Appendix A

Crosswalk: DAQ Response to EPA on the 2015 Network Plan Comments – Cross Reference Guide

Table of Contents

Enclosure A 2
Enclosure B 3
Enclosure C 4

Enclosure A

Item	Checklist Row	Issue	DAQ Response
Distance between QA collocated monitors	16	Not meeting requirement	Collocated $PM_{2.5}$ FRMs at Jerome Mack meet the 1-4 meter distance requirement. Collocated $PM_{2.5}$ FRM to FEM distance at Sunrise Acres has been adjusted to 4 meters.
Sampling season for O_3	53	Insufficient information to judge	DAQ has resubmitted waivers for O_3 monitoring based on the new O_3 standard.
Minimum monitoring requirement for second near-road NO_2 monitor	55	Not meeting requirement	DAQ began operating the Central Fire Station near-road site in 2016.
Distance from supporting structure	78	Insufficient information to judge	The PM_{10} monitors at the South Las Vegas sites (Liberty High School and Nathanial Jones Park) and Garret Junior High School will be greater than 2 meters from their supporting structures.
Distance from obstructions not on roof	80	Not meeting requirement and insufficient information to judge	DAQ is reassessing the JD Smith site based on Appendix E criteria. For Indian springs, this measurement (obstruction height above probe) is not applicable because probe is above obstruction.

Enclosure B

Additional Items Requiring Attention

DAQ Responses are in Blue text

[Item 9] Two near-road sites were approved by EPA as part of the 2014 ANP. Sites were required to begin operation by January 1, 2015. DAQ notes the Teddy and Rancho site started monitoring NO_2 in 2015 (page 45) and that the Central Fire Station site is anticipated to begin monitoring in 2015 (page 15). Please include exact start dates in next year's ANP.

- DAQ began operating the Teddy and Rancho site on August 1, 2015, and will begin operating the Central Fire Station site in 2016.

[Items 17 and 18] Please list flow rates in next year's ANP.

- DAQ included flow rates for all PM (low vol and high vol) instruments.

[Item 73] Please include exact start date of Teddy and Rancho and Central Fire Station sites.

- DAQ provided the start date of August 1, 2015, for the Teddy and Rancho site, and will begin operating the Central Fire Station site in 2016.

[Item 62] Please provide AQS IDs for South Las Vegas Valley and Garrett Junior High in next year's ANP.

- DAQ provided AQS IDs for all existing and planned sites. DAQ does not have AQS IDs for sites that are only proposed.

Enclosure C

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS						
1.	Submit plan by July 1st	58.10 (a)(1)	Yes	Yes	Plan was received June 3, 2015	Requirement satisfied.
2.	30-day public comment/ inspection period[5]	58.10 (a)(1), 58.10 (a)(2)	Yes; transmittal letter	Yes	No comments were received. Note, public inspection dates listed in the ANP on page 1 are incorrect.	Requirement satisfied.

[1] Response options: NA (Not Applicable), Yes, No, Incomplete, Incorrect. The responses "Incomplete" and "Incorrect" assume that some information has been provided.
[2] To the best of our knowledge.
[3] Assuming the information is correct.
[4] Response options: NA (Not Applicable) – [reason], Yes, No, Insufficient to Judge.
[5] 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	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
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	Yes, page 70	Insufficient Info	EPA is not approving the request to close criteria pollutant monitoring at Sunrise Acres and JD Smith and redeploy in a new location (June 2016). Please work with EPA on this request. EPA is also unable to approve the PM_{10} monitor deployment at Walter Johnson due to insufficient information on monitor type (i.e. SLAMS, SPM, etc.).	DAQ is resubmitting monitoring station close out requests using requirements outlined in 40 CFR 58.14 under separate cover. DAQ has provided complete information in Section 4 of the network plan (see table specific to Walter Johnson).

