not provided in detailed site tables
CO –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
61.	Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road CO monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015[9]	58.13(e)(1) App D 4.2.1	Y, Appendix D	Y	
SO_2 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
62.	Minimum monitoring requirements for SO_2 based on PWEI and/or RA required monitors under Appendix D 4.4.3 [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D 4.4	Y, p.26	Y	Please update next year's plan with the most recent population estimates
63.	Monitors used to meet Data Requirements Rule included in July 1, 2016 ANP (to be installed no later than January 1, 2017).	40 CFR 51.1203(c)	N/A	N/A	

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
NCORE –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS					
64.	NCore site and all required parameters operational: year-round O_3, trace SO_2, trace CO, NO_y, NO, $PM_{2.5}$ mass, $PM_{2.5}$ continuous, $PM_{2.5}$ speciation, $PM_{10-2.5}$ mass, resultant wind speed at 10m, resultant wind direction at 10m, ambient temperature, relative humidity, and Pb at CBSAs ≥ 500,000.	58.10 (a)(3); Pb collocation App. A 3.3.4.3; $PM_{10-2.5}$ minimum monitoring App. D 4.8; $PM_{10-2.5}$ sampling schedule 58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(f) App D 4.8; $PM_{10-2.5}$ collocation App. A 3.3.6	Y, p.18 Appendix D	Y	
SITE OR MONITOR - SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS (OFTEN INCLUDED IN DETAILED SITE INFORMATION TABLES)					
65.	AQS site identification number for each site	58.10 (b)(1)	Y, p.4-5 Appendix D	Y	
66.	Location of each site: street address and geographic coordinates	58.10 (b)(2)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
67.	MSA, CBSA, CSA or other area represented by the monitor	58.10 (b)(8)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
68.	Parameter occurrence code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Y, Appendix D	Insufficient Info	Some monitors do not have an assigned POC. See the following: • Los Angeles (Main St.): $PM_{2.5}$ STN • Rubidoux: $PM_{2.5}$ STN

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
69.	Statement of purpose for each monitor	58.10 (a)(1)	Y, p. 7	Y	
70.	Basic monitoring objective for each monitor	App D 1.1 58.10 (b)(6)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
71.	Site type for each monitor	App D 1.1.1	Y, Appendix D	Y	
72.	Monitor type for each monitor, and Network Affiliation(s) as appropriate	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Y, Appendix D	Incorrect, Insufficient Info	Detailed site information tables in Appendix D list various Network Affiliations (i.e. NCORE, PAMS, NATTS, etc) under the Monitor Type field. In other instances (i.e. near-road) sites do not have the appropriate near-road Network Affiliations listed in the tables. In next year's ANP, include a separate line item in the detailed site information tables for Network Affiliations.
73.	Scale of representativeness for each monitor as defined in Appendix D	58.10(b)(6); App D	Y, p.6 Appendix D	N	The Pomona O_3 monitor does not meet the requirements for neighborhood scale.
74.	Parameter code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Y, Appendix D	Insufficient Info	Some monitors (see GMW 1200 PM_{10} and the Anderson RAAS $PM_{2.5}$) in Appendix D reference Table 26 for parameter code which makes it difficult to determine which parameter code is applicable to the monitor at the site, as there are multiple parameter codes applicable to a single instrument. Also, Table 26 does also not have parameter/method code pair for the Thermo 2025i $PM_{2.5}$ samplers.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
75.	Method code and description (e.g., manufacturer & model) for each monitor	58.10 (b)(3); App C 2.4.1.2	Y, Appendix D	Insufficient Info	Detailed site information tables in Appendix D list multiple method codes for the same instrument. Each monitor should only be associated with one method code. For example, The Anderson RAAS $PM_{2.5}$ sampler has both 780 and 120 listed as the method code for $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring at a number of sites, but only 120 is a valid method code for $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring. Also, the Thermo 2025i $PM_{2.5}$ samplers have both 118 and 145 method codes listed. Please provide one method code for each sampler.
76.	Sampling start date for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Y, Appendix D	Y	
77.	Distance of monitor from nearest road	App E 6	Y, Appendix D	N, Insufficient Info	The O_3 monitor at Pomona is not meeting the distance to road requirement (7 m, 25,000 AADT) for a neighborhood scale site. This monitor should be changed to micro or middle scale and not be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements. Also, please provide the actual distance from the $PM_{2.5}$ sampler at Long Beach (North) to the nearest road.
78.	Traffic count of nearest road	App E	Y, Appendix D	Y	
79.	Groundcover	App E 3(a)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
80.	Probe height	App E 2	Y, Appendix D	Y	

