

Hoekzema, Andrew

From: Bryan Lambeth [Bryan.Lambeth@tceq.texas.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 9:59 AM
To: Hoekzema, Andrew; Ken Rozacky
Cc: Gill, Bill; Amir Poursamadi; Chris Kite; Daphne McMurrer; Erik Gribbin; Kristin Bourdon; Laura Roberts; Melanie Hotchkiss; Patricia Delacruz; Sally Klein; Stephanie Ma
Subject: Re: What is the Official Status of CAMS 614

Andrew,

I have some options for everyone involved to consider for Dripping Springs C614.

- 1) Next year operate the ozone monitor as non-regulatory and do not continue the NOx monitoring. With this approach a station calibrator would not be required and operation costs would be lowered significantly.
- 2) TCEQ should consider surplusing the ozone monitor and station to CAPCOG, thus removing any TCEQ attachment to the site.
- 3) Since the ozone data would be non-regulatory, TCEQ would no longer upload the ozone data to AQS, which also would remove this TCEQ obligation.

Since this site currently has the highest 4th high 8-hour ozone average in the Austin area for 2011, I recommend continuation of ozone monitoring at this site for at least one or two more ozone seasons.

Bryan

Bryan Lambeth, PE
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Field Operations Support Division
512-239-1657

>>> Ken Rozacky 9/13/2011 3:30 PM >>>
Hi Andrew,

Good questions for which there may be some different perspectives in some of the answers.

I could not figure out how to get your Email to images to transfer correctly, so I attached the original EMail.

- Q1) Is CAPCOG or TCEQ the owner of the site?
- Q2) Is CAPCOG or TCEQ the owner of the equipment?
- Q3) If CAPCOG is the owner of the site but TCEQ is the owner of the equipment, does CAPCOG's "ownership" of the site mean?

1-3 answer: TCEQ equipment placed by choice at a CAPCOG site.

I verified this with Kristin. Currently, c614 Dripping Springs is considered to be - Special Purpose, Seasonal (with this designation it is not considered part of the TCEQ SLAMS network).

- Q4) Is CAMS 614 considered by TCEQ or EPA to be a regulatory monitor?

Q 4 answer: The "R" designation in the webpages is a bit fuzzier....
but the designation in the webpage has more to do with could the data be used, versus are the data used for regulatory purposes.

- 5) Does TCEQ MonOps or EPA need to approve any changes to monitoring at CAMS 614?

Q 5 answer - Depends on who you ask.

6) Does TCEQ plan to locate a NOX monitor at CAMS 3 (Austin NW) in order to comply with the NO2 monitoring requirements?

If not, where does TCEQ plan to locate the community-scale NOX monitor to comply with those requirements?

7) Could CAPCOG move the NOX monitor currently located at Dripping Springs to another location?

Q6 and 7 answer - We had talked about this when y'all were planning the 2011 deployment and I think everyone at that time was OK with doing this.

8) Does TCEQ plan to continue to repair and replace the equipment at CAMS 614 as long as it continues to be operated?

Q8 - TCEQ owned equipment will be repaired by TCEQ unless other arrangements have been made.

9) Since only 2 monitoring stations are required for the area under EPA's monitoring rule, would TCEQ continue funding the operation of CAMS

614 if the Rider 8 funding was not available to continue operating the monitor at some point in the future?

Q9 - This is really a question for the extra folks I have added to this EMail distribution.

I just try to make things happen when someone asks for data.

If there becomes no reason to keep gathering data at Dripping Springs, then the site can come off the board.

More as things evolve,

Ken

Ken Rozacky
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
phone (512) 239- 6942 or 512-239-1691 FAX (512)-239-1605
E-mail: ken.rozacky@tceq.texas.gov
Regular Mail: P.O. Box 13087, MC 165,Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Shipping: 12100 Park 35 Circle, MC 165, Austin, Texas 78753

>>> "Hoekzema, Andrew" <ahoekzema@capcog.org> 9/13/2011 12:48 PM >>>

Ken:

Bill and I have been trying to understand the exact status of CAMS 614(Dripping Springs). On several of the MonOps reports, and in several EPA reports, it appears that CAMS 614 is considered a regulatory monitor. For instance, the "attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard" report includes CAMS 614:

Austin
<http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/cgi-bin/compliance/monops/select_summary.pl?region11.gif>

Dripping Springs School C614

<http://www5.tceq.state.tx.us/tamis/index.cfm?fuseaction=report.view_site&CAMS=614>

1

65 *

72 *

77

71

Audubon C38

<http://www5.tceq.state.tx.us/tamis/index.cfm?fuseaction=report.view_site&CAMS=38>

1

69

70

71

70

Austin Northwest C3/A322

<http://www5.tceq.state.tx.us/tamis/index.cfm?fuseaction=report.view_site&CAMS=3>

2

76

74

75

75

Similarly, CAMS 614 shows up in some of the EPA's report of monitoring station design values, but not others:

http://www.epa.gov/airtrends/pdfs/Ozone_DesignValues_20082010_FINAL.xlsx

However, the site description lists the "owner" of the site as CAPCOG.

http://www5.tceq.state.tx.us/tamis/index.cfm?fuseaction=report.view_site&formSub=1&showActiveOnly=1&showActMonOnly=1&siteID=1

Further, it is not listed as part of SLAMS in TCEQ's annual network review for 2011:

In the discussions we had with y'all last year about moving equipment, it seemed like somehow CAPCOG would need to obtain TCEQ's permission to move any of the equipment currently located at Dripping Springs to another location. It also sounded to us in a recent discussion with Bryan Lambeth that EPA might now consider this site part of SLAMS or NAMS and that moving any of that equipment or making any changes to monitoring at that site might require EPA approval.

With all of that in mind, I have a few questions:

- 1) Is CAPCOG or TCEQ the owner of the site?
- 2) Is CAPCOG or TCEQ the owner of the equipment?
- 3) If CAPCOG is the owner of the site but TCEQ is the owner of the equipment, does CAPCOG's "ownership" of the site mean?
- 4) Is CAMS 614 considered by TCEQ or EPA to be a regulatory monitor?
- 5) Does TCEQ MonOps or EPA need to approve any changes to monitoring at CAMS 614?
- 6) Does TCEQ plan to locate a NOX monitor at CAMS 3 (Austin NW) in order to comply with the NO2 monitoring requirements? If not, where does TCEQ plan to locate the community-scale NOX monitor to comply with those requirements?
- 7) Could CAPCOG move the NOX monitor currently located at Dripping Springs to another location?
- 8) Does TCEQ plan to continue to repair and replace the equipment at CAMS 614 as long as it continues to be operated?
- 9) Since only 2 monitoring stations are required for the area under EPA's monitoring rule, would TCEQ continue funding the operation of CAMS 614 if the Rider 8 funding was not available to continue operating the monitor at some point in the future?

It would help us better understand our own long-term planning needs for monitoring if we could have these issues cleared up.

Thanks,

Andrew Hoekzema

Air Quality Program Specialist

Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG)

Phone: (512) 916-6043 * Fax: (512) 916-6001

ahoekzema@capcog.org ~ www.capcog.org <<http://www.capcog.org/>>

www.austinairquality.com

No electronic communication by a CAPCOG

employee may legally obligate the agency.