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
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	Yes	Yes	• Redeploy O_3 at Indian Springs as SLAMS, see Row 80 below. • New SLAMS PM_{10} monitoring at South Las Vegas, see Row 78 below. • New SLAMS O_3 and PM_{10} at Garrett Junior High, see Rows 78 below.	Requirement satisfied.
5.	Does plan include documentation (e.g., attached approval letter) for system modifications that have been approved since last ANP approval?		NA	NA	None	Requirement satisfied.
6.	Any proposals to remove or move a monitoring station within a period of 18 months following plan submittal	58.10 (b)(5)	Yes, pages 58-59	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
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)	Yes, page 73	Yes	DAQ anticipates having this monitor operational by January 1, 2017, as required.	Requirement satisfied.
8.	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)	Yes, page 73	Yes	DAQ anticipates having this monitor operational by January 1, 2017, as required.	Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
9.	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)	Yes	Yes	Two near-road sites were approved by EPA as part of the 2014 ANP. Sites were required to begin operation by January 1, 2015. DAQ notes the Teddy and Rancho site started monitoring NO_2 in 2015 (page 45) and that the Central Fire Station site is anticipated to begin monitoring in 2015 (page 15). Please include exact start dates in next year's ANP.	Near Road sites' start dates are provided in Section 4 of the network plan (see table specific to Teddy-Rancho and Central Fire Station).
10.	Precision/Accuracy reports submitted to AQS	58.16(a); App A, 1.3 and 5.1.1	Yes, page 5	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
11.	Annual data certification submitted	58.15 App. A 1.3	Yes, page 5	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
12.	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.[6]	58.11 (a) (2)	Yes, Appendix A, page A-10		Indian Springs and Logandale meet Appendix A and E, Spring Mountain Youth Camp is not operating as an FEM. Please include this information in the body of next year's ANP.	Requirement satisfied.
13.	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.[7]	58.20(c)	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.

[6] 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.
[7] 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	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
14.	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)	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.
GENERAL PARTICULATE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS (PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, Pb-TSP, Pb-PM_{10})						
15.	Designation of a primary monitor if there is more than one monitor for a pollutant at a site.	Need to determine collocation	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
16.	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	Yes, Section 4	No	Distance between QA collocated monitors: 3.7 m at Jerome Mack ($PM_{2.5}$ FRMs) 4.6 m at Sunrise Acres ($PM_{2.5}$ FRM and FEM) - Samplers measuring the same pollutant to fulfill QA collocation requirements should be between 1-4 m for lovol and 2-4 m for highvol instruments.	The distance between collocated monitors at Jerome Mack meets QA collocation requirements. At Sunrise Acres, the FEM to FRM distance has been adjusted to 4 meters and now meets QA collocation requirements.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
17.	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	Yes, Section 4	Yes	Please list flow rates in next year's ANP	The flow rate for low volume instruments has been indicated in the network plan; see Section 2.0.
18.	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	Yes, Section 4	Yes	Please list flow rates in next year's ANP	The flow rate for the high volume sampler has been indicated in the network plan; see Section 2.0.
$PM_{2.5}$ –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
19.	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)	Yes, pages 58-59 and 73	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
20.	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)	NA	NA	None requested	Requirement satisfied.
21.	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	Yes, page 6	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
22.	Requirements for continuous $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring (number of monitors and collocation)	App D 4.7.2	Yes, page 6	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
23.	FRM/FEM/ARM $PM_{2.5}$ QA collocation	App A 3.2.5	Yes, page 9	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
24.	$PM_{2.5}$ Chemical Speciation requirements for official STN sites	App D 4.7.4	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.
25.	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)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
26.	Required $PM_{2.5}$ sites represent area-wide air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
27.	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)	Yes, Section 4	Yes	Sunrise Acres is maximum concentration site	Requirement satisfied.
28.	Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road $PM_{2.5}$ monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015	58.13(f)(1) App D 4.7.1(b)(2)	NA	NA	$PM_{2.5}$ near road monitoring will be required January 1, 2017	Requirement satisfied.
29.	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)	Yes, Section 4	Yes	J.D. Smith and Jerome Mack fulfill this requirement	Requirement satisfied.
30.	States must have at least one $PM_{2.5}$ regional background and one $PM_{2.5}$ regional transport site.	App D 4.7.3	Yes, Section 4	Yes	Jean is a background and transport site	Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
31.	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	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
32.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual $PM_{2.5}$ monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
33.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated $PM_{2.5}$ monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
34.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2014** for $PM_{2.5}$ monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
PM_{10} –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
35.	Minimum # of monitoring sites for PM_{10}	App D, 4.6 (a) and Table D-4	Yes, page 7	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
36.	Manual PM_{10} method collocation (note: continuous PM_{10} does not have this requirement)	App A 3.3.1	NA	NA	All PM_{10} monitors are continuous	Requirement satisfied.
37.	Sampling schedule for PM_{10}	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(e) App D 4.6	Yes, Section 4	Yes	All monitors are continuous	Requirement satisfied.
38.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual PM_{10} monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	NA	NA	All monitors are continuous	Requirement satisfied.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the information submitted?[1] If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect[2]?	Does the information provided[3] meet the requirement?[4]	Notes	DAQ Response
39.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated PM_{10} monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
40.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2014** for PM_{10} monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Yes, Section 4	Yes	The dates for semi-annual flow audits at the Boulder City and Paul Meyer are technically not within the recommended 5-7 month range, but because the audits only missed this range by 5 and 1 day respectively, EPA believes these audits to meet the requirement.	Requirement satisfied.