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
81.	Distance from supporting structure	App E 2	Y, Appendix D	N	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • Anaheim: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.5 m) & $PM_{2.5}$ POC 1 (1.0 m) • Big Bear: $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1 (1.0 m) • Compton: $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1 (1.0 m) • Crestline: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.9 m) • Fontana PM_{10}, POC 2 (1.5 m) • Glendora: PM_{10}, POC 3 (1.8 m) • Indio: PM_{10}, POC 3 (1.8 m) & $PM_{2.5}$ POC 1 (1.6 m) • Lake Elsinore: PM_{10}, POC 3 (1.8 m) • LAX Hastings: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.1 m) • Long Beach (Hudson): PM_{10}, POC 2 (1.5 m) • Long Beach (South): PM_{10}, POC 2 (1.5 m) • Los Angeles (Main St): PM_{10}, POC 2, 4 (1.5 m), $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1, 2 (1.0 m) • Mecca (Saul Martinez): PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.0 m), POC 3 (1.4 m) • Mira Loma (Van Buren): PM_{10}, POC 1, 2, 4 (1.6 m), POC 3 (1.9 m) • Norco: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.0 m) • Palm Springs: PM_{10}, POC 2 (1.5 m), POC 3 (1.7 m) • Perris: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.6 m) • Redlands: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.6 m) • Rubidoux: PM_{10}, POC 2, 4, & $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1, 2 (1.6 m) • San Bernardino: PM_{10}, POC 2 (1.0 m), 3 (1.4 m) & $PM_{2.5}$, POC 1 (1.0 m) • Santa Clarita: PM_{10}, POC 1 (1.4 m) • Upland: PM_{10}, POC 3 (1.7 m)
82.	Distance from obstructions on roof (horizontal distance to the obstruction and vertical height of the obstruction above the probe should be provided)	App E 4(b)	Y, Appendix D	Y	

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58[1]	Was the information submitted?[2] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[3]?	Does the information provided[4] meet the requirement?[5]	Notes
83.	Distance from obstructions not on roof (horizontal distance to the obstruction and vertical height of the obstruction above the probe should be provided)	App E 4(a)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
84.	Distance from the drip line of closest tree(s)	App E 5	Y, Appendix D	N	In some instances, the requirement was not met: • Crestline • La Habra • Pasadena
85.	Distance to furnace or incinerator flue	App E 3(b)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
86.	Unrestricted airflow (expressed as degrees around probe/inlet or percentage of monitoring path)	App E, 4(a) and 4(b)	Y, Appendix D	Y	
87.	Probe material ($NO/NO_2/NO_y$, SO_2, O_3; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Y, Appendix D	Y	
88.	Residence time ($NO/NO_2/NO_y$, SO_2, O_3; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Y, Appendix D	Y	

Public Comments on Annual Network Plan

Were comments submitted to the S/L/T agency during the public comment period?

No

If no, skip the remaining questions.

If yes:

- Were any of the comments substantive?
  - If yes, which ones?
  - Explain basis for determination if any comments were considered not substantive:
- Did the agency respond to the substantive comments?
  - If yes, was the response adequate?
- Do the substantive comments require separate EPA response (i.e., agency response wasn't adequate)?
- Are the sections of the annual network plan that received substantive comments approvable after consideration of comments?
  - If yes, provide rationale: