



GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

---

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION**

Air Protection Branch

Ambient Monitoring Program

### **2011 Ambient Air Surveillance Report**

This document is published annually by the Ambient Monitoring Program, in the Air Protection Branch of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division.

Date of Initial Publication November 1, 2012

DISCLAIMER: Any reference to specific brand names is not an endorsement of that brand by Georgia Environmental Protection Division.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	vi
GLOSSARY .....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHEMICAL MONITORING ACTIVITIES .....	2
CARBON MONOXIDE (CO).....	8
OXIDES OF NITROGEN (NO, NO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> and NO <sub>y</sub> ) .....	13
SULFUR DIOXIDE (SO <sub>2</sub> ) .....	19
OZONE (O <sub>3</sub> ).....	23
LEAD (Pb).....	34
PARTICULATE MATTER.....	39
PM <sub>10</sub> .....	40
PM <sub>Coarse</sub> .....	45
PM <sub>2.5</sub> .....	46
PM <sub>2.5</sub> SPECIATION.....	57
PHOTOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT MONITORING STATIONS (PAMS) .....	63
CARBONYL COMPOUNDS.....	68
AIR TOXICS MONITORING.....	75
METALS.....	77
HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM (Cr <sub>6</sub> ) .....	82
VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS (TO-14/15).....	83
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS .....	88
METEOROLOGICAL REPORT .....	92
STATE CLIMATOLOGY AND METEOROLOGICAL SUMMARY OF 2011.....	92
SUMMARY OF METEOROLOGICAL MEASUREMENTS FOR 2011.....	95
OZONE AND PM <sub>2.5</sub> FORECASTING AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	97
QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	106
QUALITY CONTROL AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT .....	107
GASEOUS POLLUTANTS .....	108
PARTICULATE MATTER.....	111
AIR TOXICS.....	116
NATTS.....	117
PHOTOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT MONITORING.....	120
METEOROLOGY .....	124
QUALITY CONTROL REPORTS .....	125
STANDARDS LABORATORY.....	125
LABORATORY AND FIELD STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE.....	125
SITING EVALUATIONS .....	125
RISK ASSESSMENT .....	127
INTRODUCTION.....	127
RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION .....	127
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION .....	136
OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.....	141
MEDIA OUTREACH.....	145
OTHER OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES.....	145
Appendix A: Additional Criteria Pollutant Data.....	148
Carbon Monoxide (CO) .....	148
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ).....	148
Nitric Oxide (NO).....	148
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> ) .....	149
Reactive Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>y</sub> ) .....	149
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> ).....	150

Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> ) .....	151
Lead (Pb) .....	153
Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) .....	154
Appendix B: Additional PM <sub>2.5</sub> Particle Speciation Data .....	160
Appendix C: Additional PAMS Data.....	165
PAMS Continuous Hydrocarbon Data (June-August 2011) .....	165
PAMS 2011 24-hour Canister Hydrocarbons.....	169
Appendix D: Additional Toxics Data .....	173
2011 Metals .....	173
2011 Semi-Volatile Compounds .....	175
2011 Volatile Organic Compounds .....	178
2011 Carbonyl Compounds, 3-hour (June-August) .....	184
2011 Carbonyl Compounds, 24-hour.....	185
Appendix E: Monitoring Network Survey .....	186
Appendix F: Siting Criteria.....	191
Appendix G: Instrument and Sensor Control Limits .....	193
References.....	194



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Georgia Air Monitoring Site Map.....	7
Figure 2: Common Sources of Carbon Monoxide (CO) in Georgia in 2008.....	8
Figure 3: Carbon Monoxide (CO) Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View .....	8
Figure 4: Carbon Monoxide Site Monitoring Map.....	10
Figure 5: Carbon Monoxide First Maximum, Compared to 1-Hour Standard.....	12
Figure 6: Carbon Monoxide First Maximum, Compared to 8-Hour Standard.....	12
Figure 7: Typical Diurnal Pattern of Nitrogen Dioxide .....	13
Figure 8: Common Sources of Nitrogen Oxides in Georgia in 2008.....	14
Figure 9: Nitrogen Oxides Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View .....	15
Figure 10: Oxides of Nitrogen Monitoring Site Map .....	17
Figure 11: Nitrogen Dioxide Annual Averages Compared to Standard, 2000-2011.....	18
Figure 12: Nitrogen Dioxide 1-Hour Design Values, 2002-2011.....	18
Figure 13: Common Sources of Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> ) in Georgia in 2008 .....	19
Figure 14: Sulfur Dioxide Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View.....	19
Figure 15: SO <sub>2</sub> 99 <sup>th</sup> of 1-Hour Maximum Daily Averages, 2000-2011 .....	20
Figure 16: SO <sub>2</sub> 1-Hour Design Values, 2000-2011 .....	20
Figure 17: Sulfur Dioxide Monitoring Site Map.....	22
Figure 18: Typical Urban 1-Hour Ozone Diurnal Pattern.....	23
Figure 19: Ozone Formation Process .....	23
Figure 20: Common Sources of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) in Georgia in 2008 .....	24
Figure 21: Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View .....	24
Figure 22: Ozone Monitoring Site Map .....	26
Figure 23: Georgia's 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Map for 1997 Standard .....	28
Figure 24: Georgia's 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Map for 2008 Standard .....	29
Figure 25: Metro Atlanta Ozone- Number of Violation Days per Year .....	30
Figure 26: Ozone Design Values, 2002-2011 .....	31
Figure 27: Metro Atlanta Ozone Exceedance Map .....	32
Figure 28: Ozone Concentrations in ppm, 2010 (Fourth Highest Daily Maximum 8-Hour Concentrations) .....	33
Figure 29: Common Sources of Lead in Georgia in 2008 .....	34
Figure 30: Lead Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View.....	34
Figure 31: Lead Monitoring Site Map.....	36
Figure 32: Three-Month Rolling Averages of Lead, 2010-2011.....	38
Figure 33: Lead Concentrations in µg/m <sup>3</sup> , 2010 (Maximum 3-month Averages) .....	38
Figure 34: Analogy of Particulate Matter Size to Human Hair .....	39
Figure 35: PM <sub>10</sub> Monitoring Site Map.....	41
Figure 36: Second Highest 24-Hour PM <sub>10</sub> Concentration.....	43
Figure 37: PM <sub>10</sub> Annual Arithmetic Mean Chart .....	44
Figure 38: PM <sub>10</sub> Second Maximum 24-Hour Concentrations (µg/m <sup>3</sup> ), 2010 .....	45
Figure 39: Common Sources of Particulate Matter 2.5 in 2008.....	47
Figure 40: Particulate Matter 2.5 Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View .....	47
Figure 41: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Federal Reference Method Monitoring Site Map.....	49
Figure 42: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Continuous and Speciation Monitoring Site Map .....	50
Figure 43: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Three-Year 24-Hour Averages, By Site .....	52
Figure 44: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Three-Year Annual Averages, By Site.....	53
Figure 45: Georgia's PM <sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Area Map .....	55
Figure 46: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Annual and 24-Hour Concentrations across the United States, 2010 .....	56
Figure 47: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Speciation, by Species, 2003-2011 .....	58
Figure 48: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Speciation, by Site, 2003-2011 .....	60
Figure 49: Four-Season Average of PM <sub>2.5</sub> Composition Data for 15 U.S. Cities .....	62
Figure 50: PAMS Monitoring Site Map.....	64
Figure 51: Isoprene Yearly Profile, 2003-2011 .....	65
Figure 52: Seasonal Occurrence of Isoprene .....	66
Figure 53: Toluene Yearly Profile, 2003-2011 .....	66

Figure 54: Toluene & Isoprene, Typical Urban Daily Profile.....	67
Figure 55: Carbonyls Monitoring Site Map.....	69
Figure 56: Average South DeKalb 3-Hour Carbonyls, June-August, 2005-2011.....	70
Figure 57: Average 24-Hour Carbonyls Concentration and Number of Detects, by Site, 2005-2011 .	71
Figure 58: Average 24-Hour Carbonyls Concentration vs. Number of Detects, by Species, 2005-2011 .....	72
Figure 59: Acrolein Concentrations and Percent Detections, 2007- 2011 .....	73
Figure 60: Metals Monitoring Site Map .....	79
Figure 61: Percentage of Metals Detections by Site, 2005-2011 .....	80
Figure 62: Average Concentration and Percentage Detections of Metals, by Species, 2005-2011 ....	81
Figure 63: Average Concentration Comparison of Zinc, by Site, 2005-2011.....	82
Figure 64: Hexavalent Chromium at South DeKalb .....	83
Figure 65: Total Volatile Organic Compounds Percent Detected per Site, 2005-2011 .....	84
Figure 66: Average Concentration and Percent Detection of Common Volatile Organic Compounds (TO-15), 2005–2011 .....	85
Figure 67: Total Volatile Organic Compound Loading all Species, by Site, 2005-2011.....	86
Figure 68: VOC and SVOC Monitoring Site Map .....	87
Figure 69: Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds Percentage of Detections Per Site, 2009-2011 .....	88
Figure 70: Total Average Concentration and Percentage Detections of Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds by Compound, 2005-2011.....	89
Figure 71: Tornado Outbreak, April 27-28, 2011 .....	93
Figure 72: Drought Conditions as of August 30, 2011 .....	94
Figure 73: Meteorological Site Map .....	96
Figure 74: Monthly Time Series of Ozone Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 Ozone Season (May-September).....	98
Figure 75: Monthly Time Series of PM <sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (January-March) .....	99
Figure 76: Monthly Time Series of PM <sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (April-June) .....	100
Figure 77: Monthly Time Series of PM <sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (July-September) .....	100
Figure 78: Monthly Time Series of PM <sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (October-December) .....	101
Figure 79: Wind Direction and Continuous PM <sub>2.5</sub> at Savannah L&A Site on June 17, 2011.....	102
Figure 80: Backward Trajectory of Smoke to Savannah L&A Site on June 17, 2011 .....	102
Figure 81: MODIS Locations of Fires on June 16, 2011 .....	103
Figure 82: Aerosol Optical Depth with MODIS AOD Terra Imagery, June 16, 2011 .....	103
Figure 83: Satellite Imagery Showing the Development of Pyro-Cumulus on June 16, 2011 .....	104
Figure 84: Wind Direction and Continuous PM <sub>2.5</sub> at Savannah L&A Site on July 5, 2011.....	105
Figure 85: Formulas for Calculating Risk and Hazard Quotient .....	132
Figure 87: Estimated Tract-Level Cancer Risk from the 2005 National Air Toxics Assessment .....	139
Figure 88: Estimated Tract-Level Total Respiratory Hazard Index from the 2005 National Air Toxics Assessment .....	140
Figure 89: The AQI.....	142
Figure 90: Number of Days with an AQI Value Above 100 .....	144
Figure 91: Sample AIRNOW Ozone Concentration Map .....	146

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: National Ambient Air Quality Standards Summary .....	3
Table 2: 2011 Georgia Air Monitoring Network .....	6
Table 3: Common Oxides of Nitrogen Species and Terms .....	14
Table 4: Audits Performed for Each Air Monitoring Program in 2011 .....	107
Table 5: NO Data Quality Assessment .....	109
Table 6: NO <sub>2</sub> Data Quality Assessment .....	109
Table 7: NO <sub>x</sub> Data Quality Assessment.....	109
Table 8: CO Data Quality Assessment .....	110
Table 9: SO <sub>2</sub> Data Quality Assessment .....	110
Table 10: O <sub>3</sub> Data Quality Assessment .....	111
Table 11: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Data Quality Assessment for FRM Samplers .....	113
Table 12: PM <sub>2.5</sub> Data Quality Assessment for Semi-Continuous Samplers .....	114
Table 13: PM <sub>10</sub> Data Quality Assessment of 24-Hour Integrated and Semi-Continuous Samplers ..	114
Table 14: Summary of Unexposed Filter Mass Replicates.....	115
Table 15: Summary of Exposed Filter Mass Replicates.....	115
Table 16: Current List of NATTS Sites with AQS Site Codes.....	118
Table 17: Measurement Quality Objectives for the NATTS Program .....	119
Table 18: MQO Data Sources for the Georgia NAATS Program.....	119
Table 19: 23 Selected HAPs and Their AQS Parameter Codes.....	120
Table 20: Percent Completeness of Georgia's 2011 AQS Data, Selected Compounds .....	120
Table 21: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for South DeKalb.....	121
Table 22: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Conyers .....	122
Table 23: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Yorkville .....	123
Table 24: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Ambient Monitoring Program .....	124
Table 25: Meteorological Measurements Accuracy Results.....	125
Table 26: Compounds Monitored and Screening Values Used in Initial Assessment.....	129
Table 27: Summary of Chemicals Analyzed in 2011.....	130
Table 28: Site-Specific Detection Frequency and Mean Chemical Concentration, 2011 .....	131
Table 29: Cancer Risk and Hazard Quotient by Location and Chemical, 2011 .....	133
Table 30: Aggregate Cancer Risk and Hazard Indices for Each Site, Excluding Carbonyls, 2011 ...	134
Table 31: Summary Data for Select VOCs at PAMS Sites, 2011 .....	135
Table 32: Summary Observations, Cancer Risk, and Hazard Quotient for Carbonyls, 2011 .....	135
Table 33: AQI Summary Data, 2011.....	143
Table 34: AIRNOW Participation Evaluation Results .....	147

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ambient Monitoring Program of the Air Protection Branch of the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has monitored air quality in the State of Georgia for more than thirty years. The list of compounds monitored has grown over the thirty years to more than 200 pollutants using several types of samplers at sites statewide. This monitoring is performed to protect public health and environmental quality. The resulting data is used for a broad range of regulatory and research purposes, as well as to inform the public. This report is the summary of the monitoring data from 2011, and is an assessment of the data in conjunction with previous years' findings.

The Chemical Monitoring Activities, Photochemical Assessment Monitoring (PAMS), and Air Toxics Monitoring sections provide an in-depth discussion of the chemicals that are monitored and maps identify individual monitoring sites. These sections also contain discussions on general health effects, measurement techniques, and attainment designations for the criteria pollutants that are monitored. Additionally, these sections discuss trends and common sources for the monitored pollutants.

Six pollutants fall within the criteria pollutant list. These pollutants are carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, lead, ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (now regulated in two size categories). The ambient concentrations of these pollutants must meet a regulatory standard. The regulatory standard is health-based. Concentrations above the standard are considered unhealthy for sensitive groups.

Another set of compounds called air toxics are monitored throughout the state in the Air Toxics Network. The sources of these emitted compounds include vehicle emissions, stationary source emissions, and natural sources. These air toxic compounds do not have ambient air regulatory standards. However, a review of the monitoring results is screened for theoretical lifetime cancer risk and potential non-cancer health effects on a yearly basis. This analysis is presented in the Risk Assessment section of this report. Estimates of theoretical cancer risk posed by these compounds are primarily driven by a small number of chemicals in the metals, volatile organic compounds, and carbonyls groups of the air toxics. The estimates of theoretical lifetime cancer risk related to air toxic pollutants in the areas monitored across the state ranged from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 1,000,000. The potential risk of non-cancer health effects from air toxic pollutants is estimated differently, and most chemicals were well below the hazard quotient of 1.

The Ambient Monitoring Program also operates an extensive network of meteorological stations. The Meteorological Report section discusses Georgia's climatology based on the meteorological data captured at the PAMS sites and the sites located statewide. The meteorological sites provide, at a minimum, wind speed and wind direction data. Some stations are very sophisticated and provide information on barometric pressure, relative humidity, solar radiation, temperature, and precipitation. A discussion of the Georgia ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> forecasting effort is also included in this section.

The Quality Assurance section shows the Ambient Monitoring Program's undertaking to produce quality data. The data has to be collected and measured in a certain manner to meet requirements that are set forth by the EPA. The requirements for each monitored pollutant are provided, including field and laboratory techniques, as well as results of the quality assurance audits.

The Outreach and Education section provides information concerning the efforts of the Clean Air Campaign to change the commuting habits of residents of Atlanta. The voluntary program partners with the public and private sector to reduce vehicle congestion and aid in reducing vehicle emissions. This section includes a description of educational and news media outreach activities, and explains how the Air Quality Index (AQI) is used to offer the public an easy to use indicator of air quality.

The appendices of this document contain summary tables for the pollutants measured during 2011. Included in the summary tables is information on where air pollutants were detected, the number of samples collected, and average and maximum concentrations.

Copies of this and previous annual reports are available in Adobe Acrobat format via the Ambient

Monitoring Program website at <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/>. A limited number of print copies are available and may be requested at 404-363-7006. Real time air monitoring information for the criteria pollutants may be found at the above website by selecting the pollutant of concern. In addition, the website also provides links to the Clean Air Campaign and the smog forecast.

## GLOSSARY

Aerosols	A gaseous suspension of fine solid or liquid particles
AM	Annual Mean
APB	Air Protection Branch
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
Anthropogenic	Resulting from human activity
ARITH MEAN	Arithmetic Mean
AQS	Air Quality System
By-product	Something produced in making something else; secondary result
BAM	Beta Attenuation Monitor
CAA	Clean Air Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CV	Coefficient of Variation
DNR	Department of Natural Resources (state agency)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (federal agency)
EPD	Environmental Protection Division (state agency)
FRM	Federal Reference Method- the official measurement technique for a given pollutant
GEO MEAN	Geometric Mean
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
HI	Hazard Index
HQ	Hazard Quotient
IUR	Inhalation Unit Risk
LOD	Limit of Detection
$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Micrograms per cubic meter
m/s	Meters per second
MDL	Method Detection Limit
Mean	Average
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standard
NAMS	National Ambient Monitoring Site
NATTS	National Air Toxics Trends Station
NMHC	Non-Methane Hydrocarbons
$\text{NO}_2$	Nitrogen Dioxide
$\text{NO}_x$	Oxides of Nitrogen
$\text{NO}_y$	Reactive oxides of Nitrogen
NUM OBS	Number of Observations
NWS	National Weather Service
ODC	Ozone depleting Chemicals
$\text{O}_3$	Ozone
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PAMS	Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Station
Pb	Lead
$\text{PM}_{2.5}$	Particles with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 microns or less
$\text{PM}_{10}$	Particles with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less
ppb	Parts per billion
ppbC	Parts per billion Carbon
ppm	Parts per million
Precursor	A substance from which another substance is formed
PUF	Polyurethane Foam
QTR	Calendar Quarter
Rawinsonde	A source of meteorological data for the upper atmosphere
RfC	Reference Concentration
Screening Value	Initial level of air toxic compounds used in risk assessment

SLAMS	State and Local Air Monitoring Site
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur Dioxide
SPMS	Special Purpose Monitoring Site
TEOM	Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance
TNMOC	Total Non-Methane Organic Compounds
TRS	Total Reduced Sulfur
TSP	Total Suspended Particulates
UV	Ultraviolet
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
w/m <sup>2</sup>	Watts per square meter

---

## INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the air quality data collected by the State of Georgia during calendar year 2011. The Air Protection Branch is a subdivision of the state's Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Environmental Protection Division (EPD).

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulates air quality standards nationwide through authority granted by Congress in the Clean Air Act. Few people realize, though, that the air quality monitoring that is required by the Act is performed almost entirely by state and local governments. The Ambient Monitoring Program conducts monitoring in Georgia, both to satisfy Clean Air Act monitoring requirements and to exceed them in cases where additional monitoring proves beneficial to the citizens and industries of the State. Monitoring is performed to facilitate the protection of public health, as well as to protect our natural environment. The data is collected and quality assured using equipment and techniques specified by EPA. Once the data is ready, it is submitted to EPA's national air quality database (AQS), where it is available to a broad community of data users.

Despite the technical nature of the information collected, every effort has been made to make the data relevant and useful to those who do not routinely study air quality data. To provide additional information for those who have interest in more detailed technical information, extensive Appendices are included. Further information about air quality in Georgia and nationwide is available from EPA.

Due to budget constraints and lack of available personnel, the Ambient Air Monitoring Program shut down certain samplers in 2008 and 2009. Much consideration went in to deciding which samplers would be shut down. Some of the factors that were considered in the decision making process included: which pollutants are examined for attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, which pollutants are federally mandated, and the number of pollutants measured at each site. The samplers that were shut down are shown in red in Table 2, on pages 5 and 6.



---

## CHEMICAL MONITORING ACTIVITIES

This section contains a summary of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and the monitoring techniques used to measure ambient air quality for comparison with these standards.

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA Administrator to identify pollutants that may endanger public health or welfare. The Administrator is required to issue air quality criteria that reflect current scientific knowledge useful in indicating the type and extent of identifiable effects on public health or welfare that may be expected from the presence of such pollutant in ambient air. Under the CAA, the EPA Administrator establishes National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for each pollutant for which air quality criteria have been issued. The EPA is to set standards where “the attainment and maintenance are requisite to protect public health” with “an adequate margin of safety.” In 1971, the EPA established standards for five “criteria” pollutants as required by the Clean Air Act. The standards and pollutants have changed over time to keep up with improvements in scientific knowledge and now consist of six pollutants. These pollutants are carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, lead, ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (now regulated in two size categories). For the most current list of standards, EPA’s website (<http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html>) should be referred. As of 2011, the following table is shown on EPA’s website.

Pollutant [final rule cite]		Primary/ Secondary	Averaging Time	Level	Form
<a href="#">Carbon Monoxide</a> [76 FR 54294, Aug 31, 2011]		primary	8-hour	9 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per year
			1-hour	35 ppm	
<a href="#">Lead</a> [73 FR 66964, Nov 12, 2008]		primary and secondary	Rolling 3 month average	0.15 µg/m <sup>3</sup> <sup>(1)</sup>	Not to be exceeded
<a href="#">Nitrogen Dioxide</a> [75 FR 6474, Feb 9, 2010] [61 FR 52852, Oct 8, 1996]		primary	1-hour	100 ppb	98th percentile, averaged over 3 years
		primary and secondary	Annual	53 ppb <sup>(2)</sup>	Annual Mean
<a href="#">Ozone</a> [73 FR 16436, Mar 27, 2008]		primary and secondary	8-hour	0.075 ppm <sup>(3)</sup>	Annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hr concentration, averaged over 3 years
<a href="#">Particle Pollution</a> [71 FR 61144, Oct 17, 2006]	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	primary and secondary	Annual	15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	annual mean, averaged over 3 years
			24-hour	35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	98th percentile, averaged over 3 years
	PM <sub>10</sub>	primary and secondary	24-hour	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years
<a href="#">Sulfur Dioxide</a> [75 FR 35520, Jun 22, 2010] [38 FR 25678, Sept 14, 1973]		primary	1-hour	75 ppb <sup>(4)</sup>	99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years
		secondary	3-hour	0.5 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per year

(1) Final rule signed October 15, 2008. The 1978 lead standard (1.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> as a quarterly average) remains in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.

(2) The official level of the annual NO<sub>2</sub> standard is 0.053 ppm, equal to 53 ppb, which is shown here for the purpose of clearer comparison to the 1-hour standard.

(3) Final rule signed March 12, 2008. The 1997 ozone standard (0.08 ppm, annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour concentration, averaged over 3 years) and related implementation rules remain in place. In 1997, EPA revoked the 1-hour ozone standard (0.12 ppm, not to be exceeded more than once per year) in all areas, although some areas have continued obligations under that standard ("anti-backsliding"). The 1-hour ozone standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with maximum hourly average concentrations above 0.12 ppm is less than or equal to 1.

(4) Final rule signed June 2, 2010. The 1971 annual and 24-hour SO<sub>2</sub> standards were revoked in that same rulemaking. However, these standards remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, where the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standard are approved.

(Source: <http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html>)

**Table 1: National Ambient Air Quality Standards Summary**

As shown in Table 1, there are two categories for ambient air quality standards, primary and secondary. Primary standards are intended to protect the most sensitive individuals in a population. These "sensitive" individuals include children, the elderly, and people with chronic illnesses. The secondary standards are designed to protect public welfare or the quality of life. This includes visibility protection, limiting economic damage, damage to wildlife, the climate, or man-made material. The varied averaging times are to address the health impacts of each pollutant. Short-term averages are to protect against acute effects. Long-term averages are to protect against chronic effects.

The Georgia ambient air monitoring network provides information on the measured concentrations of criteria and non-criteria pollutants at pre-selected locations. The 2011 Georgia Air Sampling Network consisted of 49 sites in 31 counties across the state. Table 2, on pages 5 and 6, is a list of sites in the monitoring network along with details of pollutants monitored and their locations. During 2008 and 2009, several monitors were shut down due to budgetary restraints and lack of available personnel.

The monitors highlighted in red are those that stopped operating in 2008 and 2009. Monitoring occurs year-round, although some pollutants have various required monitoring periods. Ozone, with the exception of the South DeKalb site, is sampled from March through October, and the continuous (hourly) Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) volatile organic compounds are sampled from June through August. Figure 1, following Table 2, is a spatial display of the air monitoring locations in the state. Please note that not all pollutants are monitored at all sites. Maps of the monitoring locations for individual pollutants are provided in each pollutant's respective section. For more details regarding the ambient air monitoring network, refer to Georgia EPD's Ambient Air Monitoring Plan found on EPD's website at <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/>.

The number of monitoring sites and their respective locations can vary from year to year. This variation depends on the availability of long-term space allocation, regulatory needs, and other factors such as the sufficiency of resources. Once a site is established, the most common goal for its use is to monitor for long-term trends. All official monitoring performed in support of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) must use U.S. EPA-defined reference methods described in 40 CFR Part 53, Appendix A, or equivalent methods designated in accordance with Part 53 of that chapter. All data collected in the networks undergoes an extensive quality assurance review and is then submitted to the Air Quality System (AQS) database that is maintained by the EPA.

In general, the basic monitoring objectives that govern the selection of sites are: 1) to measure the highest observable concentration; 2) to determine representative concentrations in areas of high population density; 3) to determine the impact of significant sources or source categories on ambient pollution levels; 4) to determine the general background concentration levels; and 5) to determine the concentration of a number of compounds which contribute to the formation of ground level ozone. Data collected from continuous monitors in Georgia's monitoring network are presented on EPD's website at <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/>. The data is updated hourly at 15 minutes past the hour. Specific annual summary data for 2011 are available in Appendix A.


SITE ID	COMMON NAME	COUNTY	O <sub>3</sub>	CO	PM <sub>2.5</sub> FRM	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Cont.	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Spec.	NO	NOx	NO <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>y</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	TRS	Pb	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub> Cont.	Acid Rain	PAMS VOC	VOC	SVOC	Carb-onyls	Meteoro-logy	Aethal-ometer	Cr6	Metals	
Rome MSA																										
131150003	Coosa Elementary	Floyd			S	S	X					S			S					NR	NR					NR
131150004	Co. Health Dept.	Floyd																	NR	NR						NR
Brunswick MSA																										
131270004	Arco Pump Station	Glynn													S											
131270006	Risley Middle	Glynn	S		S							S	M									NR				
131273001	Brunswick College	Glynn																	NR	NR	NR					NR
Valdosta MSA																										
131850003	Mason Elem.	Lowndes			S	S													NR	NR						NR
Warner Robins MSA																										
131530001	Robins Air Base	Houston			S	S													NR	NR						NR
Dalton MSA																										
132130003	Fort Mountain	Murray	S																			NR				
Albany MSA																										
130950007	Turner Elem.	Dougherty			S	S									S											
Gainesville MSA																										
131390003	Fair St. Elementary	Hall			S	S													NR	NR						NR
Athens-Clark County MSA																										
130590002	College Station Rd.	Clarke	S		S	S	X																			
Macon MSA																										
130210007	Allied Chemical	Bibb			S		X								S											
130210012	Forestry	Bibb	S		S	S						S							NR	NR		NR				NR
130210013	Lake Tobesofkee	Bibb	S								S											NR				
Columbus Georgia- Alabama MSA																										
132150001	Health Dept.	Muscogee			S																					
132150008	Airport	Muscogee	S		S	S						S														
132150011	Cusseta Elementary	Muscogee			S		X							S	S											
132151003	Crime Lab	Muscogee																				NR				
132155000	Columbus State	Muscogee																	NR	NR						NR
Savannah MSA																										
130510014	Shuman Middle School	Chatham													S											
130510017	Market St.	Chatham			S																					
130510021	E. President St.	Chatham	S									S							NR	NR	NR	NR				NR
130510091	Mercer Middle	Chatham			S																					
130511002	W. Lathrop & Augusta Ave.	Chatham				S						S										NR				
Augusta Georgia-South Carolina MSA																										
130730001	Riverside Park	Columbia	S								S											NR				
131890001	Fish Hatchery	McDuffie															G									
132450005	Med. College GA	Richmond			S																					
132450091	Bungalow Rd.	Richmond	S		S	S	X								S							NR				
132450092	Clara Jenkins School	Richmond																	NR	NR						NR

SITE ID	COMMON NAME	COUNTY	O <sub>3</sub>	CO	PM <sub>2.5</sub> FRM	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Cont.	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Spec.	NO	NO <sub>x</sub>	NO <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>y</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	TRS	Pb	PM <sub>10</sub> Cont.	Acid Rain	PAMS VOC	VOC	SVOC	Carb- onyls	Meteoro- logy	Aethal- ometer	Cr6	Metals
<b>Atlanta MSA</b>																								
130150003	Cartersville	Bartow												S							NR			
130630091	Georgia DOT	Clayton			S																			
130670003	National Guard	Cobb	S		S																			
130670004	Macland Aquatic Center	Cobb			S																			
130770002	Univ. of West GA	Coweta	S			S															NR			
130850001	GA Forestry	Dawson	S													G		NR	NR	NR	NR			NR
130890002	South DeKalb	DeKalb	S/P/C	S/P/C	S/C	S/C	T/C	S/P	S/P	S/P	S/P/C	C					P	N	N	P/N	P	N	N	N
130890003	DMRC	DeKalb												S										
130892001	Police Dept.	DeKalb			S										S									
130893001	Tucker	DeKalb																			NR			
130970004	W. Strickland St.	Douglas	S																		NR			
131130001	Georgia DOT	Fayette	S																		NR			
131210020	Utoy Creek	Fulton																NR	NR					NR
131210032	E. Rivers School	Fulton			S										S									
131210039	Fire Station#8	Fulton			S																			
131210048	Georgia Tech	Fulton			S			S	S	S		S			S						NR			
131210055	Confederate Ave.	Fulton	S			S						S									NR			
131210099	Roswell Road	Fulton		S																				
131350002	Gwinnett Tech	Gwinnett	S		S	S																		
131510002	County Extension	Henry	S			S																		
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	S/P	S/P	S	S		S/P	S/P	S/P							P	NR	NR		P			NR
132470001	Monastery	Rockdale	S/P					S/P	S/P	S/P							P				P			
132970001	Fish Hatchery	Walton				S																		
<b>Chattanooga Tennessee-Georgia MSA</b>																								
132950002	Maple Street	Walker			S	S	X																	
<b>Not In An MSA</b>																								
130090001	Baldwin Co. Airport	Baldwin																NR	NR					NR
130550001	Fish Hatchery	Chattooga	S												S	G								
130690002	General Coffee State Park	Coffee					X											NR	NR					NR
132410002	Lake Burton	Rabun														G								
132611001	Union High	Sumter	S																					
133030001	Co. Health Dept.	Washington			S										S									
133190001	Police Dept.	Wilkinson			S																			

Monitoring Types: S=SLAMS; P=PAMS; C=NCORE; M=SPM; X=Supplemental Speciation; T=STN; N=NATTS; NR=Non-Regulatory; G=General Information; Samplers in gray temporarily discontinued

Samplers in red are not operational

Table 2: 2011 Georgia Air Monitoring Network

**Figure 1: Georgia Air Monitoring Site Map**




## CARBON MONOXIDE (CO)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Carbon monoxide (CO) is an odorless, colorless, and poisonous gas that is a by-product of incomplete burning. In most large metropolitan areas the primary source of CO pollution is engendered from automobile exhaust. The CO emissions from automobiles are responsible for approximately 60% of CO emissions nationwide. Other contributors of CO are fires, industrial processes, cigarettes, and other sources of incomplete burning in the indoor environment. Figure 2 and Figure 3 give a visual representation of the CO emissions in Georgia. These figures are taken from EPA's latest available data on air emission sources, based on 2008 data.


#### Carbon Monoxide Emissions by Source Sector

in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 2: Common Sources of Carbon Monoxide (CO) in Georgia in 2008**




(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 3: Carbon Monoxide (CO) Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

In colder months, a few factors come together that can cause concentrations of ambient CO to be found at higher levels than the rest of the year. During the winter months, cooler temperatures prevent complete combustion of fuels, causing an increase in CO emissions. This can especially affect fuel combustion in gas-powered automobiles, as friction is increased during cold engine operation. At the same time, winter is subjected to more frequent atmospheric inversion layers. In standard conditions, the troposphere contains temperatures that decrease with increasing altitude. An inversion layer can occur when a layer of warmer air traps cooler air near the surface, disrupting the descending temperature gradient of the troposphere and preventing the usual mixing that would occur in normal conditions. During this time, the increased CO emissions can be trapped by the cap that is formed by the inversion layer, locking in CO emissions near the earth's surface.

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) with a population greater than 500,000, as determined by the last census (2000), to have at least two CO State and Local Air Monitoring Stations (SLAMS). In Georgia, only the Atlanta MSA meets the population requirement. Currently, Georgia's CO sites are located at Roswell Road, Yorkville, and South DeKalb (Figure 4). The Roswell Road site was established to monitor for CO at a microscale level. The purpose of microscale measurements is to measure peak concentrations in major urban traffic areas. A microscale site monitors an air mass that covers a distance of several meters to about 100 meters. In addition, high sensitivity CO monitors are located at the Yorkville and South DeKalb sites. The purpose of these CO monitors is to aid in the detection of combustion and smoke plumes from power plants. Furthermore, the South DeKalb site is required to monitor CO as part of the National Core (NCORE) Multipollutant Monitoring Network.





### Figure 4: Carbon Monoxide Site Monitoring Map

---

### HEALTH IMPACTS

Once CO is inhaled, it enters the blood stream, where it binds chemically to hemoglobin. Hemoglobin is the component of blood that is responsible for carrying oxygen to the cells. When CO binds to hemoglobin, it reduces the ability of hemoglobin to do its job, and in turn reduces the amount of oxygen delivered throughout the body. The percentage of hemoglobin affected by CO depends on the amount of air inhaled, the concentration of CO in air, and the length of exposure.

Negative health effects of CO include weakening the contractions of the heart that reduces blood flow to various parts of the body. In a healthy person, this effect significantly reduces the ability to perform physical activities. In persons with chronic heart disease, this effect can threaten the overall quality of life, because their systems may be unable to compensate for the decrease in oxygen. CO pollution is also likely to cause such individuals to experience chest pain during activity. Adverse effects have also been observed in individuals with heart conditions who are exposed to CO pollution in heavy freeway traffic for one or more hours.

In addition, fetuses, young infants, pregnant women, elderly people, and individuals with anemia or emphysema are likely to be more susceptible to the effects of CO. For these individuals, the effects are more pronounced when exposure takes place at high altitude locations, where oxygen concentration is lower. CO can also affect mental functions, visual acuity, and the alertness of healthy individuals, even at relatively low concentrations.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES


CO is monitored using an EPA-approved reference or equivalent method. The analyzers are self-contained and capable of measuring ambient CO on a continuous, real-time basis using the non-dispersive infrared analysis and gas filter correlation methods. CO is monitored using specialized analyzers based on the principle that CO absorbs infrared radiation. The sample is drawn through the sample bulkhead and the optical bench. Radiation from an infrared source is chopped and then passed through a gas filter alternating between CO and N<sub>2</sub>. The radiation then passes through a narrow bandpass interference filter and enters the optical bench where absorption by the sample gas occurs. The infrared radiation then exits the optical bench and falls on an infrared detector. The N<sub>2</sub> side of the filter wheel produces a measure beam which can be absorbed by CO in the cell. The chopped detector signal is modulated by the alternation between the two gas filters with amplitude related to the concentration of CO in the sample cell. Thus, the gas filter correlation system responds specifically to CO. The CO concentration is then displayed on the front panel display and sent to the analog or digital output. The sampler is equipped with a microprocessor that enables digital measurement of CO, automatic compensation for changes in temperature and pressure, and internal diagnostics.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION


Data collected from the continuous monitors are used to determine compliance with the Clean Air Act (CAA) 8-hour and 1-hour standard for CO. The 8-hour standard requires that, for 8-hour averages, no concentration greater than 9 ppm may be observed more than once per year. For 1-hour averages, no concentration greater than 35 ppm may be observed more than once a year [76 FR 54294, August 31, 2011].

The next two graphs (Figure 5 and Figure 6) show how Georgia's CO compares to the two standards. The first graph shows a comparison to the 1-hour standard of 35 parts per million (ppm), and the second graph shows a comparison to the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. Georgia's CO values have dropped considerably since 1995 and are well below the standards. If the data shows that these criteria are met, then the area is considered to be in attainment of the standard. All of Georgia is in attainment of both the 8-hour and 1-hour standards for carbon monoxide.

For additional summary data on carbon monoxide, see Appendix A.



**Figure 5: Carbon Monoxide First Maximum, Compared to 1-Hour Standard**




**Figure 6: Carbon Monoxide First Maximum, Compared to 8-Hour Standard**

## OXIDES OF NITROGEN (NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>y</sub>)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Oxides of nitrogen (see Table 3 on the following page) exist in various forms in the atmosphere. The most common is nitric oxide (NO), but other forms such as nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), nitric acid (HNO<sub>3</sub>) and dinitrogen pentoxide (N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) are also present. The bulk of these compounds in the atmosphere are produced from high temperature combustion and lightning. Nitrogen is a very stable molecule and is essentially inert unless subjected to extreme conditions. The oxides of nitrogen are less stable, however, and are key participants in atmospheric chemistry, converting back and forth between numerous states under different conditions. Many of these reactions involve the conversion of oxygen atoms between their atomic (O<sub>2</sub>) and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) forms. As such, oxides of nitrogen are studied as precursors of (and alternately by-products of) ozone formation. With the many forms of oxides of nitrogen in the atmosphere, they are sometimes referred to using the generic terms NO<sub>x</sub> or NO<sub>y</sub>. Nitric acid (HNO<sub>3</sub>) is the most oxidized form of nitrogen in the atmosphere. This species is water-soluble and is removed from the atmosphere in the form of acidic raindrops.

NO is changed to NO<sub>2</sub> in very rapid atmospheric reactions. During daylight hours, ultraviolet (UV) radiation from the sun breaks apart NO<sub>2</sub> into NO and free oxygen (O). The free oxygen atom (O) will attach itself to molecular oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) creating an ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) molecule. This is the origin of the majority of ground level ozone. With the UV radiation breaking apart the NO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, the daytime levels of are low. Then the concentrations rise rapidly overnight with the lack of UV radiation. When the sun rises again in the morning, they are converted back to NO and ozone. The following graph, Figure 7, is a representation of this typical diurnal pattern of NO<sub>2</sub>. Refer to the ozone section and Figure 18 for a comparison of each diurnal pattern.



**Figure 7: Typical Diurnal Pattern of Nitrogen Dioxide**


ABBREVIATION	FULL NAME	CREATION PROCESSES	ELIMINATION PROCESSES
NO	Nitrous Oxide	Result of ozone photochemistry High-temperature combustion	Reacts with ozone to form NO <sub>2</sub> and oxygen
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen Dioxide	High-temperature combustion Reaction of NO and ozone	Reacts with oxygen in strong sun to form ozone plus NO "Washes out" in rain
HNO <sub>3</sub>	Nitric Acid	NO <sub>2</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> O	"Washes out" in rain
PAN	Peroxyacetyl Nitrate	Oxidation of hydrocarbons in sunlight	Slow devolution to NO <sub>2</sub>
NO <sub>x</sub>	Name for NO + NO <sub>2</sub>		
NO <sub>y</sub>	Name for all atmospheric oxides of nitrogen- mostly NO, NO <sub>2</sub> , HNO <sub>3</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> , and PAN		

**Table 3: Common Oxides of Nitrogen Species and Terms**

Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) is one of the important oxides of nitrogen. It is a light brown gas, and can be an important component of urban haze, depending upon local sources. Nitrogen oxides usually enter the air as the result of high-temperature combustion processes, such as those occurring in automobiles and industries (Figure 8). Home heaters, gas stoves, and non-road equipment also produce substantial amounts of NO<sub>2</sub>. NO<sub>2</sub> is formed from the oxidation of nitric oxide (NO), which has a pungent odor at high concentrations and a bleach smell at lower concentrations. NO<sub>2</sub> is a precursor to ozone formation and can be oxidized to form nitric acid (HNO<sub>3</sub>), one of the compounds that contribute to acid rain (see Acid Precipitation section). Nitrate particles and NO<sub>2</sub> can block the transmission of light, reducing visibility. Figure 9 shows a spatial view of the varying concentrations of nitrogen oxides by county in Georgia during 2008. The following figures are taken from the latest emissions report from EPA, based on 2008 data.

### Nitrogen Oxides Emissions by Source Sector


in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 8: Common Sources of Nitrogen Oxides in Georgia in 2008**





**Figure 9: Nitrogen Oxides Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

Efforts are being taken to reduce the emissions of harmful nitrogen oxides. School bus retrofitting, truck stop electrification, and locomotive conversions are three alternative methods that are being used as to reduce emissions. School bus retrofitting focuses on older school buses that are being fitted with an emission control device to reduce emitted  $\text{NO}_x$ . A specific type of retrofit known as selective catalytic reduction (SCR) reduces output by converting nitrogen oxides to molecular nitrogen and oxygen-rich exhaust streams. SCR systems are enhanced by using a low sulfur fuel. The amount of sulfur in diesel was recently reduced by 97 percent, creating low sulfur fuel. As sulfur tends to hamper exhaust-control devices, the introduction of low sulfur fuel has allowed retrofitting to be an effective means of reducing emissions.

Truck stop electrification (TRE) reduces idling by diesel powered commercial trucks. Truck drivers are typically required to rest 8 hours for every 10 hours of travel time. During this resting period, diesel engines are idled as a means to power their air conditioning and heating systems. TRE eliminates this diesel dependence by providing an electrical system that charges battery-powered appliances including air conditioning, heating, and other electronic devices. In addition, cool or warm air is pumped into the trucks via a hose hookup at the truck stops as another method of cutting down on idling and emissions. All of this reduces oxides of nitrogen that would be produced by unnecessary idling.

Locomotive conversions reduce emissions by replacing old single diesel engines used by switch locomotives with smaller, more efficient modular diesel engines. Switch locomotives, or switchers, assemble and disassemble trains at rail yards. When they are not in action, they idle on the rails until another train comes along. The new engines, known as “genset” and eventually Tier 4 engines, utilize two or more smaller engines that can combine to equal the strength of the older engines to pull the maximum load. They can function individually, or with less horsepower, to handle less demanding loads, while cutting down on the fuel needed to perform the task. These lower-emitting off-road diesel engines also feature an automatic engine start/stop technology to reduce idling when not in use.


### HEALTH IMPACTS

Exposure to high levels of NO<sub>2</sub> for short durations (less than three hours) can lead to respiratory problems. Asthma sufferers, in particular, are sensitive to NO<sub>2</sub>. This sensitivity was expressed in a study that examined changes in airway responsiveness of exercising asthmatics during exposure to relatively low levels of NO<sub>2</sub>. Other studies also indicate a relationship between indoor NO<sub>2</sub> exposures and increased respiratory illness rates in young children, but definitive results are still lacking. In addition, many animal analyses suggest that NO<sub>2</sub> impairs respiratory defense mechanisms and increases susceptibility to infection. Several other observations also show that chronic exposure to relatively low NO<sub>2</sub> pollution levels may cause structural changes in the lungs of animals. These studies suggest that chronic exposure to NO<sub>2</sub> could lead to adverse health effects in humans, but specific levels and durations likely to cause such effects have not yet been determined.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Oxides of nitrogen, particularly NO<sub>2</sub>, are monitored using specialized analyzers that continuously measure the concentration of oxides of nitrogen in ambient air using the ozone-phase chemiluminescent method. Nitric oxide (NO) and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) react to produce a characteristic luminescence with an intensity linearly proportional to the NO concentration. Infrared light emission results when electronically excited NO<sub>2</sub> molecules decay to lower energy states. NO<sub>2</sub> must first be converted to NO before it can be measured using the chemiluminescent reaction. NO<sub>2</sub> is converted to NO by a molybdenum NO<sub>2</sub>-to-NO converter heated to about 325°C. The ambient air sample is drawn into the sample bulkhead. The sample flows through a particulate filter, a capillary, then to the mode solenoid valve. The solenoid valve routes the sample either straight to the reaction chamber (NO mode) or through the NO<sub>2</sub>-to-NO converter and then to the reaction chamber (NO<sub>x</sub> mode). Dry air enters the dry air bulkhead through a flow sensor, and then through a silent discharge ozonator. The ozonator generates the necessary ozone concentration needed for the chemiluminescent reaction. The ozone reacts with the NO in the ambient air to produce electronically excited NO<sub>2</sub> molecules. A photomultiplier tube housed in a thermoelectric cooler detects the NO<sub>2</sub> luminescence. The NO and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations calculated in the NO and NO<sub>x</sub> modes are stored in memory, and the difference between the concentrations are used to calculate the NO<sub>2</sub> concentration. The sampler outputs NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations on the front panel display and the analog or digital outputs. There are two major instrument designs. While they are closely related, they do not monitor the same species. NO<sub>x</sub> analyzers measure NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub>. NO<sub>y</sub> analyzers measure NO and NO<sub>y</sub>, but cannot measure NO<sub>2</sub>. The NO<sub>y</sub> analyzers are also specialized for measuring trace-level concentrations; as such, they cannot measure higher concentrations. Because of these tradeoffs, it is necessary to operate a network of both instrument types to get a complete picture of local conditions.

Of the oxides of nitrogen, only NO<sub>2</sub> is regulated under the NAAQS. Therefore, only the NO<sub>x</sub> type analyzers produce data directly relevant to the standard. NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring is required in urban areas with populations greater than 1,000,000. The Atlanta MSA is the only urban area in Georgia that meets that population requirement. In 2011, the Atlanta MSA had three NO<sub>2</sub> sites collecting data. They are located at the South DeKalb, Conyers, and Yorkville sites. In addition, as of January 1, 2013, GA EPD will be doing near-road NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring. The complete oxides of nitrogen monitoring network, including NO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>y</sub> monitor locations, can be found in Figure 10.




**Figure 10: Oxides of Nitrogen Monitoring Site Map**

#### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION


Data collected from the continuous monitors are used to determine compliance with the NAAQS primary and secondary annual standards for NO<sub>2</sub>. These standards require that a site's annual



average concentration not exceed 0.053 ppm or 53 ppb. In the following figure, Georgia's annual average NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are shown from 2000 to 2011. Annual average concentrations are well below the standard of 53 parts per billion. In addition, in order to protect public health against adverse effects associated with short-term NO<sub>2</sub> exposure, on January 22, 2010, EPA strengthened the NO<sub>2</sub> standard to include a 1-hour form [Federal Register, Vol. 75, No. 26, page 6474, dated February 9, 2010]. This form of the standard is a three-year average of the 98<sup>th</sup> of the annual daily maximum 1-hour averages. The level for this standard is 100 parts per billion. For this standard, EPA is interested in monitoring near-road concentrations and the effects of traffic. By January 1, 2013, GA EPD will have one of a limited number of sites that will be initially established nationwide. To show how past and current NO<sub>2</sub> data would compare to this new standard, Figure 12 below Figure 11, displays the three-year averages of ambient data, as available from 2000 to 2011. The 1-hour design values are well below the 100 ppb standard, and have consistently dropped since the 2000-2002 values. The Atlanta MSA is in attainment of both the annual and the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> standard. For additional summary data on this topic, see Appendix A.



**Figure 11: Nitrogen Dioxide Annual Averages Compared to Standard, 2000-2011**



**Figure 12: Nitrogen Dioxide 1-Hour Design Values, 2002-2011**


## SULFUR DIOXIDE (SO<sub>2</sub>)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) is a colorless reactive gas that is formed by burning sulfur-containing material, such as coal, or by processing sulfur-containing ores. Most SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Georgia come from electric generation (Figure 13). SO<sub>2</sub> is odorless at low concentrations, but pungent at very high concentrations. It can be oxidized in the atmosphere into sulfuric acid. When locomotives, large ships, and non-road equipment burn sulfur-bearing fuel, or when ores that contain sulfur are processed, the sulfur is oxidized to form SO<sub>2</sub>. SO<sub>2</sub> then can react with other pollutants to form aerosols. In liquid form, SO<sub>2</sub> may be found in clouds, fog, rain, aerosol particles, and in surface liquid films on these particles. Both SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> are precursors to the formation of acid rain that leads to acidic deposition. SO<sub>2</sub> is also a precursor for sulfate particles. Major sources of SO<sub>2</sub> are fossil fuel-burning power plants and industrial boilers. Figure 13, below, shows common SO<sub>2</sub> sources and Figure 14, below, shows SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by county in Georgia. These figures are based on 2008 data and are taken from the latest emissions report from EPA.


### Sulfur Dioxide Emissions by Source Sector

in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 13: Common Sources of Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) in Georgia in 2008**



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 14: Sulfur Dioxide Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

On June 2, 2010, the SO<sub>2</sub> primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard was strengthened. In order to protect public health from high short-term concentrations of SO<sub>2</sub>, 1-hour concentrations are compared to this new standard. Three-year averages of the 99<sup>th</sup>% of annual daily maximum 1-hour averages are compared to the level of 75 ppb. The next two graphs (Figure 15 and Figure 16) show how Georgia's SO<sub>2</sub> data compares to the new 1-hour standard. Figure 15 displays all the 99<sup>th</sup>% of the maximum values for the 1-hour averages from 2000 to 2011. Figure 16 shows the three-year averages as the past and current air quality would relate to this new standard.




Figure 15: SO<sub>2</sub> 99<sup>th</sup>% of 1-Hour Maximum Daily Averages, 2000-2011




Figure 16: SO<sub>2</sub> 1-Hour Design Values, 2000-2011

---

### HEALTH IMPACTS

Exposure to SO<sub>2</sub> can cause impairment of respiratory function, aggravation of existing respiratory disease (especially bronchitis), and a decrease in the ability of the lungs to clear foreign particles. It can also increase mortality, especially if elevated levels of particulate matter (PM) are present. Individuals with hyperactive airways, cardiovascular disease, and asthma are most sensitive to the effects of SO<sub>2</sub>. In addition, elderly people and children are also likely to be sensitive to SO<sub>2</sub>.

The effects of short-term peak exposures to SO<sub>2</sub> have been evaluated in controlled human exposure studies. These studies show that SO<sub>2</sub> generally increases airway resistance in the lungs, and can cause significant constriction of air passages in sensitive asthmatics. These impacts have been observed in subjects engaged in moderate to heavy exercise while exposed to relatively high peak concentrations. These changes in lung function are accompanied by perceptible symptoms such as wheezing, shortness of breath, and coughing in these sensitive groups.

The presence of particle pollution appears to aggravate the impact of SO<sub>2</sub> pollution. Several studies of chronic effects have found that people living in areas with high particulate matter and SO<sub>2</sub> levels have a higher incidence of respiratory illnesses and symptoms than people living in areas without such a combination of pollutants.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Sulfur dioxide is measured in the ambient air using EPA-approved equivalent method instruments as defined in 40 CFR Part 53, Appendix A. Georgia's sulfur dioxide network consists of continuous instruments using a pulsed ultraviolet (UV) fluorescence technique. This monitoring technique is based on measuring the emitted fluorescence of SO<sub>2</sub> produced by its absorption of UV radiation. Pulsating UV light is focused through a narrow bandpass filter allowing only light wavelengths of 1,900 to 2,300 angstrom units (Å) to pass into the fluorescence chamber. SO<sub>2</sub> absorbs light in this region without any quenching by air or most other molecules found in polluted air. The SO<sub>2</sub> molecules are excited by UV light and emit a characteristic decay radiation. A second filter allows only this decay radiation to reach a photomultiplier tube. Electronic signal processing transforms the light energy impinging on the photomultiplier tube into a voltage which is directly proportional to the concentration of SO<sub>2</sub> in the sample stream being analyzed. The sampler outputs the SO<sub>2</sub> concentration to the front panel display and to an analog or digital output. Data gained from the continuous monitors are used to determine compliance with the NAAQS for SO<sub>2</sub>.

Figure 17 shows the locations of the Georgia SO<sub>2</sub> monitoring stations for 2011.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

To determine if an SO<sub>2</sub> monitor is in attainment, the annual, 24-hour average, and 3-hour averages are evaluated. The data collected has to be at least 75 percent complete in each calendar quarter. A 24-hour block average is considered valid if at least 75 percent of the hourly averages for that 24-hour period are available [61 FR 25579, May 22, 1996]. To be considered in attainment, an SO<sub>2</sub> site must have an annual mean less than 0.03 parts per million (ppm), no more than one 24-hour average exceeding 0.14 ppm, and no more than one 3-hour average exceeding 0.50 ppm. In addition, for the new 1-hour standard, the three-year averages of the 99<sup>th</sup>% of annual daily maximum 1-hour averages should be less than 75 ppb [Federal Register, Vol. 75, No. 119, page 35520, dated June 22, 2010], as shown above. As EPA develops the implementation for the new primary standard, the older primary standards will no longer be used for attainment designation. For 2011, all of Georgia is in attainment of the sulfur dioxide standard. For additional summary data on this topic, see Appendix A.





Figure 17: Sulfur Dioxide Monitoring Site Map



## OZONE (O<sub>3</sub>)


### GENERAL INFORMATION

Ground level ozone formation occurs through a complex series of photochemical reactions that take place in the presence of strong sunlight. Since the reactions must take place in the presence of strong sunlight, ozone concentrations have a strong diurnal pattern (occurring daily and in daylight hours). Figure 18 shows this typical diurnal pattern of ozone concentration throughout the day.



**Figure 18: Typical Urban 1-Hour Ozone Diurnal Pattern**

For these photochemical reactions to take place, certain components, or precursors, must be available. The precursors<sup>1</sup> to ozone are oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and photochemically reactive volatile organic compounds (VOCs) (Figure 19). Common sources of NO<sub>x</sub> include combustion processes from vehicles and industrial processes. Examples of the reactive VOCs that contribute to ozone formation are: hydrocarbons found in automobile exhaust (benzene, propane, toluene); vapors from cleaning solvents (toluene); and biogenic emissions from plants (isoprene).




(Courtesy of Jamie Smith)

**Figure 19: Ozone Formation Process**


<sup>1</sup> For a more complete discussion on ozone precursors, please see the NO<sub>2</sub> section and the PAMS section of this report.

Sources of VOCs in Georgia are shown in Figure 20, below, and it is followed by a spatial view of VOC emissions across the state in Figure 21. In Georgia, biogenic emissions may be most common, but they are not part of the emission inventory. These figures are taken from the latest emissions report from EPA, based on 2008 data. Ozone is a colorless gas; however, when mixed with particles and other pollutants, such as  $\text{NO}_2$ , the atmospheric reaction forms a brownish, pungent mixture. This type of pollution first gained attention in the 1940's as Los Angeles photochemical "smog". Since then, photochemical "smog" has been observed frequently in many other cities.

### Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions by Source Sector in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



**Figure 20: Common Sources of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) in Georgia in 2008**



**Figure 21: Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

As indicated above, ozone is formed when its precursors come together in the presence of strong sunlight. The reaction only occurs when both precursors are present, and the reaction itself consumes the precursors as it produces ozone. The amount of ozone produced, assuming sufficient sunlight, is controlled by what is known as the “limiting reactant.” This limiting reactant can be thought of in terms of household baking. One can only bake cookies until any one of the ingredients is gone. If the flour is gone, it does not matter how much milk and sugar there is; no more cookies can be made without more flour. In the same way, ozone production can only occur until the process has consumed all of any one of the required ingredients. As it turns out, natural background hydrocarbon levels are quite low in Los Angeles. Therefore, in that area, hydrocarbons are typically the reactant that limits how much ozone can be produced. The control measures that proved effective in reducing smog in the Los Angeles area involved reducing hydrocarbon emissions. These control measures and the science behind them have become relatively advanced because the Los Angeles ozone problem was so severe and developed so long ago. However, many of the fundamental lessons learned about smog formation in Los Angeles over many years of research have proven to not apply in the same way in Georgia.

At the start of air quality control implementation in Georgia, the assumption was that Georgia was also hydrocarbon limited. However, the initial control measures seemed ineffective in actually reducing ozone levels. In time, researchers discovered that vegetation naturally emits large quantities of hydrocarbons. The solution to ozone control in Georgia, then, would have to focus on a different limiting reactant. Since there will always be strong sunshine in the summer, and there will always be oxygen, the only effective way left to control ozone production is to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen.


Various strategies have been put into place to control hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen. With respect to reducing emissions from automobile engines, for example, the addition of relatively simple and inexpensive catalytic converters to existing engine design was a great leap forward in reducing hydrocarbon emissions and have been used with great success since the early 1970’s. In Atlanta, while catalytic converters and many other VOC controls have been put into place, there have been control measures also put into place for the reduction of oxides of nitrogen including selective catalytic reduction (SCR) on power plant generators.

A final difference between ozone and the other pollutants is that ozone is sometimes good. While ground level ozone is considered a hazardous pollutant, the ozone in the upper atmosphere, approximately 10-22 miles above the earth’s surface, protects life on earth from the sun’s harmful ultraviolet (UV) rays. This ozone is gradually being depleted due to man-made products called ozone depleting chemicals, including chlorofluorocarbons (CFC), which when released naturally migrate to the upper atmosphere. Once in the upper atmosphere, the CFCs break down due to the intensity of the sun’s UV rays, releasing chlorine and bromine atoms. These atoms react with the ozone and destroy it. Scientists say that one chlorine atom can destroy as many as 100,000 “good” ozone molecules. The destruction of this ozone may lead to more harmful ultraviolet rays reaching the earth’s surface, causing increased skin cancer rates. This reduction in the protection provided by ozone in the upper atmosphere is usually referred to as the “ozone hole” and is most pronounced in polar regions.

With the exception of the South DeKalb site, ozone in Georgia, unlike other pollutants previously discussed, is only monitored during the “summer” months (March through October), according to EPA’s 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 58 monitoring requirements. The South DeKalb site began year-round monitoring as of November 2009. Many urban areas experience high levels of ground level ozone during the summer months. High ozone levels can also be seen in rural and mountainous areas. This is often caused by ozone and/or its precursors being transported by wind for many hundreds of miles.



In 2011, the GA Environmental Protection Division monitored ground level ozone at 20 sites throughout the state. The following figure shows the locations of all the ozone monitoring stations, including the Fayetteville station, which was temporarily discontinued.



**Figure 22: Ozone Monitoring Site Map**

---

### HEALTH IMPACTS

Ozone and other photochemical oxidants such as peroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN) and aldehydes are associated with adverse health effects in humans. Peroxyacetyl nitrate and aldehydes cause irritation that is characteristic of photochemical pollution. Ozone has a greater impact on the respiratory system, where it irritates the mucous membranes of the nose, throat, and airways. Ninety percent of the ozone inhaled into the lungs is never exhaled. Symptoms associated with exposure include cough, chest pain, and throat irritation. Ozone can also increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In addition, ozone impairs normal functioning of the lungs and reduces the ability to perform physical exercise. Recent studies also suggest that even at lower ozone concentrations some healthy individuals engaged in moderate exercise for six to eight hours may experience symptoms. All of these effects are more severe in individuals with sensitive respiratory systems, and studies show that moderate levels may impair the ability of individuals with asthma or respiratory disease to engage in normal daily activities.

The potential chronic effects of repeated exposure to ozone are of even greater concern. Laboratory studies show that people exposed over a six to eight hour period to relatively low ozone levels develop lung inflammation. Animal studies suggest that if exposures are repeated over a long period (e.g. months, years, lifetime), inflammation of this type may lead to permanent scarring of lung tissue, loss of lung function, and reduced lung elasticity.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES


Georgia's ozone analyzers continuously measure the concentration of ozone in ambient air using the ultraviolet (UV) photometric method and are EPA-approved for regulatory air monitoring programs. The degree to which the UV light is absorbed is directly related to the ozone concentration. The ambient air is drawn into the sample bulkhead and is split into two gas streams. One gas stream flows through an ozone scrubber to become the reference gas. The reference gas then flows to the reference solenoid valve. The sample gas flows directly to the sample solenoid valve. The solenoid valves alternate the reference and sample gas streams between the two cells every 10 seconds. When cell A contains reference gas, cell B contains sample gas and vice versa. The UV light intensities of each cell are measured by detectors A and B. When the solenoid valves switch the reference and sample gas streams to opposite cells, the light intensities are ignored for several seconds to allow the cells to be flushed. The sampler calculates the ozone concentration for each cell and outputs the average concentration to both the front panel display and the analog or digital output. Data gained from the continuous monitors are used to determine compliance with the NAAQS for ozone.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

Ozone monitoring has been in place in the Atlanta area since 1980. The 1980 network consisted of two monitors located in DeKalb and Rockdale Counties. Currently the metro Atlanta area ozone network includes ten monitors located in ten counties.


In July 1997 the US EPA issued an 8-hour ozone standard intended to eventually replace the older 1-hour standard. This 8-hour standard is attained when the average of the fourth highest concentration measured is equal to or below 0.08 ppm (up to 0.085 ppm with third digit truncated, or cut off) averaged over three years (see Table 1; 62 FR 38894, July 18, 1997). Areas EPA has designated attainment with the 1-hour standard are immediately exempt from that standard, but thereafter are subject to the 8-hour standard. In the summer of 2005, the metro Atlanta area was designated attainment with the 1-hour standard. As of the printing of this report, then, only the 8-hour ozone standard is applicable in Georgia. Data shows that the Atlanta area will be in attainment with the 1997 8-hour standard of 0.085 ppm, but has not been officially redesignated as attainment. For attainment designations to be official, the maintenance state implementation plan (SIP) needs to be submitted by GA EPD and approved by EPA. GA EPD has submitted the maintenance SIP and is awaiting approval. The current Atlanta ozone nonattainment area compared to the 1997 standard consists of Barrow, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett,

Henry, Paulding, Rockdale, Bartow, Carroll, Hall, Newton, Spalding, and Walton Counties. All other metropolitan statistical areas in Georgia are currently in attainment of this standard. Catoosa County is part of the Chattanooga Early Action Compact area. Figure 23 shows the boundaries of this nonattainment area.



**Figure 23: Georgia's 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Map for 1997 Standard**


On March 27, 2008 the ozone primary standard level was lowered to 0.075 ppm for the 8-hour averaging time, fourth maximum value, averaged over three years (Federal Register, Vol. 63, No. 60). With the implementation of the 2008 ground-level ozone standard, the boundary of the Atlanta nonattainment area is defined as a 15-county area. The 15-county area includes Bartow, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry, Newton, Paulding, and Rockdale Counties. A map of this area is shown in the following figure on the next page. Because the Atlanta area was defined with a 'marginal' designation compared to the 2008 ground-level ozone standard, a SIP is not required.



**Figure 24: Georgia's 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Map for 2008 Standard**

A number of activities to aid in controlling the precursors to ozone formation have been implemented. A new State Implementation Plans (SIP) will be developed to assist in ozone reduction. As new areas are declared in nonattainment, these control measures may be expanded to include them. One activity could include a vehicle inspection program. However, as the vehicle fleet gets younger, this is not as beneficial. Other activities include installing controls on stationary emission sources, and the establishment of a voluntary mobile emissions reduction program. An example of such a program in metro Atlanta is called The Clean Air Campaign (CAC). Activities of The Clean Air Campaign include distributing daily ozone forecasts (as well as PM<sub>2.5</sub> forecasts produced by EPD) during the ozone season to enable citizens in the sensitive group category, as well as industries, to alter activities on days that are forecasted to be conducive to ozone formation. This is also done for the Macon area. In addition to the daily forecasts, citizens have access to forecast and monitoring data on an as needed basis by either calling 1-800-427-9605 or by accessing the Georgia DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring website at <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/index.php>. For a more detailed discussion concerning the CAC, see the section titled "Outreach and Education".

Figure 25 shows how past air quality would relate to the new 0.075 ppm 8-hour standard (red line), and how current air quality relates to the old 0.085 ppm 8-hour standard (blue line). This chart was produced by comparing measurement data against both ambient standards. This demonstrates the relative strictness of each standard and shows how metro Atlanta's air quality has changed over time. Despite a great deal of fluctuation, over the course of the past twenty-six years, there has been a gradual reduction in the number of days exceeding either ozone standard. A trendline, produced by regression analysis, was created for both the 8-hour standards. The trendlines for both 8-hour ozone standards show that the number of days that exceed the ozone standard has fallen by about a day each year over this time period. Even with the new, lower 8-hour ozone standard, the data shows a decrease in the number of days with ozone exceedances for the metro Atlanta area. In 2011, the metro Atlanta area had a total of 44 days that violated the current (0.075 ppm) 8-hour standard.



**Figure 25: Metro Atlanta Ozone- Number of Violation Days per Year**



In the following graph, the three-year design values are shown for all twenty of GA EPD's ozone sites across the state. Only a few sites (all within the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta MSA) have 2009-2011 three-year design values (shown in dark green) above the standard.




Figure 26: Ozone Design Values, 2002-2011

Figure 27, below, maps each metro Atlanta ozone monitor that exceeded the 8-hour ozone standard in 2011, and also indicates the monthly breakdown of the exceedances. Since the 8-hour increment is calculated as a running 8-hour timeframe, there are a number of averages each day. Figure 27 shows the number of days that each monitor had 8-hour averages above the 0.075 ppm standard. Both the Confederate Avenue and Conyers site show the highest number of days with 8-hour ozone averages above 0.075 ppm, with a total of 15 days for the 2011 ozone season. Eight of the total ten ozone sites collecting data in the metro Atlanta area had exceedance days in 2011.

For additional ozone summary data, see Appendix A.





Figure 27: Metro Atlanta Ozone Exceedance Map

The following map was taken from the EPA document “Our Nation’s Air- Status and Trends through 2010”. It shows the fourth maximum reading for the 8-hour ozone readings across the United States. Georgia’s fourth maximum ozone readings in 2010 were in the 0.060-0.075 ppm (light blue) and 0.076-0.095 ppm (yellow) ranges.



(From EPA’s “Our Nation’s Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2010”)

**Figure 28: Ozone Concentrations in ppm, 2010 (Fourth Highest Daily Maximum 8-Hour Concentrations)**




## LEAD (Pb)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

In the past, the Clean Air Act required extensive lead monitoring in order to detect the high levels of airborne lead that resulted from the use of leaded gasoline. With the phase-out of leaded gasoline, lead concentrations had decreased to nearly detection level by the late 1980s. Since then, the concentrations have hovered just above detection level. Based on data from EPA's Air Emission Sources for 2008, Georgia's primary source of lead emissions is mobile sources (Figure 29). Other sources of lead emissions include industrial processes (metals processing, iron and steel production), combustion of solid waste, and lead-acid battery manufacturing. Figure 30, below, shows a spatial view of Georgia's lead emissions, also from EPA's Air Emission Sources, based on 2008 data.


### Lead Emissions by Source Sector

in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 29: Common Sources of Lead in Georgia in 2008**



(From EPA's Air Emissions Sources)

**Figure 30: Lead Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

At the beginning of 2009, there were two dedicated lead monitors remaining in Georgia for comparison to the NAAQS lead standard. One was in the Atlanta area for monitoring long-term trends in ambient lead levels. The other was in Columbus for industrial source monitoring, given the historical issues with lead pollution in the area. At the end of 2008, EPA strengthened the standard and monitoring requirements. As well as lowering the standard, additional monitors were to be placed in areas with demonstrated lead emissions of 1.0 or more tons per year and urban areas of more than 500,000 (Federal Register, Vol. 73, No. 219, dated November 12, 2008). In response to this rule change, in December of 2009, GA EPD added a site to monitor another lead source in the Cartersville area. Since this time, on December 14, 2010, EPA lowered the source-oriented monitors for lead emission levels to 0.50 tons per year, and changed the population based requirement to include the 'NCore network' (40CFR58, Docket #EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0735). GA EPD is in the process of evaluating the lead emissions data, the current lead network, and any changes that may be needed to the lead network in Georgia.

The current criteria lead monitoring network is as indicated in Figure 31. For summary data on criteria lead monitoring, see Appendix A. In addition to the criteria network sites, lead is also being monitored at sites throughout Georgia as a trace metal in the Georgia Air Toxics Monitoring Network, the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS), and with the PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation samplers. With the Air Toxics Network, the samples are taken from total suspended particles in the ambient air. The NATTS sampler is a PM<sub>10</sub> sampler, and particles are sampled up to 10 microns in size. With the PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation sampler, samples are taken on particles up to 2.5 microns in size. For additional summary data on lead as collected as an Air Toxics trace metal, see Appendix D.




Figure 31: Lead Monitoring Site Map

### HEALTH IMPACTS

Exposure to lead occurs mainly through inhalation and ingestion of lead in food, water, soil, or dust. Lead particles can re-enter the environment through re-entrainment of dust from vehicle traffic,

construction activities, and agricultural activities. It accumulates in the blood, bones, and soft tissues. Lead can adversely affect the kidneys, liver, nervous system, and other organs. Excessive exposure to lead may cause neurological impairments, such as seizures, mental retardation, and behavioral disorders. Even at low doses, lead exposure is associated with damage to the nervous systems of fetuses and young children, resulting in learning deficits and lowered IQ. Recent studies also show that lead may be a factor in high blood pressure and subsequent heart disease. Lead can also be deposited on the leaves of plants, presenting a hazard to grazing animals. Lead deposition in soil puts children at particular risk exposure since they commonly put hands, toys, and other items in their mouths, which may come in contact with the lead-containing dust and dirt.


### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Since lead is a particulate, the measurement for ambient air lead concentrations is performed using a manual method, unlike measurements for the gaseous pollutants discussed earlier (ozone, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and CO). Samples are collected on 8" x 10" pre-weighed fiberglass filters with a high-volume total suspended particulate (TSP) sampler for 24 hours, collecting particles with diameters of 100 microns or less. High volumes of ambient air in the flow range of 40-60 cubic feet per minute are sampled at a constant rate during the sampling period. This produces a uniform distribution of particles deposited on the sample filter downstream of the sampler inlet. Samples collected with the TSP high volume sampler can be used to determine the average ambient TSP concentration over a sampling period followed by subsequent analysis to determine the identity and quantity of inorganic metals present in the TSP. The filter sample is shipped to a laboratory for analysis using inductively coupled plasma mass spectroscopy (commonly known as ICP-MS). Data gained from the criteria lead samplers are used to determine compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for lead.

In addition to the criteria lead network sites, lead is monitored as a trace metal in the Georgia Air Toxics Monitoring Network, the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS), and with the PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation samplers. With the Air Toxics Network, samples are obtained with a High-Volume sampler collecting total suspended particles in the ambient air. The NATTS lead is sampled using a PM<sub>10</sub> sampler, and particles are sampled up to 10 microns in size. With the PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation sampler, samples are collected that include particles up to 2.5 microns in size. All three of these additional sampling techniques also collect 24-hour samples on pre-weighed filters, have samples sent to a laboratory for analysis, and are analyzed with ICP-MS.


### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

The compliance with the national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for lead and its compounds is determined based on the assumption that all lead is elemental lead. In order to comply with both the primary and secondary standard, the concentration of lead in the air must have an arithmetic mean no higher than 0.15 micrograms per cubic meter averaged on a rolling 3-month basis (Federal Register, Vol. 73, No. 219, dated November 12, 2008). On October 15, 2008 this standard was changed from the original standard of 1.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> averaged per calendar quarter that has been in place since October 5, 1978 (43 FR 46258). This new lead standard became effective on January 12, 2009 and was to be implemented by January 1, 2010. All of Georgia is currently in attainment of the lead standard. The following graph, on the next page, shows how Georgia's lead data compares to the rolling three-month average standard for 2010 through 2011. The last of the three months used for each average is indicated on the graph. For additional summary data on this topic, see Appendix A.



**Figure 32: Three-Month Rolling Averages of Lead, 2010-2011**

The following map was taken from EPA's document "Our Nation's Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2010" showing the maximum three-month lead averages across the United States. Georgia's three-month maximum lead averages in 2010 were in the lowest range, 0.00-0.07 ppm (dark blue).



(From EPA's "Our Nation's Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2010")

**Figure 33: Lead Concentrations in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , 2010 (Maximum 3-month Averages)**



## PARTICULATE MATTER

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Particulate matter is a broad range of material that consists of solid particles, fine liquid droplets, or condensed liquids absorbed onto solid particles. Airborne particulates are not a single pollutant as discussed for the other criteria pollutants, but rather a mixture of many different air pollutants. Primary sources that emit particles include combustion, incineration, construction, mining, metals smelting, metal processing, and grinding. Other sources include motor vehicle exhaust, road dust, wind blown soil, forest fires, open burning of vegetation for land clearing or waste removal, ocean spray, and volcanic activity.

There are two ways (primary and secondary) that particulate matter is formed. Primary particulate is emitted directly from a source, like a vehicle's tailpipe or a factory's smokestack. However, a great deal of particulate matter is not directly emitted from such sources. In fact, the vast majority of primary air pollution is in the form of gases. Those gaseous air pollutants readily react in the atmosphere with oxygen and with each other. While many of those reactions produce other gases, they frequently produce particles. Particles formed through this process are known as secondary particulate matter. Examples of secondary particulates include:

- Atmospheric sulfate particles, formed from the oxidation of gaseous  $\text{SO}_2$ .
- Atmospheric nitrate particles, such as ammonium nitrate, formed from a complex series of reactions that transform gaseous  $\text{NO}_x$ .
- Atmospheric calcium nitrate or sodium nitrate particulates formed from a series of atmospheric reactions involving gaseous nitric acid ( $\text{HNO}_3$ ) reacting with sodium chloride/calcium carbonate.

Since diesel combustion and vehicle exhaust are sources of particulate matter, efforts are being made to reduce these emissions by retrofitting diesel engines and making alternative diesel fuels available.



Retrofitting is defined as the addition of an emission control device designed to remove emissions from an exhaust engine. Currently, school buses and diesel powered commercial trucks are being retrofitted for emission reduction. One method is a particulate trap, which essentially filters exhaust from the engine. In some cases, as the particulate accumulates in the filter, the particulate is oxidized or burned off in order to regenerate the filter and reuse it. Regeneration is achieved by various techniques that reduce the temperature necessary to oxidize accumulated particulate matter. Disposable filters are also used when the particulate matter cannot be cleaned by oxidation. For information about Georgia

EPD's program, go to <http://www.georgiaair.org/retrofit/index.htm>.

In addition to retrofitting, alternative diesel fuels are available that emit less particulate matter, as well as other pollutants. Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel is one fuel that emits less sulfur and particulate matter. Biodiesel fuel emits less particulate matter, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and air toxics. Also, emulsified diesel emits less nitrogen oxides and particulate matter.

Particulate pollution may be categorized by size since there are different health impacts associated with the different sizes. The Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program currently monitors for three sizes of particles:  $\text{PM}_{10}$  (up to 10 microns in diameter),  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  (up to 2.5 microns in diameter) and  $\text{PM}_{\text{coarse}}$  ( $\text{PM}_{10}$  minus  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ ). All of these particles are very small in size. For example, Figure 34 shows how approximately ten  $\text{PM}_{10}$



Figure 34: Analogy of Particulate Matter Size to Human Hair

particles can fit on a cross section of a human hair, and approximately thirty  $PM_{2.5}$  particles would fit on a cross section of a hair.

Maps of each of the particulate matter networks ( $PM_{10}$ ,  $PM_{coarse}$ ,  $PM_{2.5}$  federal reference method,  $PM_{2.5}$  continuous, and  $PM_{2.5}$  speciation) are included in the following subsections that discuss particulate matter.

## **$PM_{10}$**


Particulate matter (PM) less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter is defined as  $PM_{10}$ . These particles can be solid matter or liquid droplets from smoke, dust, fly ash, or condensing vapors that can be suspended in the air for long periods of time.  $PM_{10}$  represents part of a broad class of chemically diverse particles that range in size from molecular clusters of 0.005 microns in diameter to coarse particles of 10 microns in diameter (for comparison, an average human hair is 70-100 microns in diameter, as shown in the previous figure). PM results from all types of combustion. The carbon-based particles that result from incomplete burning of diesel fuel in buses, trucks, and cars are of major sources of  $PM_{10}$ . Another important combustion source is the burning of wood in stoves and fireplaces in residential settings. Also of concern are the sulfate and nitrate particles that are formed as a by-product of  $SO_2$  and  $NO_2$  emissions, primarily from fossil fuel-burning power plants and vehicular exhausts.

For a map of the  $PM_{10}$  network, refer to Figure 35 on the next page.

### **HEALTH IMPACTS**

The U.S. national ambient air quality standard was originally based on particles up to 25-45 microns in size, termed "total suspended particles" (TSP). In 1987, EPA replaced TSP with an indicator that includes only those particles smaller than 10 microns, termed  $PM_{10}$ . These smaller particles cause adverse health effects because of their ability to penetrate deeply into the lungs. The observed human health effects of PM include breathing and respiratory problems, aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease, alterations in the body's defense system against inhaled materials and organisms, and damage to lung tissue. Groups that appear to be most sensitive to the effects of PM include individuals with chronic lung or cardiovascular disease, individuals with influenza, asthmatics, elderly people, and children.



Figure 35: PM<sub>10</sub> Monitoring Site Map

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES


The Georgia PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring network consists of two types of EPA-approved reference or equivalent monitors. Both types of monitors are used to determine attainment with the PM<sub>10</sub> standard. The first type of monitor is an integrated low-volume sampler that collects samples for a 24-hour period. Ambient air is sampled through an impaction inlet device that only allows particles with 10 microns or less diameter reach the filter media. The flow rate is controlled by an electronic mass-flow controller, which uses a flow sensor installed below the filter holder to monitor the mass flow rate and to control the speed of the motor accordingly. The filters are weighed in a laboratory before and after the sampling period. The change in the filter weight corresponds to the mass of PM<sub>10</sub> particles collected. That mass, divided by the total volume of air sampled, corresponds to the mass concentration of the particles in the air.

The second type of PM<sub>10</sub> monitor that Georgia EPD operates is a continuous monitor. The continuous monitor measures and records hourly particulate mass concentrations in ambient air. The monitor consists of three basic components; the central unit, the sampling pump and the sampling inlet hardware. In order to sample particles that are 10 microns or less, the inlet is designed to cut out particles larger than 10 microns in size. The monitor uses beta ray attenuation to calculate collected particle mass concentrations in units of micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). A <sup>14</sup>C element (60  $\mu\text{Ci}$  +/- 15  $\mu\text{Ci}$ ) emits a constant source of low-energy electrons, also known as beta particles. The beta rays are attenuated as they collide with particles collected on a filter tape. The decrease in signal detected by the scintillation counter is inversely proportional to the mass loading on the filter tape. The pump turns on at the beginning of the hour and runs for 50 minutes. During the last 10 minutes of the hour, the pump is off while the tape transport operates, final mass reading is collected, and self-tests are performed. PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations are displayed on the front panel and sent to the analog or digital output.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION


The primary and secondary standards for PM<sub>10</sub> are the same. In order for an area to be considered in compliance with the PM<sub>10</sub> standard, the 24-hour concentration of 150 micrograms per cubic meter should not be exceeded more than once per year on average over three years [52 FR 24663, July 1, 1987, as amended at 62 FR 38711, July 18, 1997; 65 FR 80779, Dec. 22, 2000]. There was also an annual average standard for PM<sub>10</sub> until December 17, 2006. EPA revoked the annual standard because of a lack of evidence of chronic health effects resulting from long-term exposure to moderate levels of PM<sub>10</sub>.

Figure 36, on the next page, shows how Georgia compares to the 24-hour standard for PM<sub>10</sub>, which remains set at 150  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . The standard allows one exceedance per year averaged over a 3-year period, therefore this chart shows the second highest 24-hour average for each site. Although there is variation from year to year at any given site, the statewide 24-hour average is relatively stable, with a gradual decrease over the nine years. It is believed that concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub> in 2007 were above normal due to excessive smoke from the Sweat Farm/Big Turnaround/Bugaboo Fire in the Okefenokee Swamp. Due to this wildfire, Georgia EPD requested from the U.S. EPA that two PM<sub>10</sub> data points from the Albany site be flagged as an exceptional event, and not used in regulatory calculations. The U.S. EPA has approved this request. However, since the public was exposed to these levels of PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations, they are included in Figure 37 and Figure 36, on the following page. For the 2007 data (shown in teal), the second highest 24-hour value of 187  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for the Albany site is one of the two exceptional event data points that were taken out of the dataset for regulatory calculations. The other data point was Albany's highest value of 189  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . In 2008 (shown in dark blue), almost all the sites show a marked decline in the second highest 24-hour concentration of PM<sub>10</sub>, with many sites' concentrations below the level of the 2006 concentrations (shown in light green). The majority of the sites continue to show a decrease in 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations. For the past few years, all of the second highest 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations have remained below 60  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , well below the 150  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  limit. For additional PM<sub>10</sub> summary data, see Appendix A.



**Figure 36: Second Highest 24-Hour PM<sub>10</sub> Concentration**

Figure 37 shows the annual PM<sub>10</sub> averages in Georgia. On an annual basis, PM<sub>10</sub> levels in Georgia are relatively low. However, there was an increase in the annual averages of PM<sub>10</sub> for 2007 that is presumed to be a product of the Sweat Farm/Big Turnaround/Bugaboo Fire in the Okefenokee Swamp. In 2008, there was a noticeable reduction in annual average concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub> across the state. In 2009, concentrations remained relatively consistent with the 2008 concentrations, with annual averages ranging from 18-27  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . In 2010, there was an overall decrease in PM<sub>10</sub> averages. The 2010 annual averages ranged from 16-25  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . Again in 2011, there was an overall decrease, with annual averages ranging from 15-21  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .




+ Includes exceptional event data for 2007

\*Rome data consolidated for 131150003 and 131150005 in 2009

**Figure 37: PM<sub>10</sub> Annual Arithmetic Mean Chart**



Figure 38 shows a map that was taken from the EPA document “Our Nation’s Air-Status and Trends through 2010”. It shows PM<sub>10</sub> second maximum 24-hour concentrations across the United States for 2010. This gives a comparison of Georgia’s PM<sub>10</sub> data, compared to the rest of the country. For Georgia, the second maximum 24-hour concentrations were in the lowest range of 2-54 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (dark blue).



(From EPA’s “Our Nation’s Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2010”)

**Figure 38: PM<sub>10</sub> Second Maximum 24-Hour Concentrations (µg/m<sup>3</sup>), 2010**

### PM<sub>Coarse</sub>

PM<sub>coarse</sub>, or PM<sub>10-2.5</sub>, is described as particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter and greater than 2.5 microns. The composition of PM<sub>coarse</sub> is predominantly crustal matter (from construction, demolition, mining, agricultural activities, sea spray, dust) and organic materials (from resuspension of biological material from soil surfaces and roads). However, composition and sources can vary greatly by region. The regional relative humidity can affect the level of water present within the particles and affect how much dissolved gases or reactive species enter the lungs. The amount of water within the PM<sub>coarse</sub> material can also affect the size and particle deposition characteristics.

For a map of that includes the location of Georgia EPD’s PM<sub>coarse</sub> monitor, refer to Figure 35 in the previous section.

### HEALTH IMPACTS

At this point, there is a limited amount of available data on health effects of PM<sub>coarse</sub> material. Studies have shown that short-term exposure to high levels of ambient PM<sub>coarse</sub> is associated with decreased lung function, increased hospital admissions for respiratory systems and heart disease, and possible

premature death. Efforts are being made to collect more information on sources, characteristics and toxicity of  $PM_{coarse}$  that will help with understanding the potential health effects.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

As part of the NCore requirements, the South DeKalb site began  $PM_{coarse}$  sampling as of January 1, 2011. Georgia EPD measures  $PM_{coarse}$  with two beta attenuation particle monitors networked together. Both units are identical except for the inlet size. The  $PM_{10}$  unit has an inlet that only allows particles of 10 microns or smaller in size, while the  $PM_{2.5}$  unit has a Very Sharp Cut Cyclone (VSCC) inlet allowing only particles of 2.5 microns in size or smaller. At the beginning of each hourly measurement cycle, beta rays containing  $^{14}C$  are emitted across clean filter tape, then measured with a photomultiplier tube with a scintillator. Next, air is sampled through the clean spot on the filter tape. The particulate matter is collected on the tape, and the beta rays are measured across the dirty spot. The difference between the clean and dirty spots determines the concentration. A  $PM_{coarse}$  board and synchronization cable connects the two samplers. Each hour, the  $PM_{10}$  sampler measures the  $PM_{10}$  concentration, collects the  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration from the  $PM_{2.5}$  sampler, and calculates the  $PM_{10-2.5}$  concentration.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

Currently, there is no attainment standard for  $PM_{coarse}$ .  $PM_{coarse}$  measurements are performed to support the regulatory, analytical, and public health purposes of the program. While it is understood that these  $PM_{coarse}$  particles are harmful, the severity and type of health outcomes, rural versus urban area sources, and composition are not well understood. By collecting data about current concentrations, researchers can later compare GA EPD's data with health data to better understand the health effects.

## **PM<sub>2.5</sub>**

The U.S. EPA defines 2.5 particulate matter as solid particles and liquid droplets present in the air that are less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter. These particles and droplets are invisible to the naked eye. However, collectively, they may appear as a fog-like haze or clouds and are often referred to as "fine" particles.


Fine particles are produced by various sources, including fires, industrial combustion, residential combustion, and vehicle exhaust (Figure 39 and Figure 40, on the next page). However, fine particles are also formed when combustion gases are chemically transformed. Fine particles can soil and accelerate the deterioration of man-made materials. In addition, fine particles impair visibility and are an important contributor to haze, particularly in humid conditions. The visibility effect is roughly doubled at 85% relative humidity as compared to humidity under 60% (U.S. EPA, 2004a). Based on data from EPA's Air Emission Sources for 2008, Georgia's primary source of  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions is fires, with over 68,000 tons attributed to this emission source. This information is displayed in Figure 39. Figure 40, on the next page, shows a spatial view of Georgia's  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions, also from EPA's Air Emission Sources, based on 2008 data.

Considerable effort is being undertaken to analyze the chemical composition of fine particles ( $PM_{2.5}$ ), so pollution control efforts can be focused in areas that create the greatest hazard reductions. Therefore, Georgia currently monitors fifty-three (53) particle species, which include gold, sulfate, lead, arsenic, and silicon. This speciation data is discussed further in the  $PM_{2.5}$  Speciation section.




### PM2.5 Emissions by Source Sector

in Georgia (NEI 2008 v1.5 GPR)



**Figure 39: Common Sources of Particulate Matter 2.5 in 2008**



**Figure 40: Particulate Matter 2.5 Emission in Georgia in 2008 – Spatial View**

### HEALTH IMPACTS

Fine particles can penetrate into the sensitive regions of the respiratory tract, which make them a health concern. Recently published community health studies indicate that significant respiratory and cardiovascular-related problems are associated with exposure to fine particle levels below the existing particulate matter standards. In addition, fine particles are likely to cause the most serious health effects, which include premature death, hospital admissions from respiratory causes, and increased respiratory problems. Long-term exposure to particulate matter may increase the rate of respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses and reduce the life span of an individual. Some data also suggests that fine particles can pass through lung tissues and enter the bloodstream. Therefore, children, the

elderly, and individuals with cardiovascular disease or lung diseases such as emphysema and asthma are especially vulnerable.

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations are measured with two types of methods. These two techniques consist of an integrated method and a continuous method. At sites where mass PM<sub>2.5</sub> samples are taken on an integrated basis, the samples are measured using very similar techniques utilized for measuring PM<sub>10</sub>. The official reference method requires that samples are collected on Teflon filters with a PM<sub>2.5</sub> sampler for 24 hours. A specialized particle size sorting device is used to filter the air, collecting only particles 2.5 microns in size and smaller. The filters are weighed in a laboratory before and after the sampling period. The change in the filter weight corresponds to the mass weight of PM<sub>2.5</sub> particles collected. That mass weight, divided by the total volume of air sampled, corresponds to the mass concentration of the particles in the air for that 24-hour period. The reference method filters are used for attainment determinations. However, due to the delay in collecting each filter, shipping it to the laboratory, and weighing, weeks may pass before the results are known. Although this method is very accurate, it is not useful for real-time determinations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in ambient air.

At sites where the continuous method is utilized, Georgia EPD uses two types of instruments. One type GA EPD uses is the beta attenuation method. The continuous monitor measures and records hourly particulate mass concentrations in ambient air. The monitor consists of three basic components; the central unit, the sampling pump and the sampling inlet hardware. In order to sample particles that are 2.5 microns or less, the inlet is designed to cut out particles larger than 2.5 microns in size. The monitor uses beta ray attenuation to calculate collected particle mass concentrations in units of micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). A <sup>14</sup>C element (60  $\mu\text{Ci}$  +/- 15  $\mu\text{C}$ ) emits a constant source of low-energy electrons, also known as beta particles. The beta rays are attenuated as they collide with particles collected on a filter tape. The decrease in signal detected by the scintillation counter is inversely proportional to the mass loading on the filter tape. The pump turns on at the beginning of the hour and runs for 50 minutes. During the last 10 minutes of the hour, the pump is off while the tape transport operates, final mass reading is collected, and self-tests are performed. PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are displayed on the front panel and sent to the analog or digital output. The sampling method for the BAM type of continuous PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitor was approved as Federal Equivalent Method (FEM) in Notices of the Federal Register/Vol.73, No.49 dated March 12, 2008 when used with a "Very Sharp Cut Cyclone". When GA EPD begins operating the continuous BAM as an FEM with a "Very Sharp Cut Cyclone", these samplers will be used for making attainment decisions relative to the NAAQS. As of January 1, 2011, Georgia EPD began running a BAM as an FEM sampler at the South DeKalb site (associated with the PM<sub>coarse</sub> unit described above), and this sampler can be used for attainment designations.