Pb –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
41	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)	Yes, page 8	Yes	None required	Requirement satisfied.
42	Pb collocation: for non-NCore sites	App A 3.3.4.3	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.
43	Any source-oriented Pb site for which a waiver has been granted by EPA Regional Administrator	58.10 (b)(10)	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.
44	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)	NA	NA		Requirement satisfied.
45	Designation of any Pb monitors as either source-oriented or non-source-oriented	58.10 (b)(9)	Yes, pages 8, 25-30	Yes	Only NCore Pb is required	Requirement satisfied.
46	Sampling schedule for Pb	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(b) App D 4.5	Yes, page 27	Yes	1:6	Requirement satisfied.
47	Frequency of flow rate verification for Pb monitors audit	App A 3.3.4.1	Yes, page 29	Yes	Performed monthly	Requirement satisfied.
48	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in **CY2014** for Pb monitors	App A 3.3.4.1	Yes, page, 30	Yes	One performed each quarter of 2014	Requirement satisfied.

GENERAL GASEOUS MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
49	Frequency of one-point QC check (gaseous)	App. A 3.2.1	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
50	Date of Annual Performance Evaluation (gaseous) conducted in **CY2014**	App. A 3.2.2	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
O3 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
51	Minimum # of monitoring sites for O_3 [Note: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitoring sites, and # required monitoring sites][8]	App D, 4.1(a) and Table D-2	Yes, page 6	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
52	Identification of maximum concentration O_3 site(s)	App D 4.1 (b)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

[8] Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements. In addition, ozone monitors that do not meet traffic count/distance requirements to be neighborhood or urban scale (40 CFR 58 Appendix E, Table E-1) cannot be counted towards minimum monitoring requirements.

53	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)	Yes, Section 4, page 35, and Appendix B; Letter from Stephen Deyo, DAQ to Jared Blumenfeld, EPA dated July 29, 2015	Insufficient Info	Appendix B includes an ozone season waiver letter from EPA dated March 8, 2012 which approves a shortened monitoring season at Apex and Mesquite sites. In last year's ANP review, EPA asked DAQ to include the information that continues to support a shortened ozone season and request renewal of the ozone season waiver. DAQ requested a renewal of this waiver on page 35 and attached the original approval letter in Appendix B. Additionally, in a letter from Stephen Deyo, DAQ to Jared Blumenfeld, EPA dated July 29, 2015, DAQ requested an ozone season waiver for the newly deployed SLAMS site at Indian Springs. EPA is unable to approve current waiver renewal requests for Apex and Mesquite. EPA notes that Indian Springs will continue to operate through the remainder of CY2015 and therefore, approval of the new waiver request for Indian Springs is not needed at this time. Please resubmit new waiver requests for these sites addressing the 2015 8-hour Ozone NAAQS.	DAQ has applied for non-summer O_3 monitoring waivers under separate cover. These waiver requests are based on the new O_3 NAAQS.