At the other locations where Georgia EPD samples PM<sub>2.5</sub> on a continuous basis, GA EPD uses the tapered element oscillating microbalance (TEOM) method. These monitors use an inline PM<sub>2.5</sub> cyclone for particle size selection and an inline Sample Equilibration System (SES), which uses a diffusion drying technique to minimize water vapor interference with the particle mass measurement. The instrument oscillates the sample filter on a microbalance continuously while particles are collected from ambient air. By measuring the change in the oscillation frequency, the change in filter mass can be determined. PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are displayed on the front panel and sent to the analog or digital output. As configured in the Georgia ambient air monitoring network, these analyzers (TEOM) are not approved as reference or equivalent method, and the data collected from these samplers cannot be used for making attainment decisions relative to the NAAQS.

Both types of PM<sub>2.5</sub> continuous samplers are used to support development of air quality models and forecasts, including the Air Quality Index (AQI), and to provide the public with information about pollutant concentrations in real time. Continuous PM<sub>2.5</sub> data is reported every hour, at fifteen minutes after the end of each hour, on Georgia's Ambient Air Monitoring web page located at <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/index.php>. The immediate availability of this data allows the public to make informed decisions regarding their outdoor activities. Figure 41 shows the location of

Georgia's PM<sub>2.5</sub> FRM monitors and Figure 42, on the following page, shows the location of PM<sub>2.5</sub> continuous and speciation monitors.





Figure 41: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Federal Reference Method Monitoring Site Map


Figure 42: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Continuous and Speciation Monitoring Site Map

---

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

In order for an area to be in attainment of the national primary and secondary annual ambient air PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, the area must have an annual arithmetic mean concentration less than or equal to 15.0 micrograms per cubic meter [62 FR 38711, July 18, 1997]. In addition, there is a 24-hour primary and secondary standard that requires that the three year average of the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile of the 24-hour concentration be less than or equal to 35 micrograms per cubic meter [71 FR 61144, October 17, 2006]. All sample analyses used for determining compliance with the standards must use a reference method based on information present in 40 CFR Appendix L or an equivalent method as designated in accordance with Part 53.

As can be seen in Figure 43 on the following page, the three-year averages of 98<sup>th</sup> percentile of PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour data are compared to the 24-hour standard of 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. For the 2003-2006 data, there were no exceptional events to consider. The 2007 data was affected by the Sweat Farm/Big Turnaround/Bugaboo Fire in the Okefenokee Swamp. To show the complete data set that was collected, the 2007 data includes the exceptional event data that was taken out for regulatory purposes. Therefore, in Figure 43 the three-year average calculations including the 2007 data (2005-2007, 2006-2008, and 2007-2009) are not a regulatory comparison to the 24-hour standard. The 98<sup>th</sup> percentile of 24-hour average concentrations have consistently decreased from the 2004-2006 to the 2009-2011 averages for almost all the sites. All of the 2009-2011 98<sup>th</sup> percentile of 24-hour averages (shown in orange) are well below the standard of 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.



+ Includes all data from 2007 that was excluded for exceptional events

\* Site was shut down from 9/06 to 12/08; averages not complete 3 years


\*\* Sites established in 2005

\*\*\* Sites consolidated in 2009, data combined for Rome-Coosa Elem and Rome-Coosa High

**Figure 43: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Three-Year 24-Hour Averages, By Site**




Figure 44 also shows a non-regulatory comparison of three-year averages of annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> data to the annual standard of 15.0 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This graph includes the PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceptional event data for 2007 to show the complete data set that was collected, as well. Therefore, in Figure 44 the 2005-2007, 2006-2008 and 2007-2009 annual averages are not a regulatory comparison to the standard. There is an obvious continual decreasing trend in the annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> data, with most of the 2009-2011 averages (shown in orange) ranging from 10.0 to 12.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. For additional PM<sub>2.5</sub> summary data, see Appendix A.



**Figure 44: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Three-Year Annual Averages, By Site**

The PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual standard attainment and nonattainment designations require three years of monitoring data. Therefore, Georgia's initial attainment status was not determined until late 2004. Based on the three years of data (2001-2003), EPA officially declared several areas of Georgia in nonattainment of the annual standard. Nonattainment areas included Walker and Catoosa Counties, which are a part of the metro Chattanooga nonattainment area. All of Bibb County and portions of Monroe County were included in the Macon nonattainment area. Floyd County itself was declared a nonattainment area. Finally, the metro Atlanta nonattainment area was also declared. This includes Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding, and Walton Counties, along with portions of Heard and Putnam Counties. Figure 45, on the next page, illustrates the boundaries of Georgia's four PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual standard nonattainment areas. Currently, based on 2007-2009 data, all of Georgia is meeting the PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual standard, but has not been officially designated as in attainment. For attainment designations to be official, the maintenance state implementation plan (SIP) needs to be submitted and approved by EPA. GA EPD has submitted the maintenance SIP to EPA and is awaiting approval.


For the PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour standard, the entire state of Georgia is classified as in attainment. The 24-hour standard is also based on three years of monitoring data, and this attainment status is based on the 2005-2007 data.




**Figure 45: Georgia's PM<sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Area Map**

Figure 46, on the next page, shows maps that were taken from the EPA document "Our Nation's Air - Status and Trends through 2010". The first map shows PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual average concentrations across the United States for 2010, and the second map shows the 24-hour average concentrations. This gives a comparison of Georgia's PM<sub>2.5</sub> data, compared to the rest of the country. It appears that for Georgia, the annual average concentrations were in the 3.1-12.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (dark blue) and 12.1-15.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (light blue) ranges. The 24-hour average concentrations were in the 16-35  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (light blue) range across Georgia.

## Annual Concentrations



## Daily Concentrations



(From EPA's "Our Nation's Air- Status and Trends through 2010")

**Figure 46: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Annual and 24-Hour Concentrations across the United States, 2010**



---


## PM<sub>2.5</sub> SPECIATION

As required by the National PM<sub>2.5</sub> Speciation program (40 CFR 58), EPD monitors the mass concentration of fine particulate matter (in micrograms per cubic meter of air) along with the chemical composition of those particles. Attempts to control the concentration of fine particulate matter are a national priority through listings in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Therefore, regulations intended to reduce levels of fine particulate matter are now being implemented on a widespread basis. The desired reduction of fine particulate matter concentrations is expected to produce benefits in human health and assist in the improvement of visibility by reducing the presence of haze.

It is known that particulate matter has varying health effects depending of their size and chemical composition. The particles that compose fine particulate matter are not uniform. While they are all smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter, their size varies. Some fine particles are emitted into the air directly from engine exhaust, fossil fuel combustion, unpaved roads, and the tilling of fields; others are formed in the atmosphere through reactions between gaseous pollutants. Each individual particle, regardless of its source, has a distinct chemical composition. The overall composition of all particles that make up the fine particulate matter in a given volume of air may also vary, depending on local sources and a variety of other factors. Within the make-up of the particulate matter, some chemicals are more toxic than others. There has been some disagreement on whether the quantity or toxicity of fine particulate matter is the main culprit. This reinforces the need to monitor and analyze both the species of particulate matter and weight of the species.

Georgia currently monitors fifty-three species, which include gold, sulfate, lead, arsenic, and silicon. However, there are only approximately six chemicals that are detected frequently. Of these, sulfate and organic carbon are detected in the highest concentrations, with magnitudes of up to five to nine times greater than the other major species. Figure 47 illustrates the average concentrations of these six chemicals from 2003 to 2011. The chemical elements typical of the Earth's crust are grouped together as "crustal". All of the sites are shown for one bar, showing how each site makes up the total of each of the major constituents of the speciation data. Note that the Rossville site began collecting data in 2005; therefore, the blue bars are not included in the 2003 and 2004 data. With the exception of the 2007 data, which was affected by the Okefenokee Swamp wildfire, there seems to be a general downward trend in the data. Below the figures is a listing of the most significant chemical constituents of fine particulate matter.

Refer to Figure 42 for a map of Georgia's PM<sub>2.5</sub> Speciation monitors.



**Figure 47: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Speciation, by Species, 2003-2011**



---

**PREDOMINANT SPECIES FOUND IN PM<sub>2.5</sub>**

**Ammonium ion:** commonly released by fertilizer production, livestock production, coke production, and some large refrigeration systems. Ironically, it can be emitted by NO<sub>x</sub> control systems installed on large fossil fuel combustion systems, which use ammonia or urea as a reactant.

**Sulfate products:** formed during the oxidation of SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. SO<sub>2</sub> is primarily produced by coal burning boilers.

**Nitrate products:** formed through a complex series of reactions that convert NO<sub>x</sub> to nitrates. Vehicle emissions and fossil fuel burning produce NO<sub>x</sub>.


**Crustal products:** components that are the result from the weathering of Earth's crust. They may include ocean salt and volcanic discharges. Crustal products include aluminum, calcium, iron, titanium, and silicon. These components are released by metals production, and can be resuspended in the atmosphere by mechanisms that stir up fine dust, such as mining, agricultural processes, and vehicle traffic.

**Elemental carbon:** carbon in the form of soot. Sources of elemental carbon include diesel engine emissions, wood-burning fireplaces, and forest fires.

**Organic carbon:** consist of hundreds of organic compounds that contain more than 20 carbon atoms. These particles may be released directly, but are also formed through a series of chemical reactions in the air, mostly as a result of the burning of fossil fuels and wood.

Data on the composition of fine particulate matter is a useful input to scientific models of air quality. Ultimately, it helps scientists and regulators track the progress and effectiveness of newly implemented pollution controls. The data also improves scientific understanding of the relationship between particle composition, visibility impairment, and adverse human health effects.

Figure 48 presents a different view of the same data to facilitate visualization of trends. Each site is shown with all species making up the composition of each bar. Each year is shown separately.

Figure 48: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Speciation, by Site, 2003-2011

To look at the data by site, there is a general trend downward of the speciated parameters, except in 2007 when the data was affected by the Sweat Farm/Big Turnaround/Bugaboo Fire in the Okefenokee Swamp, as discussed in the PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> sections. The rural background site, General Coffee, continues to show the smallest total average concentration. In 2011, the General Coffee site had about 7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> overall concentration. All the other sites had overall concentrations around 8 to 9 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

Ammonium ion concentrations (shown in pink) are relatively even statewide, with concentrations lowest at the General Coffee site. The concentrations ranged from 0.42 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at the General Coffee site to 0.78 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at the Athens site in 2011. Ammonium ion is the third largest single contributor to the total speciation make up.

The Rome area has the highest elemental carbon concentration, 0.93 µg/m<sup>3</sup> shown in burgundy. Cities with less heavy vehicle traffic generally have lower concentrations. The General Coffee site has the lowest elemental carbon concentration, with 0.19 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2011.

Organic carbon concentrations (shown in green) are relatively consistent throughout the state, usually consisting of about 3-4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> of the total speciation concentration. Organic carbon concentrations are much higher than typical ammonium ion or elemental carbon concentrations, having one of the largest contributions to the total PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations.

Sulfate (shown in dark blue) is also found in higher concentrations, with concentrations around 2.0-2.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2011. Concentrations are relatively consistent statewide, though somewhat lower in rural areas, and their relatively large observed mass means that they are also a major contributor to overall PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations.


Nitrate concentrations (shown in purple) are relatively small (0.21-0.55 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2011), usually contributing the fourth or fifth largest single component of the total five major constituents. Atmospheric forms of nitrate can be formed from the conversion of NO<sub>x</sub>. Other forms of nitrate can be found in fertilizers, animal and human organic waste, medications, and used in welding.

Crustal matter concentrations (shown in gray) are generally one of the lowest speciation concentrations (0.16-0.21 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2011) and consistent in most areas. Rome and Macon have in some years recorded unexpectedly high crustal matter concentrations. This may be attributed to local industry, or possibly a sign of poor dust control at agricultural, construction, or mining operations in those areas.

The section labeled 'Other' (shown in orange) is a make-up of all the rest of the compounds not included in the five major contributors or crustal make-up. This is a total of the remaining 43 compounds in the speciation sample. Concentrations range from 1.17 to 1.40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2011.

For PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation summary data, see Appendix B.

To show a comparison of Georgia's PM<sub>2.5</sub> speciation data to the rest of the United States, the following map was taken from the EPA's "Our Nation's Air- Status and Trends through 2008." In Georgia, as well as the other states in the Southeast, sulfate and organic carbon are the main contributors of PM<sub>2.5</sub> data, while nitrate is barely a contributor. In the North and the West, sulfate and organic carbon are still major contributors, however, nitrate (shown in red) also shows considerable contribution. Nitrate's predominant sources originate from highway vehicles, non-road mobile, electric utilities, and industrial boilers. In the East, the main sources of sulfate are electric utilities and industrial boilers. The major sources of organic carbon are highway vehicles, non-road mobile, waste burning, wildfires, and vegetation. In addition, woodstoves and fireplaces are principal contributors to organic carbon in the West. The composition of PM<sub>2.5</sub> seems to vary across the country depending on predominant sources.



(From EPA's "Our Nation's Air- Status and Trends through 2008")

**Figure 49: Four-Season Average of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  Composition Data for 15 U.S. Cities**

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Particle speciation measurements require the use of a wide variety of sampling and analytical techniques, but all generally use filter media to collect the particles to be analyzed. Laboratory techniques currently in use are gravimetric (microweighing); X-ray fluorescence and particle-induced X-ray emission for trace elements; ion chromatography for anions and selected cations; controlled combustion for carbon; and gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy (GC/MS) for semi-volatile organic particles.

### ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION

Particle speciation measurements are performed to support the regulatory, analytical, and public health purposes of the program. There are no ambient air quality standards regarding the speciation of particles.

---


## PHOTOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT MONITORING STATIONS (PAMS)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Ozone is the most prevalent photochemical oxidant and an important contributor to photochemical pollutants. The understanding of the chemical processes in ozone formation and the specific understanding of the atmospheric mixture in nonattainment areas nationwide are essential. To better understand the chemical processes and develop a strategy for solving those problems, EPA revised the ambient air quality surveillance regulations. In February 1993, Title 40, Part 58 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Part 58) was developed to include provisions for enhanced monitoring of ozone, oxides of nitrogen, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), selected carbonyl compounds, and monitoring of meteorological parameters. These parameters would be monitored at Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS). Stated in Title 40, Part 58 of the Code of Federal Regulation (40 CFR Part 58), the increased monitoring of ozone and its precursor concentrations allows for the characterization of precursor emissions within the area, transport of ozone and its precursors, and the photochemical processes leading to nonattainment. By expanding on the study of ozone formation, PAMS monitoring sites better serve as a means to study trends and spatial and diurnal variability.

As described in the Technical Assistance Document (TAD), PAMS monitoring was to be implemented in cities that were classified as serious, severe, or extreme for ozone nonattainment. The classifications were based on the number of exceedances of the ozone standard, and the severity of those exceedances. Nineteen areas nationwide were required to implement a PAMS network. In the Atlanta metropolitan area, a network of four sites was established beginning in 1993. The monitoring sites were selected depending on the pollutants monitored in relation to the prevailing winds in the area. The Yorkville site serves as a Type 1 site. It is a rural background site, upwind of the city, which aids in determining the role of transport of pollutants into the Atlanta area. The South DeKalb and Tucker sites were the primary and secondary wind directions for an urban core-type site, serving as Type 2 sites. These sites are expected to measure the highest precursor concentrations of NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs in the Atlanta area. The Conyers site is the downwind site where titration of the precursors has occurred and the ozone concentrations should be at their highest. The Conyers site serves as a Type 3 site. Until the end of 2006, this was the set up of the PAMS network. At the end of 2006, the Tucker site was shut down. From that point, South DeKalb has served as the urban core-type site. When the PAMS network was originally designed, there was a plan for a Type 4 site, which samples the air once it has returned to background levels far downwind from the metropolitan area. However, when the network was instituted, this type of site was not used. The PAMS network as it was set up for the 2011 monitoring year can be seen in Figure 50, on the next page.




**Figure 50: PAMS Monitoring Site Map**




Of the fifty-six PAMS compounds monitored, the same volatile organic compounds (VOCs) consistently show the highest average concentrations at all three sites. These compounds include isoprene, m/p xylene, toluene, propane, ethane, isopentane, n-butane and n-pentane. Propane, ethane, isopentane, n-butane, and n-pentane have a limited reactivity for ozone formation, and therefore are the most prevalent of the volatile organic compounds measured. However, when the characterization of the top compounds is based upon contributions to ozone formation potential, the list is slightly different.

Isoprene, the tracer for VOCs emissions from vegetation, is by far the largest contributor to ozone formation at every site. Isoprene is a 5 carbon organic compound naturally released in large quantities by conifer trees. These trees are very abundant in the Southeastern United States, contributing a significant portion to the overall carbon loading of the atmosphere in this region. Isoprene's chemical structure makes it a highly reactive substance with a short atmospheric lifetime and large ozone forming potential.

Figure 51 and Figure 52, below, show the seasonal occurrence of isoprene from 2003 to 2011. Both of the figures represent a combination of the 6-day, 24-hour data from the three PAMS sites, and concentrations are given in parts per billion Carbon (ppbC). Figure 51 shows the data spread out for the nine years, while Figure 52 shows a different perspective of the same data, overlapping, for the course of a year's time. Evidence of isoprene's natural origin is shown in these figures, where the ambient concentration is essentially non-existent from November to May with an occasional spike outside the consistent cycle. During the spring of 2009, the laboratory facility moved its location, and the PAMS canister data was not processed. As a result, there is a break in the data from March until June of 2009 in the following PAMS figures.




**Figure 51: Isoprene Yearly Profile, 2003-2011**



**Figure 52: Seasonal Occurrence of Isoprene**


The anthropogenic compounds detected at all sites with the highest ozone formation potential were toluene, m/p xylene, propylene, ethylene, and isopentane. The sources for these five compounds are varied. All five compounds are emitted by mobile sources, with ethylene being an important tracer for vehicle emissions. Toluene (generally the most abundant species in urban air), m/p xylene, and isopentane are also emitted by solvent use and refinery activities. Toluene reaches the air from a variety of sources such as combustion of fossil fuels and evaporative emissions. This hydrocarbon is in motor vehicle fuel and is also used as a common solvent in many products such as paint. It has a substituted benzene ring possessing modest atmospheric reactivity. Figure 53, below, compares the seasonal occurrence of toluene with overlapping data from 2003 through 2011. Again, this figure is a combination of the 6-day, 24-hour data from the three PAMS sites, and concentrations are given in parts per billion Carbon (ppbC).



**Figure 53: Toluene Yearly Profile, 2003-2011**

As shown in Figure 53, above, the atmospheric levels of toluene are relatively constant throughout the year, suggesting a steady level of emissions year-round. Over the past nine years, an occasional spike in concentration has occurred without evidence of a pattern. Overall, the PAMS site that is situated in the urban area (South DeKalb) has slightly higher levels of toluene, while the sites located on the outskirts of the Atlanta metropolitan area (Yorkville and Conyers) show lower levels of toluene. The jaggedness of these graphs is an artifact of the sampling frequency.

In the following graph, Figure 54, the daily profiles of toluene and isoprene are plotted. This graph uses data gathered in the summer, and shows a constant background of toluene emissions with higher levels resulting from morning and evening rush hour traffic. The graph shows the typical diurnal, or daily, profile for a typical urban area. During morning hours, when the nocturnal inversion has not yet broken, emissions become trapped within the boundary layer, resulting in a temporary increase in atmospheric concentration. Nighttime toluene levels are constant from midnight to 5:00 am. From 6:00 am to 7:00 am, increased vehicular activity releasing emissions into an atmosphere with limited dispersing ability produces an increase in the ambient concentration. This behavior is typical of area source anthropogenic emissions with modest to long atmospheric lifetimes. Isoprene, on the other hand, exhibits very different behavior. At night, emission levels are at zero as photosynthesis ceases. At sunrise (about 6:00 am) concentrations begin to rise and continue to do so throughout the daylight hours. The vertical flux, or mass input per unit area, in the atmosphere of this substance is massive, being only slightly influenced by the enhanced mid-morning mixing. This effect can be seen at 9:00 am when a slight drop in concentration occurs followed by a quick resumption in rise.



**Figure 54: Toluene & Isoprene, Typical Urban Daily Profile**

## CARBONYL COMPOUNDS

Carbonyl compounds define a large group of substances, which include acetaldehyde, acrolein, and formaldehyde. These compounds can act as precursors to ozone formation. Some of the sources of carbonyl compounds include vehicle exhaust and the combustion of wood. Depending on the amount inhaled, exposure to these compounds can cause irritation to the eyes, ears, nose, and throat, dizziness, and damage to the lungs. Each of the seven carbonyl compounds that Georgia EPD monitors is discussed further in the following paragraphs. The South DeKalb site is part of both the PAMS network and the National Air Toxics Trends Stations (NATTS) network, and collects samples every six days throughout the year, and every three hours throughout the summer. Until the end of 2008, carbonyls were monitored at the Savannah, Dawsonville, and Brunswick sites as part of the Air Toxics Network, and sampled every twelve days. As stated earlier, at the end of 2008, several of the ambient monitors were shut down due to budgetary constraints and lack of available personnel. The Brunswick carbonyls monitor was one of the monitors that was shut down (see Table 2 for details). For a map of current monitoring locations, see Figure 55, on the next page.

**Acrolein** is primarily used as an intermediate in the manufacture of acrylic acid. It can be formed from the breakdown of certain organic pollutants in outdoor air, from forest fires and wildfires, as well as from vehicle exhaust. It is also found in cigarette smoke.

**Acetaldehyde** is mainly used as an intermediate in the production of other chemicals. Acetaldehyde is formed as a product of incomplete wood combustion (in fireplaces and woodstoves, forest fires, and wildfires), pulp and paper production, stationary internal combustion engines and turbines, vehicle exhaust, and wastewater processing.



**Formaldehyde** is used mainly to produce resins used in particleboard products and as an intermediate in the production of other chemicals. The major sources of emissions to the air are forest fires and wildfires, marshes, stationary internal combustion engines and turbines, pulp and paper plants, petroleum refineries, power plants, manufacturing facilities, incinerators, cigarette smoke, and vehicle exhaust.

**Acetone** is used industrially as a reactant with phenol to produce bisphenol A, which is an important component of polymers. It is used in nail polish removers, superglue removers, and as a drying agent. It is also used to dissolve plastic. Acetone is highly volatile and evaporates quickly. Inhalation of acetone can lead to liver damage.

**Benzaldehyde** is the simplest form of the aromatic aldehydes. It has an almond scent and is used in the food industry. It is also used as an industrial solvent, and is used in making pharmaceuticals, plastic additives, and aniline dyes. Liquid phase oxidation or chlorination of toluene can form benzaldehyde. In addition, benzaldehyde can be formed from a reaction between benzene and carbon monoxide. The combustion of gasoline, diesel fuel, wood burning, and incinerators emit benzaldehyde into the atmosphere.


**Butyraldehyde** is used in the manufacture of synthetic resins, solvents, and plasticizers. It is emitted into the air by combustion of gasoline, diesel fuel, and wood.

**Propionaldehyde** is a highly volatile compound that is produced or used in making propionic acid, plastics, rubber chemicals, alkyd resins, and is also used as a disinfectant and preservative. It is released into the atmosphere by combustion of gasoline, diesel fuel, wood, and polyethylene.



As part of the PAMS network, the South DeKalb site collects 3-hour samples of carbonyls during the summer months (June, July, and August). Samples are collected at hours 6:00, 9:00, 12:00, and


15:00, every three days. The average concentrations (shown in micrograms per cubic meter) of all the 3-hour samples of carbonyls collected during those months for 2005 through 2011 have been combined for a given hour and are shown in Figure 56. The early morning ambient concentrations are generally lower for all constituents. Overall, most of the concentrations appear to peak at the 12:00 hour. There are a few visible changes when comparing the data from 2005 through 2011. All of the concentrations seem to gradually increase from 2005 to 2007, and then decrease in 2008. Again in 2009, the average concentrations increased, particularly formaldehyde concentrations, which more than doubled from 2008. In 2010, almost every annual average concentration decreased to levels seen in 2008. Then again in 2011, acetone, and again formaldehyde, showed an obvious doubling to 2009 levels, with early morning formaldehyde reaching peak levels. This could possibly be a cyclic trend forming for the formaldehyde and acetone concentrations. Acetaldehyde, acetone, and formaldehyde continue to be the biggest contributors, and generally follow the same daily pattern with the averages increasing from the 6:00 to 9:00, and again from the 9:00 to 12:00 hours, then decreasing at the 15:00 hour.



**Figure 56: Average South DeKalb 3-Hour Carbonyls, June-August, 2005-2011**




The next two graphs address the 24-hour samples of carbonyls data. Due to the differences in sampling method, analysis method, and the sites collecting acrolein data, acrolein is discussed separately in later paragraphs. In Figure 57, below, the average concentration of the remaining carbonyls is compared with the total number of detections at each of the sampling sites. Because the South DeKalb site collects data every six days with the PAMS and NATTS networks, while Savannah, and Dawsonville collect data every twelve days with the Air Toxics Network (discussed in next section), the detections are shown as a percentage of the overall samples taken. A detection of any given pollutant is counted as any number that is above half the limit of detection. To compare the data collected from 2005 to 2011, there are some noticeable changes. The Dawsonville site had a visible increase in concentration from 2006 to 2007, almost tripling from  $7.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $21.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . Then in 2008, the Dawsonville site's concentration dropped back down to  $6.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . In both 2009 and 2010, the Dawsonville site's total average concentration showed a slight increase, with a larger increase in 2010 reaching a concentration of  $13.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . Concentrations dropped in 2011, however, returning to levels seen in previous years. Until 2009, the South DeKalb site consistently had the highest average concentrations of all sites. However, in 2010, the Savannah site's total average concentration had a significant increase, from  $7.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in 2009 to  $33.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in 2010. This is more than a fourfold increase in concentration from 2009 to 2010 at the Savannah site, and is attributed mainly to formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, and acetone. The Savannah and South DeKalb sites total average concentrations were almost identical in 2011, as the South DeKalb site had an increase and the Savannah site, a decrease. As stated earlier, carbonyls are emitted into the air by combustion of gasoline and wood, and have industrial uses. Overall, the number of detections above detection limit, and average concentrations in this graph were lowest in 2008. The percent detections have remained relatively the same from 2005 to 2011 (around 40-60%).



**Figure 57: Average 24-Hour Carbonyls Concentration and Number of Detects, by Site, 2005-2011**

Figure 58, below, shows six of the seven species in the analyte group according to their statewide annual abundance, based on percentage of detections and average concentration. A graph of the seventh carbonyl, acrolein, is shown separately, as it is collected with the canister method and involves all the Air Toxics sites (discussed below). A gradient is evident from this graph below, with formaldehyde and acetone as the most abundant carbonyls. For the most part, it appears that the number of detections track the average concentration. With the higher average concentration, there are higher percent detections. Acetaldehyde does not follow this pattern, however, having a higher percentage of detections compared to lower concentrations. For all the compounds, there appears to

be a slight increase from the 2005 to 2007 data. In 2008, there is a decrease in both concentrations and detections (shown in light green). With the 2009 data (shown in tan), the average concentrations either remained about the same or had a slight increase from the 2008 concentrations. In 2010, all of the total average concentrations showed an increase. This 2010 increase is primarily attributed to the Savannah site's concentrations, as seen in the above graph. This trend continued with formaldehyde in 2011; however in 2011, the higher concentration is attributed to both the South DeKalb and Savannah sites. The remaining compounds saw a slight drop in concentration in 2011. The proportion of each compound remained the same throughout all seven years of data, with the biggest contributors (formaldehyde, acetone, and acetaldehyde) continuing through the years.




**Figure 58: Average 24-Hour Carbonyls Concentration vs. Number of Detects, by Species, 2005-2011**

Due to EPA research to improve acrolein sampling and analysis, a new method was developed by EPA and implemented in Georgia in July of 2007. The sampling method uses the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) canister collection method, and the analysis method uses gas chromatograph and mass spectroscopy (GC/MS). This change occurred due to EPA's findings during the new School Air Toxics Monitoring Initiative. For more information on this study, please see EPA's website, <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/airtoxschool.html>. Georgia EPD began using the new method for the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) at the South DeKalb site and at the other Air Toxics sites (discussed in the next section). In previous years, acrolein was sampled, along with the six other carbonyls, with the method of a dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) cartridge and analyzed with high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) at select sites across the state. The DNPH sampling and HPLC analysis method were used on the data that is displayed in the three previous carbonyls graphs. Since acrolein is no longer collected with DNPH and analyzed with HPLC, it is not shown in the previous carbonyls graphs. Before the new methods were used, in 2005, there were a total of 4 detections above detection limit, in 2006 there were zero detections, and in 2007 there was one detection above the detection limit in Georgia. With the canister collection and GC/MS analysis method and additional sampling locations, the number of acrolein detections above detection limit drastically increased in 2007. All the sites had above 80% detection, and some had 100% detection (Figure 59, below) in 2007.

At the end of 2008, nine of the Air Toxics Network sites were discontinued (see Table 2 for complete list). Six sites continue to collect acrolein data. From 2007 to 2009, the average concentrations remained relatively level. However, in 2010, there was a drastic increase in average concentrations. Every site had at least twice the 2009 concentration. The Savannah site had the highest increase from  $0.34 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in 2009 to  $4.25 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in 2010. This was followed by an equally dramatic decrease in concentration for 2011, with concentration levels reduced by half or more. For most sites, this appears to be a result of a significant decline in percent detections, with General Coffee, South DeKalb, and Yorkville sites reporting the lowest percent detections in the five year time period.

Acrolein may enter the environment as a result of combustion of trees and other plants, tobacco, gasoline, and oil. Additionally, it can be used as a pesticide for algae, weeds, bacteria, and mollusks (ATSDR, 2007c). The potential for acrolein to cause health effects is not well understood. At very low concentrations, it is an upper respiratory irritant. At very high concentrations it may produce more serious damage to the lining of the upper respiratory tract and lungs (ATSDR, 2007c; U.S. EPA, 2003).



**Figure 59: Acrolein Concentrations and Percent Detections, 2007- 2011**

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

A number of methods are used to conduct the PAMS hydrocarbon portion of the analyses. Throughout the year, 24-hour integrated volatile organic compounds samples are taken every sixth day at the PAMS sites (Conyers, South DeKalb, and Yorkville) and analyzed in the GA EPD laboratory for 56 hydrocarbon compounds. A SUMMA<sup>®</sup> polished canister is evacuated to a near-perfect vacuum and attached to a sampler with a pump controlled by a timer. The canister is filled to greater than 10 psig. Then, the canister is analyzed using a gas chromatograph with mass spectroscopy detection (GC/MS).

Additionally, during June, July, and August, hydrocarbon samples are analyzed hourly at the PAMS sites (Conyers, South DeKalb, and Yorkville) using a gas chromatography unit with a Flame Ionization Detector (FID). The gas chromatograph produces analyses of the ambient air for the same 56 hydrocarbons.

The carbonyls are sampled with two types of methods. One type is an absorbent cartridge filled with dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) coated silica that is attached to a pump to allow approximately 180 L

of air to be sampled. The cartridge is analyzed using High Performance Liquid Chromatography. Twenty-four hour integrated samples are collected throughout the year, every 12 days at the Air Toxics sites (Dawsonville and Savannah) and every 6 days at the NATTS site (South DeKalb). Also, during June, July, and August, four integrated three-hour carbonyl samples are taken every third day at the NATTS site (South DeKalb). All analyses are conducted at the GA EPD laboratory. The other collection method is the canister sampler that is used for sampling volatile organic compounds (described above). Acrolein is analyzed using this method. Specific annual summaries for the 2011 PAMS data may be found in Appendix C.

### **ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION**

There are no specific ambient air standards for the hydrocarbon and aldehyde species measured. PAMS measurements are performed to support the regulatory, analytical, and public health purposes of the ambient air monitoring program. By performing these measurements, GA EPD can better understand the characterization of precursor emissions within the area, transport of ozone and its precursors, and the photochemical processes leading to nonattainment. In addition, by studying local atmospheric chemistry, it improves the ability to control the formation of secondary pollutants like ozone and particulate matter. By making such data available, scientists can study air quality and how it relates to human health. This data can serve to guide policymakers toward making decisions that protect public health.

---

## AIR TOXICS MONITORING

### GENERAL INFORMATION

The citizens of Georgia have demonstrated a long-term interest in the quality of Georgia's air. Since the 1970's, ambient ozone concentrations have been monitored in several communities throughout the state. As the state's population grew, more compounds have been monitored in ambient air as required by the Federal Clean Air Act. In 1993, the EPD began to monitor a number of compounds that have no established ambient air standard. The monitoring has been conducted under two efforts, the first being the previously discussed Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Station (PAMS) project, a federally mandated program for areas in serious, severe, or extreme nonattainment of the ozone standard. The second effort is the EPD-sponsored monitoring activities for ambient concentration of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). That effort was undertaken since monitoring only criteria pollutants would not provide an adequate understanding of the quality of Georgia's air.

In 1994, the EPD conducted an intensive air quality study in Savannah (GADNR, 1996a). Then in 1996, the EPD conducted an intensive study in Glynn County as part of a multimedia event with EPA (GADNR, 1996b). These studies provided detailed pictures of the air quality in the communities, but the studies were not long-term studies and could not provide information on seasonal variation or trends. A reassessment of the air toxic monitoring program occurred, and in 1996 the EPD embarked on establishing a statewide hazardous air pollutant-monitoring network. The network was not designed to monitor any one particular industry, but to provide information concerning trends, seasonal variations, and rural versus urban ambient concentrations of air toxics. In order to evaluate the rural air quality, two background sites were proposed: one in North Georgia and one in South Georgia. The majority of the other sites were located in areas with documented emissions to the atmosphere of HAPs exceeding one million (1,000,000) pounds per year as indicated by the 1991 Toxic Release Inventory (GADNR, 1993).

After six years, by 2002, the Air Toxics Network (ATN) consisted of fourteen sites statewide, including a collocated (where two sets of monitors sample side by side) site at Utoy Creek, monitoring for a common set of toxic compounds. From the list of 187 compounds identified by EPA as being HAPs, the toxic compounds include metals, volatile organic compounds, and semi-volatile organic compounds. In addition, three of the ATN sites (Brunswick, Dawsonville, and Savannah) monitored carbonyl compounds (as seen in the previous section).

In 2003, a National Air Toxics Trends site was added to the network at the South DeKalb site, bringing the total to fifteen air toxics sites. The National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) network was established in 2003 and is intended for long-term operation for the purpose of discerning national trends. The NATTS Network consists of 27 sites nationwide, 20 urban and 7 rural. At the South DeKalb site, the same compounds are monitored as at the other air toxics sites, as well as hexavalent chromium, black carbon, and carbonyls (already being monitored with PAMS network).

All of these air toxic pollutants can have negative effects on human health, ranging from causing headaches, nausea, dizziness, cancer, birth defects, problems breathing, and other serious illnesses. These effects can vary depending on frequency of exposure, length of exposure time, health of the person that is exposed, along with the toxicity of the compound. These air pollutants also affect the environment. Wildlife experiences symptoms similar to those in humans. Pollutants accumulate in the food chain. Many air pollutants can also be absorbed into waterways and have toxic effects on aquatic wildlife. Some of the substances tend to have only one critical effect, while others may have several. Some of the effects may occur after a short exposure and others appear after long-term exposure, or many years after being exposed. Exposure is not only through direct inhalation of the pollutant, but also through the consumption of organisms such as fish that have absorbed the pollutant.

Air toxic compounds are released from many different sources, including mobile sources (such as vehicles), stationary industrial sources, small area sources, indoor sources (such as cleaning

materials), and other environmental sources (such as wildfires). The lifetime, transportation, and make-up of these pollutants are affected by both weather (rain and wind) and landscape (mountains and valleys). They can be transported far away from the original source, or be caught in rain and brought down to waterways or land. The following section discusses air toxic compounds, possible sources, monitoring techniques, findings for 2011 and a comparison of 2011 data to previous years.

In 2004, the Air Toxics Network underwent changes to the detection limits and reporting limits of the chemicals in this network. These limits were lowered, enabling analysis of a broader range of data. Instead of only seeing the higher numbers that were detected and using those numbers for average concentrations, one is able to see both sides of the spectrum and have a truer average for each chemical. Also, including the lower concentrations for each chemical allows for a better understanding of what levels can cause chronic health problems. Seeing only the higher levels of concentration, or possibly spikes, only yields data useful for identifying acute health effects. However, with the lower concentration levels included in the data, there can be further assessment of potential chronic health effects. With the lower limits included in the data, one is able to see all possible effects of the chemicals analyzed.

As stated earlier, in 2008, certain samplers within Georgia's ambient air monitoring network were discontinued. More than half of the Air Toxics Network was included in this process. Six out of the 15 total Air Toxics sites (including one NATTS site) collected data in 2011. The following section will reflect only the data collected from the samplers that remain in the network. Refer to Table 2 for complete list of discontinued samplers.



---

## METALS

The metals subcategory includes antimony, arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, lead, manganese, nickel, selenium, and zinc.

**Antimony** is used as a hardener in lead for storage batteries, in matches, as an alloy in internal combustion engines, and in linotype printing machines. Antimony compounds are used in making materials flame-retardant, and in making glass, ceramic enamels, and paints. Forms of the antimony metal are also used in medicines, and can be found in gasoline and diesel exhaust.

**Arsenic** occurs naturally at trace levels in soil and water. Most people are not exposed to arsenic through air pollution, but it can be found in food. The arsenic found in air comes mainly from the burning of coal or fuel oil, from metal smelters or iron foundries, and from the burning of waste.

**Beryllium** is a lightweight and rigid metal and used in watch springs, computer equipment, and used in the production of beryllium-copper as an alloying agent. This strong alloy is used to conduct heat and electricity, in spot welding, electrical contacts, and high-speed aircraft. Until 1949, beryllium was used in fluorescent lighting, until it was determined to have caused berylliosis, a disease that primarily affects the respiratory system and skin. Beryllium in ambient air is mainly a result of the burning of coal or fuel oil.

**Cadmium** emissions, like beryllium and arsenic, are mainly from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal or oil. The incineration of municipal waste and the operation of zinc, lead, or copper smelters also release cadmium in the air. For nonsmokers, food is generally the largest source of cadmium exposure.

**Chromium** sources include the combustion of coal and oil, electroplating, vehicle exhaust, iron and steel plants, and metal smelters. The emissions from these sources are a combination of elemental chromium and compounds including chromium ions. The most toxic form is hexavalent chromium.

**Cobalt** is used as a pigment (blue and green coloring agent), as a drying agent for paints, inks and varnishes, and as a catalyst for the petroleum and chemical industries. It is used as an alloy for parts in turbine aircraft engines, corrosion-resistant alloys, magnets, battery electrodes, and steel-belted tires. Cobalt also has a medicinal use as a radioactive metal in radiotherapy. It is also found in gasoline and diesel exhaust. Cobalt is actually necessary to many forms of life, when ingested through the digestive tract, in small amounts, as a micronutrient. It is a central component of vitamin B-12. As with most micronutrients, however, human activity can cause it to accumulate in unnatural locations or in unnatural concentrations. In those cases, it may be harmful and is considered a pollutant.

**Lead** is used in the manufacturing of batteries. The largest source of lead in the atmosphere used to be from the combustion of leaded gasoline. With the elimination of lead from gasoline, lead levels in the air have decreased considerably. Other sources of lead emissions include combustion of solid waste, coal, oils, emissions from iron and steel production, and lead smelters. Exposure to lead can also occur from food and soil. Children are at particular risk to lead exposure, because they commonly put hands, toys, and other items in their mouths that may come in contact with lead-containing dust and dirt. Lead-based paints were commonly used for many years. Flaking paint, paint chips, and weathered paint powder may be a major source of lead exposure, particularly for children.

**Manganese** is a naturally occurring substance found in many types of rock and soil. It is ubiquitous in the environment and found in low levels in water, air, soil, and food. Manganese can also be released into the air by combustion of coal, oil, wood, and the operation of iron and steel production plants.

**Nickel** is found in the air as a result of oil and coal combustion, residential heating, nickel metal refining, lead smelting, sewage sludge incineration, manufacturing facilities, mobile sources, and other sources.

**Selenium** is a by-product of mining and smelting sulfide ores, such as silver, copper, and pyrite. It is found in soils, and can also be released by burning coal. Selenium has photovoltaic and photoconductive properties and is therefore used in photocells and solar panels. It is used as a pigment (red coloring agent) in enamels and glass. It is also used as a toner in photographs and in photocopying. Selenium is also found in gasoline and diesel exhaust. Selenium is a micronutrient, needed at very low levels for the health of all living creatures. It is normally absorbed through the digestive tract, though, and is not desirable in the air.



**Zinc** is found in gasoline and diesel exhaust. It is used to prevent corrosion of galvanized steel. It is also used in die-casting, and as part of battery containers. Zinc has been used as the primary metal in making the U.S. penny since 1982. Zinc compounds are used in making white pigment, sunscreen, deodorant, calamine lotions, and pigments for glow in the dark items. It is also used in the rubber industry.

Like selenium, zinc is also a micronutrient needed for the health of living beings when consumed through the digestive system. When found in the air, though, it may be considered a pollutant.

For a map of the current metals monitoring locations, see Figure 60 on the next page.






Figure 60: Metals Monitoring Site Map



**Figure 61: Percentage of Metals Detections by Site, 2005-2011**

Figure 61 shows the percentage of metal species detected above the detection limit at each site for the years 2005 through 2011. Following EPA's guidance, a detection of any given pollutant is counted as any number that is above half the limit of detection. It is important to note that the South DeKalb metals sampler is designed to take the sample from the smaller PM<sub>10</sub> fraction of the air as part of the NATTS network, while the other samplers in the Air Toxics Network collect samples from all the total suspended particles. Lower limits of detection (LOD) were introduced in September of 2004; therefore to be consistent, the data represented in these figures starts with the 2005 data. There have been only seven full years of data collected at the lower limits, therefore true trends may not be discernible at this time. With Figure 61, the distribution of metals at the various locations across the state can be examined as well as any changes in the past seven years. The distribution across the sites is relatively similar. For all the sites, the percent detections remain around 80% to 90% of the total samples collected. The variability across the various sampling locations is modest, considering the vast geographic distribution of the sites, and climatological and anthropogenic influences from local urban development.

Figure 62 shows the network's percentage of detections above detection limit and total average concentrations by metallic species at all Air Toxics sites during 2005 through 2011. The detection of any given pollutant is counted as any number that is above half the limit of detection. One point of interest when looking at data is to track the percentage of detections along with the concentration. When examining this aspect, it appears that most metals had several detections, almost consistently up to 100%. Therefore, each metal detection contributes little concentration to the overall total concentration. This does not seem to be the case for zinc. While its detection frequency was almost the same as the other metals, zinc had the highest average concentration for all seven years. This would indicate that for each zinc detection, there was a higher concentration of that metal. Some metals including zinc, nickel, antimony, lead, chromium, and cadmium have been associated with emissions from tires and brake linings. The use of vehicles on Georgia's roads could be a reason for higher levels associated with some of these metals. With the concentrations of zinc being much higher than the other metals, zinc is explored further in Figure 63 (on the following page), which examines the concentrations of zinc by site.




**Figure 62: Average Concentration and Percentage Detections of Metals, by Species, 2005-2011**

With Figure 63 on the next page, the total average concentrations of zinc are investigated more closely, divided by site, for 2005 through 2011. It is important to note that zinc does not have a health based screening value (see Risk Assessment section for more details) that is considered harmful to humans. In addition, zinc is not one of the 187 hazardous air pollutants; however, it is reported for completeness.

With a few exceptions, most sites have had a consistent level of zinc throughout the seven years of data. As noted earlier, the South DeKalb metals sampler is designed to take the sample from the smaller PM<sub>10</sub> fraction of particles in the air, while the other samplers collect samples from all the total suspended particles. The lower levels at the South DeKalb site, in comparison, could be due to the larger particles (larger than PM<sub>10</sub> size) being restricted by the sampler, indicating that some of the zinc sample could be lost in the larger, restricted fraction of particles. An obvious change over the seven years of data is the Macon site's 2009 average zinc concentration more than doubling from the 2008 average concentration. This data was investigated further; however, results were inconclusive as to



the cause of the Macon site's higher values in 2009. The changes in zinc levels at the Macon site could be due to changes in local industry. Zinc can be released into the environment from mining, metal processing, steel production, burning coal, and burning certain wastes. In 2010 (shown in pink), the average zinc concentration for the Macon site decreased by about half again, resulting in a level near that of 2008. With the remaining 2010 zinc data, the Savannah site's average zinc concentration had a small increase, while the other four sites' average concentrations remained about the same as 2009 levels. In 2011, the Savannah site had a slight increase again, the General Coffee site also had a slight increase, and the remaining sites continued to show zinc concentrations around the same level as seen in previous years.