NO_2 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
54.	Minimum monitoring requirement for single near-road NO_2 monitor (in CBSA ≥ 1 million) by 1/1/2014	58.13(c)(3) App D 4.3.2	Yes	Yes	EPA approved the selection of the near-road site at Teddy and Rancho Drive per the site selection as part of the 2014 ANP. The site started monitoring in 2015. Please include exact date of operation commenced in next year's ANP.	Requirement satisfied.
55.	Minimum monitoring requirement for second near-road NO_2 monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015	58.13(c)(4) App D 4.3.2	Yes	No	EPA approved the selection of the Central Fire Station near-road site as part of the 2014 ANP. This requirement, however, is not fully met until operation of monitor begins. As of June 2015, the site had not begun operation.	DAQ will begin operating the Central Fire Station near-road site in 2016.
56.	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)	App D 4.3.3	Yes, page 7	Yes	One required, fulfilled by J.D. Smith and Sunrise Acres	Requirement satisfied.
57.	Minimum monitoring requirements for susceptible and vulnerable populations monitoring (aka RA40) NO_2 (operation required by January 1, 2013)	App D 4.3.4	Yes, page 7	Yes	One required, fulfilled by Sunrise Acres	Requirement satisfied.

58.	Identification of required NO_2 monitors as either near-road, area-wide, or vulnerable and susceptible population (aka RA40)	58.10 (b)(12)	Yes, page 7	Yes	Identified as Sunrise Acres	Requirement satisfied.
CO –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
59.	Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road CO monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015	58.13(e)(1) App D 4.2.1	NA	NA	Near-road monitoring for CO required by 1/1/2017	Requirement satisfied.
SO_2 –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
60	Minimum monitoring requirements for SO_2 [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D 4.4	Yes, page 7	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

NCORE –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS						
61	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	Yes, pages 25-30	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
SITE OR MONITOR - SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS (OFTEN INCLUDED IN DETAILED SITE INFORMATION TABLES)						
62	AQS site identification number for each site	58.10 (b)(1)	Yes, Section 4	Yes	Please provide AQS IDs for South Las Vegas Valley and Garrett Junior High in next year's ANP.	DAQ will provide AQS IDs for each existing and planned monitoring site. AQS IDs are not available for proposed monitoring sites.
63	Location of each site: street address and geographic coordinates	58.10 (b)(2)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
64	MSA, CBSA, CSA or other area represented by the monitor	58.10 (b)(8)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

65	Parameter occurrence code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
66	Statement of purpose for each monitor	58.10 (a)(1)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
67	Basic monitoring objective for each monitor	App D 1.1 58.10 (b)(6)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
68	Site type for each monitor	App D 1.1.1	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
69	Monitor type for each monitor, and Network Affiliation(s) as appropriate	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
70	Scale of representativeness for each monitor as defined in Appendix D	58.10(b)(6); App D	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
71	Parameter code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
72	Method code and description (e.g., manufacturer & model) for each monitor	58.10 (b)(3); App C 2.4.1.2	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

73	Sampling start date for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, Section 4	Incomplete	Please include exact start date of Teddy and Rancho and Central Fire Station sites.	Start dates provided for Teddy and Rancho and Central Fire Station sites (see table specific to Teddy-Rancho and Central Fire Station).
74	Distance of monitor from nearest road	App E 6	Yes	Yes	EPA notes that the following monitors were converted to middle scale: : • O_3 at Mesquite • NO_2 at Joe Neal	Requirement satisfied.
75	Traffic count of nearest road	App E	Yes, page 5 and Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
76	Groundcover	App E 3(a)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
77	Probe height	App E 2	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
78	Distance from supporting structure	App E 2	Yes, Section 4	Insufficient Info	The proposed South Las Vegas and Garrett Junior High SLAMS PM_{10} sites list distance from supporting structure as 1.2 m (anticipated) and 1.5 m (anticipated), respectively. This distance should be >2 m.	The PM_{10} monitors at the south Las Vegas sites (Liberty High School and Nathanial Jones Park) and Garret Junior High School will be greater than 2 meters from their supporting structures.
79	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)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.

80	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)	Yes, Section 4	No, Insufficient Info	The JD Smith site does not meet App E 4(a). Please add obstruction height above probe to your description at the Indian Springs site.	DAQ is reassessing the JD Smith site based on Appendix E criteria. For Indian Springs, the obstruction height above probe measurement is not applicable because the probe is above obstruction.
81	Distance from the drip line of closest tree(s)	App E 5	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
82	Distance to furnace or incinerator flue	App E 3(b)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
83	Unrestricted airflow (expressed as degrees around probe/inlet or percentage of monitoring path)	App E, 4(a) and 4(b)	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
84	Probe material ($NO/NO_2/NO_y$, SO_2, O_3; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.
85	Residence time ($NO/NO_2/NO_y$, SO_2, O_3; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Yes, Section 4	Yes		Requirement satisfied.