**Figure 63: Average Concentration Comparison of Zinc, by Site, 2005-2011**


## HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM (Cr<sub>6</sub>)

Hexavalent chromium (chromium in its +6 oxidation state) in the environment is almost always related to human activity. Hexavalent chromium can be released into the atmosphere through the production of stainless steel, chrome plating, coating processes, and painting. It is also found in vehicle engines. The presence of chromium compounds is common at hazardous waste sites. From locations such as these, exposure of populations residing or working nearby can occur through inhalation of air containing particulates or mists of chromium compounds. These particles can also find their way into drinking water if soluble forms of chromium leach into groundwater. Human exposure can also occur through skin contact with soil at hazardous waste sites. Hexavalent chromium is absorbed most readily through the lungs or digestive tract. Other forms of the metal, such as chromium in the +3 oxidation state, occur naturally in the environment and are not as efficient at entering the body. In general, hexavalent chromium compounds are more toxic than other chromium compounds. The toxicity of hexavalent chromium is in part due to the generation of free radicals formed when biological systems reduce hexavalent chromium to the +3 oxidation state. Effects in humans exposed occupationally to high levels of chromium or its compounds, primarily hexavalent chromium, by inhalation may include nasal septum ulceration and perforation, and other irritating respiratory effects. Cardiovascular effects, gastrointestinal and hematological effects, liver and kidney effects, and increased risks of death from lung cancer may also result from such exposure. In addition to the respiratory effects, exposure to chromium compounds can be associated with allergic responses (e.g., asthma and dermatitis) in sensitized individuals. Hexavalent chromium dioxide is a tetravalent chromium compound with limited industrial application. It is used to make magnetic tape, as a catalyst in chemical reactions, and in ceramics. Because of its limited industrial uses, the potential for human



exposure is less for chromium dioxide than for the more industrially important hexavalent chromium and chromium +3 compounds.

This is the seventh year hexavalent chromium has been monitored at the South DeKalb site, as part of the NATTS network. The data for 2005 through 2011 is presented in Figure 64. The sampler did not operate the last quarter of 2007 through part of May 2008; therefore, a gap in the data is shown. Observed concentrations range over an order of magnitude, from 0.01 to 0.3 ng/m<sup>3</sup> (nanograms per cubic meter). To observe the lower data points, the maximum concentration shown on the graph is 0.10 ng/m<sup>3</sup>. The observed concentrations are represented with the points, the black line represents a moving average across the data set, and the yellow line represents the overall linear trend in the dataset. It appears that from 2005 through 2007 the hexavalent chromium concentrations were sporadic and included some higher values. Then from 2008 through 2011, the concentrations seem more consistent and lower. The highest data point of 0.3 ng/m<sup>3</sup> was observed in 2006, while the highest data point from 2008 through 2011 was 0.09 ng/m<sup>3</sup>. As the data set grows, possible seasonal variation in concentration or other trends may be observed.




**Figure 64: Hexavalent Chromium at South DeKalb**

## VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS (TO-14/15)


Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) make up a group of chemicals from various industrial, stationary, and mobile sources. VOCs reach the atmosphere by way of evaporative emissions as well as incomplete combustion processes. Chlorinated compounds are very stable in the atmosphere, with lifetimes of several years. Dichlorodifluoromethane, a chlorinated compound, was the refrigerant of choice for automotive cooling. This material has not been manufactured since the mid-1990s (cars now use R-134a), yet dichlorodifluoromethane remains prevalent in the environment. Chloromethane is a volatile industrial solvent. Toluene is a major component of paints, solvents and is also present in gasoline. Benzene is found in vehicle emissions, evaporation from gasoline service stations, emissions from the burning of coal and oil, and in industrial solvents. Carbon tetrachloride and the Freons are generally used as refrigerants, industrial solvents, and as fire suppressants (though generally known as Halon in that application). The atmospheric reactivity of aromatic compounds is relatively high, with lifetimes in the weeks to months range.

Figure 65 shows the statewide detection distribution of air toxic (TO-15) type volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from 2005 to 2011 across the state's Air Toxics Network. The detection of any given pollutant is counted as any number that is above half the limit of detection. The South DeKalb site has samples collected every six days; therefore, all of the site's detections are shown as a percentage of samples taken. The distribution is relatively even across the state, although the sites are located in different geographic regions, and have different local influences. The percentage of detections has remained relatively low throughout the seven years shown here. Out of all the VOCs samples taken, the percent detections have consistently been about 8% to 15%, with a slight drop in the 2011 percentages.




**Figure 65: Total Volatile Organic Compounds Percent Detected per Site, 2005-2011**

Figure 66, on the next page, compares the relationship between the concentrations observed and percent detections above detection limit, showing the top ten compounds of the VOCs group that were detected for 2005 through 2011. Although there are 42 species in this analyte group, only a relatively smaller subset is typically detected with any regularity. The percentage of detections was derived using any detection that was above half of the method detection limit. To obtain the average concentration for compounds with at least one detection, the half method detection limit for that compound was substituted for any number lower than that compound's half method detection limit. Chloromethane and trichlorofluoromethane consistently had the same pattern of the highest detection rates, but the total average concentrations were frequently the second and third highest over the seven years. This would indicate that the concentrations of chloromethane and trichlorofluoromethane are relatively average per each consistent detection. Conversely, dichlorodifluoromethane had one of the highest levels of concentration and one of the highest detection rates consistently for the seven years of data. This would indicate that for each detection, the dichlorodifluoromethane concentration had a consistently higher weight. From the 2009 to 2010 data, there was a noticeable increase in benzene and cyclohexane (shown in dark purple). The higher benzene levels seem to be attributed to samples collected at both the Macon and Dawsonville sites, while the higher cyclohexane appears to have been collected at the Macon site. In 2011, both benzene and cyclohexane (shown in brown) concentrations dropped back down below levels seen in 2009. Carbon tetrachloride had a slight increase in concentration, while the other frequently detected compounds remained relatively stable in 2011.



**Figure 66: Average Concentration and Percent Detection of Common Volatile Organic Compounds (TO-15), 2005–2011**

Figure 67, on the next page, shows the total volatile organic compound concentration, or loading, at each site for 2005 through 2011. This “total loading” measurement is produced by adding all the detected concentrations of all VOCs, even those below half of the detection limit as discussed earlier. It is intended as a surrogate measure showing general trends in overall VOC concentrations. When considering Figure 67, it is important to note that the South DeKalb site could appear elevated since this site has a larger number of scheduled samplings than the rest of the sites in the network. Samples are collected on a 6-day schedule at the South DeKalb site, as part of the NATTS network. It is important to note that the Macon site was shut down for most of 2008 due to damage to the site, causing that value to appear much lower than the other Air Toxics sites. In looking at trends in the data, there seems to be some fluctuation of VOCs concentrations at most sites, and a slight decrease in 2008. Then in 2009, there was a slight increase in total VOC concentrations. In 2010, all of the sites showed an increase in total VOCs concentrations, except the General Coffee site. The Dawsonville and Macon sites had a significant increase in total concentrations in 2010. For the Macon site, these higher concentrations seem to be attributed primarily to cyclohexane, dichloromethane, and benzene samples. While at the Dawsonville site, the higher concentrations seem to be attributed primarily to the benzene samples. Then in 2011, the Macon and Dawsonville sites had a dramatic decrease, to levels below those of 2009, while the other sites’ total concentrations remained relatively stable or had a slight increase.



**Figure 67: Total Volatile Organic Compound Loading all Species, by Site, 2005-2011**

For a map of VOC and SVOC monitoring locations, see Figure 68 on the next page.






## SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), also called semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOC) are chemical compounds that consist of fused, six-carbon aromatic rings. They are formed by incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels such as wood, coal, diesel fuel, fat or tobacco. Over 100 different chemicals are comprised within this designation. Many of them are known or suspected carcinogens. Some environmental facts about this class of compounds are listed below.

- PAHs enter the air mostly as releases from volcanoes, forest fires, burning coal, and automobile exhaust.
- PAHs can occur in air attached to dust particles.
- Some PAH particles can readily evaporate into the air from soil or surface waters.
- PAHs can break down by reacting with sunlight and other chemicals in the air over a period of days to weeks.
- PAHs can enter water through discharges from industrial and wastewater treatment plants.
- Most PAHs do not dissolve easily in water. They stick to solid particles and settle to the bottoms of lakes or rivers.
- Microorganisms can break down PAHs in the soil or water after a period of weeks to months.
- In soils, PAHs are most likely to stick tightly to particles. Certain PAHs move through soil to contaminate groundwater.
- PAH content of plants and animals may be much higher than the PAH content of the soil or water in which they live.

For a map of SVOC monitoring locations, see Figure 68, on the previous page.




**Figure 69: Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds Percentage of Detections Per Site, 2009-2011**

Figure 69 displays the percentage of detections according to site from fourth quarter of 2009 through 2011 for all semi-volatile organic compounds combined in the Air Toxics Network, as well as the South DeKalb (NATTS) site. Prior to the fourth quarter of 2009, the semi-VOCs data collected within the Air Toxics Network was analyzed by the GA EPD laboratory with a gas chromatograph with Electron Capture Detector, while the semi-VOCs data collected within the NATTS network was analyzed with a gas chromatograph by an EPA contract laboratory. Then in the fourth quarter of 2009, the GA EPD laboratory began analyzing the Air Toxics Network data with a gas chromatograph, the same method used to analyze data from the South DeKalb site. This caused an increase in detection rate for the five sites in the Air Toxics Network. Historically, there were only a few compounds that would have any detections, and most compounds would have no detections. Since the change in laboratory analysis method, the detection rates have ranged from about 7% to 32%, for the five sites



in the Air Toxics Network. Even though the same laboratory analysis method is used for this analysis, the South DeKalb data shows a significantly higher percentage of detections, ranging from about 64% to 88% detection rate. The seventeen semi-VOCs that were collected at all sites were compared in this graph, although the South DeKalb site collects five additional compounds. Detections were counted as any number that was above half of the method detection limit. As data is collected in the future, the relationship between these sites will continue to be tracked. In addition, the data will be observed for possible continuing increase in detections with the gas chromatograph laboratory analysis method.

Figure 70, below, shows the percentage of detections compared to the total average concentration for the seventeen semi-volatile organic compounds that all six sites have in common from fourth quarter 2009 through 2011. The percentage detections were derived using any detection that was above half of the method detection limit. To obtain the average concentration for compounds with at least one detection, the half method detection limit for that compound was substituted for any number lower than that compound's half method detection limit. As discussed above, until 2009, the percentage of detections and average concentrations were very low. Before the laboratory analysis method change for the Air Toxics Network data, the percent detections were below 10% and the average concentrations were below  $0.01 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . With the laboratory analysis change in the last quarter of 2009, there were significant increases in detections and concentrations for some compounds. Percent detections were as high as 32%, and concentrations were as high as  $0.17 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in the fourth quarter of 2009 for the Air Toxics data. Since the analysis method is the same, the following graph combines the Air Toxics Network data and the NATTS data. The largest semi-VOC contributor in both total average concentration and percent detections is naphthalene. The concentrations of naphthalene range from about  $0.085 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $0.21 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , and percent detections are around 90 to 95%. These concentrations are approximately four to nine-fold higher than the next highest concentrations of around  $0.015$  to  $0.035 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for phenanthrene. Phenanthrene's total detections have been in the 80% to 90% range, indicating that there were several small concentrations detected, as compared to having higher concentrations for each detection of naphthalene. Over half of the compounds continue to have low average concentrations and percent detections below 50%. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons such as these are found in the air from the burning of coal, oil, gas, and garbage, and are found in dyes, cigarette smoke, coal tar, plastics, and pesticides. They have been found to bother the skin and mucous membranes and have even been linked to cancer.



**Figure 70: Total Average Concentration and Percentage Detections of Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds by Compound, 2005-2011**

---

### MONITORING TECHNIQUES

In 2011 air toxics samples were collected from a total of six sites, including a NATTS site, and two background (rural) sites.

The compounds sampled at the ATN sites are shown in Appendix D. The list was derived from the 187 compounds EPA has designated as Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPS). Many of the HAPS do not have standardized ambient air sampling and analytical methods. In order to collect the compounds of interest for the Georgia network, three types of samplers are used at all locations: the HIVOL, PUF, and canister. In addition, carbonyls were monitored at two of the ATN sites, as well as one NATTS/PAMS site, in 2011.

This equipment samples for metals, semi-volatile organic compounds, and volatile organic compounds once every twelve days following a pre-established schedule that corresponds to a nationwide sampling schedule. The South DeKalb site collects samples every six days, as part of the National Air Toxics Trends (NATTS) network. On the run day, the sampler runs midnight to midnight and takes a 24-hour integrated sample.

The HIVOL sampler used for sampling metals is a timed sampler. The sampler is calibrated to collect 1300 to 2000 liters of air per minute. Particulate material is trapped on an 8.5" x 11" quartz fiber filter. The particulates include dust, pollen, diesel fuel by-products, particulate metal, etc. The filters are pre-weighed at a remote laboratory prior to use and weighed again after sampling. The filters are subjected to a chemical digestion process and are analyzed on an inductively coupled plasma spectrometer.

The PUF (polyurethane foam) sampler used for sampling semi-volatile organic compounds is a timed sampler. The sampler is calibrated to collect 198 to 242 liters (L) of air per minute. A multi-layer cartridge is prepared which collects both the particulate fraction and the volatile fraction of this group of compounds. The plug, filter and absorbent are extracted at a remote laboratory and analyzed using a gas chromatograph.

The canister sampler used for sampling volatile organic compounds is a timed sampler. A SUMMA<sup>®</sup> polished canister is evacuated to a near-perfect vacuum and attached to a sampler with a pump controlled by a timer. The canister is filled to greater than 10 psig. The canister is analyzed using a gas chromatograph with mass spectroscopy detection (GC/MS).

The carbonyls are sampled with two types of methods. One type is an absorbent cartridge filled with dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) coated silica that is attached to a pump to allow approximately 180 L of air to be sampled. The cartridge is analyzed using High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC). A 24-hour integrated carbonyl sample is taken every 6 days throughout the year. The other method used for collecting carbonyls is the canister sampler that is used for sampling volatile organic compounds. Acrolein is a carbonyl compound that is collected using the canister method, described above, and analyzed with the GC/MS method.

As part of the National Air Toxics Trends network, the above listed compounds, as well as hexavalent chromium and black carbon are monitored at the South DeKalb site. In addition, metals are monitored on a PM<sub>10</sub> sampler at the South DeKalb site.

The hexavalent chromium sampler used for sampling Cr+6 is a timed sampler. Samples are collected at a flow rate of 15 liters of air per minute using a 37 mm diameter substrate of bicarbonate impregnated cellulose. The filter is controlled by an auto cover which remains closed until sampling, and fully exposes the filter when the sampler is running. The sample is analyzed using the modified California Air Resources Board (CARB) SOP 039. The filters are extracted in deionized water via sonication, which is analyzed by ion chromatography. Cr+6 is separated through a column, forming a

complex with diphenylcarbohydrazide. Dianex Peaknet chromatography software is used to determine the peak analysis.

The aethalometer is a continuous sampler used for sampling black and organic carbon. Operating at 60 watts / 110V AC, the aethalometer uses quartz tape to perform an optical analysis to determine the concentration of carbon particles passing through an air stream. The analysis is conducted using spectrophotometry, measuring the wavelength of the light energy absorbed and plotting the results on the site computer.

The PM<sub>10</sub> sampler used for sampling toxic metal particles less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter is a timed sampler. Collecting 1020 to 1240 liters of air per minute, the sampler uses a 8.5" x 11" quartz glass fiber filter to trap particulate matter. The sample is analyzed using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). In ICP-MS, an argon gas is used to atomize and ionize the elements in a sample. The resulting ions are used to identify the isotopes of the elements and a mass spectrum is used to identify the element proportional to a specific peak formed from an isotope.

### **ATTAINMENT DESIGNATION**

Currently, there are no attainment standards for the air toxics compounds, with the exception of lead, which has its designation as a criteria pollutant. Air toxics measurements are performed to support the regulatory, analytical, and public health purposes of the program. While it is understood that these compounds are toxic, it is not well understood what airborne concentrations of each compound may be harmful. By collecting data about their current concentrations, researchers can later compare GA EPD's data with health data to determine what levels of each compound may be safe.

## METEOROLOGICAL REPORT

### STATE CLIMATOLOGY AND METEOROLOGICAL SUMMARY OF 2011

The climate of north and central Georgia, which includes the metropolitan areas of Atlanta, Columbus and Macon, involves summers of warm, humid weather, and variable temperatures during the winter months. The climate across Northern Georgia is largely a function of terrain. Average amounts of rainfall reach between 45-50", with September and October averaging as the driest months and the wettest being March. According to the National Weather Service office in Peachtree City, Georgia, 2011 was a year of extremes for North and Central Georgia.

The NWS reports<sup>2</sup> that the year began on a mild note, but quickly shifted to an arctic airmass on the 8<sup>th</sup>, followed by a record-setting winter storm on the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup>. An upper level disturbance tracked across the northern Gulf of Mexico dumping 8.8 inches of snow on Athens; while Atlanta received a snow and sleet mix totaling 4.4 inches. This was the most snow from a single storm in Athens on record, and the greatest storm total in Atlanta since January 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup>, 2002. Colder than normal temperatures lingered through much of the month until unseasonably mild conditions arrived for the final four days. The abundance of dry, cool air masses for much of the month led to precipitation deficits in all four cities. Departures from normal ranged from -1.37" in Athens to -2.40" in Atlanta.

Colder than normal temperatures returned on February 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup>, then persisted into mid-month. However, the second half of February experienced a remarkable rebound in temperature as daily averages climbed to as much as 14-18 degrees above normal. This was in response to a strong southwesterly low-level flow, which pushed high temperatures into the middle and upper 70s, and to as high as 80°F on the 19<sup>th</sup>. Unseasonably mild conditions persisted through the remainder of February pushing monthly averages well above normal. Departures from normal were +3.3°F in Atlanta, +2.6°F in both Athens and Columbus, and +2.2°F in Macon. With regard to precipitation, only Atlanta posted a rainfall deficit for the month, registering a departure from normal of -0.43". On the 4<sup>th</sup>, a stalled front across Georgia, combined with a surge of moisture ahead of a second system over southeast Texas, produced daily rainfall totals of 1.38", 1.55", 2.09", and 2.54" in Atlanta, Athens, Columbus, and Macon, respectively. These set new records for both Columbus and Macon, breaking the previous mark of 1.76" and 2.21" from 1959.

Columbus and Macon fell short of their average rainfall in March by 0.45" and 0.87", respectively. Monthly totals of 9.06" and 6.65" in Atlanta and Athens, respectively, were 3.68" and 1.66" above their averages. The mild temperatures also persisted with Atlanta failing to record a freezing temperature during the entire month. This was the first March since 1989 in which Atlanta did not record a temperature of 32°F or below. Monthly departures from normal ranged from +1.2°F in Athens to +2.7°F in Columbus. In addition, Macon tied a record high on the 19<sup>th</sup> from 1963 when the mercury reached 88°F.

In April, a fading tropical Pacific La Nina episode contributed to conditions remaining mild and dry. The increased warmth produced record and near record high temperatures on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. This excessive warmth helped fuel three severe weather events occurring on the 4-5<sup>th</sup>, 15-16<sup>th</sup>, and 27-28<sup>th</sup>. All three produced tornadoes in Georgia with the 27-28<sup>th</sup> April outbreak being of historic proportion. In fact, this 13 state outbreak produced well over 200 tornadoes and was the most extensive since the "Super Outbreak" of April 3-4, 1974. In Georgia, fifteen tornadoes occurred, with the strongest, rated as an EF-4, producing devastating damage in Catoosa County before tracking into Tennessee (Figure 71, below).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.srh.noaa.gov/ffc/?n=clisum2011>






Figure 71: Tornado Outbreak, April 27-28, 2011

However, the additional warmth and severe weather was not accompanied by sufficient enough precipitation to offset a drier than average month in all four locations. Rainfall deficits ranged from -0.56" in Atlanta to -2.17" in Columbus. Consequently, by the end of April, moderate drought conditions were creeping northward and into northern Georgia. The drought intensified in May, as Athens, Columbus, and Macon all received less than an inch of rainfall. Monthly totals were 0.82", 0.65", and 0.66", respectively.

Conversely, temperatures during the month of May experienced two swings between much below and much above average readings. For example, high temperatures ranged between the mid 60s and low 70s in the middle of the month to the lower and upper 90s by the end of the month. The 90°F plus high temperatures along with little or no rainfall brought the return of severe to extreme drought conditions to much of Georgia by the 1<sup>st</sup> of June. A large persistent upper level ridge of high pressure became entrenched over the south-central U.S. for June, July and August, resulting in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hottest summer on record for Georgia. Unlike the heat, rainfall was in short supply for June. All four cities recorded deficits ranging between 1.50" in Athens and 0.78" in Macon. July and August too, posted rainfall deficits seven out of eight times in the four cities, and generally on a larger scale. Only Columbus, with 5.05" of precipitation in August received a surplus (+1.28") in these two months. By the end of August most of Georgia was under a severe to extreme drought.

## U.S. Drought Monitor

### Georgia


August 30, 2011

Valid 7 a.m. EST

	Drought Conditions (Percent Area)					
	None	D0-D4	D1-D4	D2-D4	D3-D4	D4
Current	0.00	100.00	99.99	90.82	79.64	0.00
Last Week (08/23/2011 map)	0.00	100.00	92.73	81.31	52.11	0.00
3 Months Ago (05/31/2011 map)	8.95	91.05	81.25	71.79	54.85	0.00
Start of Calendar Year (12/28/2010 map)	2.42	97.58	85.37	40.34	6.49	0.00
Start of Water Year (09/28/2010 map)	4.80	95.20	39.24	5.11	0.00	0.00
One Year Ago (08/24/2010 map)	59.28	40.72	10.01	0.00	0.00	0.00

#### Intensity:

D0 Abnormally Dry	D3 Drought - Extreme
D1 Drought - Moderate	D4 Drought - Exceptional
D2 Drought - Severe	



The Drought Monitor focuses on broad-scale conditions. Local conditions may vary. See accompanying text summary for forecast statements.

<http://drought.unl.edu/dm>



Released Thursday, September 1, 2011  
Eric Luebehusen, USDA

Figure 72: Drought Conditions as of August 30, 2011

Highs in the middle to upper 90s persisted into the first three days of September, followed by welcomed relief. A series of early polar fronts sweeping through on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> cooled daytime highs to the upper 60s and 70s, while providing overnight lows in middle and upper 50s to low 60s. The fronts, while stalling across South Georgia, did help to provide above average monthly rainfall for



Columbus (+0.50") and Macon (+0.37"). However, the beneficial rain occurred mostly to the south of Atlanta and Athens, as both cities again recorded substantial deficits.

By the onset of September, La Nina conditions had re-emerged in the tropical Pacific. Characteristically, this resulted in an overall warmer and drier October through December period. However, the onslaught of cool air masses persisted through October providing another rare month with a below average temperature. Departures from normal were all below average in Atlanta (-1.2°F), Athens (-2.7°F), Columbus (-2.5°F), and Macon (-3.6°F). In line with La Nina, a record high of 85°F was set in the capital city on the 18<sup>th</sup>, breaking the old record from 1920 of 84°F. Record warmth was also achieved in November as two more records fell in Atlanta. November ended with monthly averages at or near normal in Macon (0.0°F) and Athens (+0.1°F) and 1.7°F and 1.3°F above in Atlanta and Columbus, respectively. The warmth though was mostly accompanied by drier than average conditions, as the four cities once again recorded monthly deficits. Departures from normal ranged from -1.61" in Atlanta to -0.19" in Macon. In December, a moderate strength La Nina lived up to its expectations, as milder than normal conditions prevailed throughout the month.

## SUMMARY OF METEOROLOGICAL MEASUREMENTS FOR 2011

A complete suite of meteorological instrumentation is used to characterize meteorological conditions around metropolitan Atlanta. The basic surface meteorological parameters measured at the Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Sites (PAMS). The PAMS sites are Conyers, South DeKalb, Tucker, and Yorkville. South DeKalb is considered an NCore, and a NATTS site as well. The Tucker site primarily records meteorological data for possible future modeling or comparative purposes. All PAMS sensors measure hourly-averaged scalar wind speed and vector-averaged wind direction at the 10-meter level, and hourly-averaged surface temperature, relative humidity and barometric pressure at the 2-meter level. Several sites include instruments to record hourly-averaged precipitation, global solar radiation and total ultraviolet radiation. The standard deviation of the wind direction is also computed at the South DeKalb (NCore, NATTS site). Upper air meteorological observations (primarily wind speed and direction) are made at Peachtree City using a PA5-LR SODAR system. A map of the EPD meteorological network, along with which measurements are taken at each location, is shown in Figure 73, below.





Figure 73: Meteorological Site Map

---

## **OZONE AND PM<sub>2.5</sub> FORECASTING AND DATA ANALYSIS**

Each day a team of meteorologists from Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division (EPD) and Georgia Tech scientists meet at 1:30 EST to issue an air quality forecast for the Atlanta, Macon, Columbus, and Augusta metropolitan areas. The air quality forecast is then relayed to the Clean Air Campaign and EPA, which disseminate the forecast to important national outlets, such as NWS, USA Today, and The Weather Channel. The forecasts are determined based upon several meteorological factors, such as the synoptic regime, surface and upper air meteorology, satellite imagery, as well as the ambient concentration of pollutant. Multiple 2D and 3D forecasting models generated by Georgia Tech are utilized in addition to National Weather Service (NWS) synoptic forecasting models. These synoptic models consist of the North American Model (NAM/WRF), the Global Forecasting System (GFS), the European, and the Canadian models to name a few.

Metropolitan Atlanta had forty ozone violations during ozone season in 2011, while Macon had six ozone violations and Augusta had three. Athens experienced two ozone violations, while the north Georgia Mountains had two. This was considered to be a typical to slightly above average ozone season for Metro Atlanta. Monthly time series plots of ozone predictions and observations for Metro Atlanta during the 2011 ozone season are shown in Figure 74, below.




(Data compiled by Dr. Carlos Cardelino of Georgia Tech)

**Figure 74: Monthly Time Series of Ozone Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 Ozone Season (May-September)**

The dark squares shown in the figure indicate days where an ozone violation occurred, but was not forecasted, or did not occur and was forecasted. Most violations occurred during the months of June and August, with the highest concentration day occurring on July 2<sup>nd</sup> (94 parts per billion by volume, ppbv). Interestingly, there were no code red (unhealthy) days detected during 2011, with August having the most number of code orange days. During a violation on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, the eastern-central part of the United States was dominated by a strong high-pressure system that put north Georgia on the

eastern flank of the ridge with light downslope flow conditions. This provided a stable air mass with clear skies and low moisture, leading to the breakout of ozone violations. As shown in Figure 74 (above), there were six ozone violations in May, eleven in June, six in July, thirteen in August, and four in September. On a day-of-the-week basis, the greatest number of violations occurred from the middle to the end of the week. The most number of violations (nine) occurred on Friday. Some of this could possibly be attributed to the buildup of traffic around the Metro area as the weekend approaches. Overall forecasting performance for the team for the 2011 ozone season was 77.8% on an event to a non-event basis (binary error) and 62.1% on an AQI basis (color category).


There were three particle pollution ( $PM_{2.5}$ ) violations in Metro Atlanta in 2011, whereas South Georgia had twelve violations and Savannah had five. Monthly time series plots of aerosol predictions and observations for Metro Atlanta during 2011 are shown in Figure 74 through Figure 78, below. Many of these violations could be attributed to wildfire activity across South Georgia. For example, aerosol optical depth imagery from GOES East Aerosol Smoke Product (GASP) indicated elevated  $PM_{2.5}$  levels in Savannah associated with two smoke episodes from wildfire activity in South Georgia on June 17<sup>th</sup> and July 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> (discussed below figure). The Honey Prairie wildfire in the Okefenokee Swamp in southeast Georgia and several other fires in Florida and Georgia were ongoing during both of these particle pollution episodes in June and July.



(Data compiled by Dr. Carlos Cardelino of Georgia Tech)


**Figure 75: Monthly Time Series of  $PM_{2.5}$  Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (January-March)**






(Data compiled by Dr. Carlos Cardelino of Georgia Tech)

**Figure 76: Monthly Time Series of PM<sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (April-June)**



(Data compiled by Dr. Carlos Cardelino of Georgia Tech)


**Figure 77: Monthly Time Series of PM<sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (July-September)**




(Data compiled by Dr. Carlos Cardelino of Georgia Tech)

**Figure 78: Monthly Time Series of PM<sub>2.5</sub> Predictions and Observations for Metro Atlanta During 2011 (October-December)**

A distinct increase in particle pollution at the Savannah Lathrop-Augusta (L&A) monitoring site was observed on June 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. This increase occurred under south-southwesterly flow conditions and is shown for June 17<sup>th</sup> in Figure 79. Back-trajectory analysis further verifies the transport of smoke from the wildfire areas into the Savannah area, as given by Figure 80. The approximate locations of the active wildfires are given by MODIS hotspot areas depicted in Figure 81. Enhancement of aerosol optical depth was evident from MODIS AOD Terra imagery and is shown across much of extreme South Georgia in Figure 82. Also overlaid are the AQI readings from EPA AIRNOW site, which show elevated PM<sub>2.5</sub> readings around the Valdosta area as well. This indicates that much of extreme south Georgia region was under the same smoke plume from Honey Prairie wildfire activity in southeast Georgia. Interesting visible satellite imagery, as shown in Figure 83, showed the development of pyro-cumulus during the afternoon convective hours on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June. This analysis showed that this increase in particle pollution around the Savannah area was attributed to transport of smoke from wildfire activity across extreme South Georgia and possibly northern Florida.



**Figure 79: Wind Direction and Continuous PM<sub>2.5</sub> at Savannah L&A Site on June 17, 2011**



**Figure 80: Backward Trajectory of Smoke to Savannah L&A Site on June 17, 2011**




Figure 81: MODIS Locations of Fires on June 16, 2011





Figure 82: Aerosol Optical Depth with MODIS AOD Terra Imagery, June 16, 2011






**Figure 83: Satellite Imagery Showing the Development of Pyro-Cumulus on June 16, 2011**

A similar increase in particle pollution occurred in early July around the Savannah area under south-southwesterly flow conditions on July 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. Figure 84 shows this increase in PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels for the Savannah L&A monitoring site on July 5<sup>th</sup>. Elevated aerosol optical depth imagery from GOES East Aerosol Smoke Product occurred in concert with the particle pollution increase. Further surface and upper air meteorological analysis, although not shown, further verified transport of smoke pollution from the same wildfire activity as described above. Both of the above cases indicate that transport from wildfire activity can play a major role in elevated particle pollution events across South Georgia and northern Florida.





**Figure 84: Wind Direction and Continuous PM<sub>2.5</sub> at Savannah L&A Site on July 5, 2011**


## QUALITY ASSURANCE

The purpose of this report is to provide ambient air quality users and the general public, with a summary of the quality of the 2011 ambient air monitoring data in quantifiable terms. It presents an overview of various quality assurance and quality control activities. The tables included in this report provide summary data for ambient air monitoring stations in the statewide network.

The Georgia Air Protection Branch mission is to promote and protect public health, welfare, and ecological resources through effective and efficient reduction of air pollutants while recognizing and considering the effects on the economy of the state. The Ambient Air Monitoring Program provides a key element of that mission through collecting and reporting quality information on a large number of pollutants and for a vast air monitoring network. The Ambient Air Monitoring Program, directed by federal law, conducts various monitoring projects in support of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GA DNR), Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD), and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). The monitoring projects include gaseous criteria and non-criteria pollutants, particulate matter, air toxics, non-methane hydrocarbons, and meteorological parameters. Data from these monitoring sources provide the means to determine the nature of the pollution problem and assess the effectiveness of the control measures and programs.

It is the goal of the Ambient Monitoring Program to provide accurate, relevant, and timely measurements of air pollutants and their precursors associated with the corresponding meteorological data to support Georgia's Air Protection Branch for the protection of environment and public health. The Quality Assurance Unit conducts various quality assurance activities to ensure that data collected comply with procedures and regulations set forth by the U.S. EPA and can be considered good quality data and data for record.

What is quality assurance? Quality assurance is an integrated system of management activities that involves planning, implementing, assessing, and assuring data quality through a process, item, or service that meets users needs for quality, completeness, representativeness and usefulness. Known data quality enables users to make judgment about compliance with quality standards, air quality trends and health effects based on sound data with a known level of confidence. The objective of quality assurance is to provide accurate and precise data, minimize data loss due to malfunctions, and to assess the validity of the air monitoring data to provide representative and comparable data of known precision and accuracy.



Quality assurance (QA) is composed of two activities: quality control and quality assessment. Quality control (QC) is composed of a set of internal tasks performed routinely at the instrument level that ensures accurate and precise measured ambient air quality data. Quality control tasks address sample collection, handling, analysis, and reporting. Examples include calibrations, routine service checks, chain-of-custody documentation, duplicate analysis, development and maintenance of standard operating procedures, and routine preparation of quality control reports.

Quality assessment is a set of external, quantitative tasks that provide certainty that the quality control system is satisfactory and that the stated quantitative programmatic objectives for air quality data are indeed met. Staff independent of those generating data perform these external tasks. Tasks include conducting regular performance audits, on-site system audits, inter-laboratory comparisons, and periodic evaluations of internal quality control data. Performance audits ascertain whether the samplers are operating within the specified limits as stated in the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). Table 4 illustrates the types of performance audits currently performed by the QA program in 2011. Field and laboratory performance audits are the most common. System audits are performed on an as needed basis or by request. Whole air sample comparisons are conducted for the toxic air contaminants and non-methane hydrocarbons.

Air Monitoring Program	Field Performance Audit	Laboratory Performance Audit	System Audit	Whole Air Audit
Gaseous Pollutants	X		X	
Particulate Matter	X	X	X	
Air Toxic Contaminants	X	X		X
Non-Methane Hydrocarbons	X	X	X	X
Meteorology	X		X	

**Table 4: Audits Performed for Each Air Monitoring Program in 2011**

## QUALITY CONTROL AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The Quality Assurance Program supports all ambient monitoring programs undertaken by Georgia EPD, which in 2011 includes gaseous pollutants, particulate pollutants, air toxics contaminants, non-methane hydrocarbons and meteorological sensors run by the Ambient Monitoring Program. In 2011, 49 air monitoring sites operated in Georgia (see Table 2 for details). Appendix E of this document provides information about the air monitoring network (i.e., sampling schedules, number of instruments, collection/analysis method, etc.). The air quality monitors collect data in both real-time and on a time integrated basis. The data is used to define the nature, extent, and trends of air quality in the state; to support programs required by state and federal laws; and to track progress in attaining air quality standards. The precision and accuracy necessary depends on how the data will be used. Data that must meet specific requirements (i.e., criteria pollutants) are referred to as *controlled data sets*. Criteria for the accuracy, precision, completeness, and sensitivity of the measurement in controlled data sets must be met and documented.

The process by which one determines the quality of data needed to meet the monitoring objective is sometimes referred to as the Data Quality Objectives Process. Data quality indicators associated with measurement uncertainty include:

**Precision.** A measurement of mutual agreement among individual measurements of the same property usually under prescribed similar conditions, expressed generally in terms of the standard deviation.

**Bias.** The systematic or persistent distortion of a measurement process, which causes errors in one direction.

**Accuracy.** The degree of agreement between an observed value and an accepted reference value. Accuracy includes a combination of random error (imprecision) and systematic error (bias) components that are due to sampling and analytical operations.

**Completeness.** A measure of the amount of valid data obtained from a measurement system compared to the amount that is expected to be obtained under correct, normal conditions.

**Detectability.** The low critical range value of a characteristic that a method specific procedure can reliably discern.

Data without formal data quality objectives (i.e., toxics) are called *descriptive data sets*. The data quality measurements are made as accurately as possible in consideration of how the data are being used. Quantified quality assessment results describe the measurement variability in standard terminology, but no effort is made to confine the data set to values within a predetermined quality limit.

The Georgia Air Sampling Network's (GASN) Quality Assurance Program is outlined in a five-volume *Quality Assurance Manual*. The volumes, listed below, guide the operation of the quality assurance programs used by the GASN.

Volume I: Quality Assurance Plan

Volume II: Standard Operating Procedures for Air Quality Monitoring

Volume III: Laboratory Standard Operating Procedures

Volume IV: Monitoring Methods for the State Ambient Air Quality standards

Volume V: Audit Procedures for Air Quality Monitoring

Volume I lists the data quality objectives and describes quality control and quality assessment activities used to ensure that the data quality objectives are met.



**Sampling Cone**

## **GASEOUS POLLUTANTS**

Ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) are continuously monitored by an automated network of stations run by the Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program. Exposure to these pollutants may cause adverse health effects such as: respiratory impairment, fatigue, permanent lung damage, and increased susceptibility to infection in the general population. Gaseous criteria and non-criteria pollutant data are a controlled data set and are subject to meeting mandatory regulations.

**Accuracy:** Annually, EPA conducts field through-the-probe (TTP) performance audits for gaseous pollutants to verify the system accuracy of the automated methods and to ensure the integrity of the sampling system. Accuracy is represented as an average percent difference. The average percent difference is the combined differences from the certified value of all the individual audit points. The upper and lower probability limits represent the expected accuracy of 95 percent of all the single analyzer's individual percent differences for all audit test levels at a single site. Bias is the systematic or persistent distortion of a measurement process, which causes errors in one direction. Overall, the responses of the individual analyzers indicate that as a whole, the network is providing accurate data. Eighty-five percent of the gaseous pollutant instruments audited in 2011 were found to be operating within the Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring control limits ( $\pm 15\%$ ). The tables below summarize the 2011 performance audit results for each gaseous pollutant.

**Precision:** On a weekly basis, site operators confirm the linear response of the instrument by performing zero, precision and span checks. The zero precision check confirms the instrument's ability to maintain a stable reading. The span precision check confirms the instrument's ability to respond to a known concentration of gas. The degree of variability in each of these weekly measurements is computed as the precision of that instrument's measurements.

Annually, the Quality Assurance Unit conducts a precision data analysis as an overall indicator of data quality. The analysis addresses three parameters: precision data submission, precision data validity, and a combination of the two referred to as data usability rates. The precision performance goal for all three parameters is 85%. The submission rate is the number of precision points submitted for a pollutant divided by the expected number of bi-weekly submissions. Data validity is the percent difference of the actual and indicated values of each precision check. These differences should not exceed  $\pm 15\%$  for gaseous analyzers. Usable data rates are determined by multiplying the data submission and data validity rates that indicate the completeness of verifiable air quality data on the official database. The tables below show the Georgia annual Data Quality Assessment summary for the gaseous pollutants (NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>).

NO Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-089-0002	Decatur - S. DeKalb	54	3.84	3.25	1.64	-4.97	8.17	8	-3.66	-8.62	1.30	97
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	43	3.60	3.13	-1.08	-7.13	4.96	8	2.56	-1.46	6.57	96
13-247-0001	Conyers - Monastery	49	3.09	6.14	5.50	0.25	10.74	8	2.82	-0.80	6.43	97
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		146	3.52	4.18	2.13	-3.86	8.13	24	0.57	-3.66	4.80	96.7
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit									

Table 5: NO Data Quality Assessment

NO <sub>2</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-089-0002	Decatur - S. DeKalb	54	3.82	3.69	-2.28	-8.81	4.26	8	1.20	-2.56	4.96	97
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	50	4.09	3.03	0.36	-6.59	7.31	8	-1.61	-6.83	3.61	96
13-247-0001	Conyers - Monastery	48	2.87	2.66	-1.12	-5.98	3.75	8	-0.04	-7.99	7.90	97
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		152	3.61	3.15	-1.04	-7.25	5.16	24	-0.15	-6.05	5.75	96.7
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit									

Table 6: NO<sub>2</sub> Data Quality Assessment

NO <sub>x</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-089-0002	Decatur - S. DeKalb	54	2.95	2.45	-0.87	-5.91	4.17	8	2.81	-5.54	11.16	97
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	49	2.92	3.32	2.31	-2.64	7.27	8	1.58	-3.66	6.82	96
13-247-0001	Conyers - Monastery	49	2.72	3.83	3.20	-1.40	7.81	8	3.02	-0.31	6.35	97
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		152	2.87	3.18	1.47	-3.41	6.35	24	2.47	-3.54	8.48	96.7
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit									

Table 7: NO<sub>x</sub> Data Quality Assessment



CO Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-121-0099	Atlanta - Roswell Rd.	55	3.50	4.15	-3.09	0.00	2.91	10	-3.32	-25.97	19.32	97
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	56	2.93	3.69	2.95	-2.16	7.89	6	4.41	1.68	7.34	97
13-089-0002	Decatur-South DeKalb	54	12.55	6.64	2.64	-18.95	23.93	6	-1.70	-5.03	1.64	97
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		165	3.21	3.92	-0.04	-5.57	5.48	16	-0.42	-18.66	17.81	97
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit									

**Table 8: CO Data Quality Assessment**

SO <sub>2</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-021-0012	Macon - Forestry	61	3.31	3.22	2.17	-3.54	7.88	8	0.00	-2.03	2.03	96
13-051-0021	Savannah - East President St.	52	4.40	4.03	-1.92	-9.42	5.58	4	6.17	0.33	12.01	95
13-051-1002	Savannah - L & A	49	2.77	3.21	2.25	-2.46	6.95	4	-1.12	-3.12	0.88	94
13-215-0008	Columbus Airport	55	4.62	6.31	5.24	-2.67	13.16	4	8.04	4.44	11.65	97
13-115-0003	Rome - Coosa Elementary	58	3.65	4.01	3.17	-3.16	9.37	8	4.54	-0.13	9.20	97
13-121-0055	Atlanta - Confederate Ave.	55	2.45	2.86	-2.08	-6.27	2.10	4	-0.88	-3.28	1.51	98
13-127-0006	Brunswick - Risley School	47	1.61	3.59	3.25	0.52	5.97	4	8.07	-3.24	19.37	97
13-089-0002	Atlanta-South DeKalb	59	2.18	2.19	1.46	-2.35	5.16	8	-2.06	2.06	4.95	98
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		436	3.30	3.90	1.73	-4.58	8.04	44	2.67	-1.85	7.19	96.5
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit									

**Table 9: SO<sub>2</sub> Data Quality Assessment**

O <sub>3</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary												
Site Code	Site Name	No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Validation of Bias			Annual Performance Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
					Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-021-0012	Macon - Forestry	33	0.96	0.61	0.37	-1.20	1.94	4	4.94	-7.36	17.23	96
13-051-0021	Savannah - East President St.	31	3.55	2.95	0.13	-5.64	5.89	4	0.00	-1.63	1.63	98
13-055-0001	Summerville - DNR Fish Hatchery	32	1.25	2.19	1.86	-0.18	3.90	4	-11.76	-11.76	-11.76	98
13-059-0002	Athens - Fire Station 7	31	1.20	1.08	0.77	-1.17	2.72	4	-0.28	-1.57	1.00	99
13-067-0003	Kennesaw - Georgia National Guard	32	1.74	1.22	0.15	-2.69	2.98	4	6.67	3.04	10.30	98
13-073-0001	Evans - Riverside Park	30	1.89	2.25	-1.60	-4.65	1.45	4	-11.11	-11.11	-11.11	95
13-077-0002	Newnan - University of West Georgia	35	3.75	2.35	1.45	-4.72	7.61	4	7.14	4.35	9.94	99
13-085-0001	Dawsonville - Georgia Forestry	32	1.51	1.18	-0.49	-2.95	1.97	4	0.00	-4.07	4.07	97
13-089-0002	Decatur - South DeKalb	42	2.14	1.56	0.22	-3.67	3.51	4	7.14	7.07	7.21	99
13-097-0004	Douglasville - West Strickland Street	39	1.90	1.41	0.35	-2.88	3.43	4	3.66	-0.47	7.79	99
13-121-0055	Atlanta - Confederate Ave.	32	1.83	1.80	-0.99	-3.98	2.00	4	15.38	8.72	22.05	99
13-127-0006	Brunswick - Risley School	45	3.48	4.61	-3.47	-9.33	2.39	4	13.33	8.37	18.30	97
13-135-0002	Lawrenceville - Gwinnett Tech	30	1.19	1.04	-0.73	-2.65	1.19	4	0.14	-3.96	4.24	98
13-151-0002	McDonough - County Extension Office	31	1.24	0.69	0.27	-1.74	2.28	4	3.41	1.71	5.12	98
13-213-0003	Chatsworth - Fort Mountain	32	1.50	0.93	0.45	-1.99	2.90	4	7.14	4.35	9.94	96
13-215-0008	Columbus - Airport	37	2.82	3.34	-2.22	-6.88	2.43	4	7.14	6.12	8.16	98
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	30	2.03	1.60	-0.98	-4.26	2.30	4	6.67	4.79	8.54	99
13-245-0091	Augusta - Bungalow Rd.	32	1.31	1.18	-0.85	-2.99	1.29	4	14.29	13.03	15.54	98
13-247-0001	Conyers - Monastery	34	2.20	1.58	-0.09	-3.69	3.52	4	7.14	2.04	12.24	98
13-261-1001	Leslie - Union High School	33	3.77	3.16	2.24	-3.92	8.40	4	-5.56	-7.24	-3.87	96
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		673	2.11	1.90	-0.21	-3.98	3.57	80	3.77	-0.36	7.91	98
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit		95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit										

Table 10: O<sub>3</sub> Data Quality Assessment

## PARTICULATE MATTER

Particulate matter is a mixture of substances that include elements such as carbon, metals, nitrates, organic compounds and sulfates; complex mixtures such as diesel exhaust and soil. Particles with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or smaller pose an increased health risk because they can deposit deep in the lung and contain substances that are particularly harmful to human health. Respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) increase the chance of respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death.

Particulate matter monitoring is conducted using both manual and continuous type samplers. Manual samplers are operated on a six-day sampling schedule for PM<sub>10</sub>, and a similar, or more frequent schedule, for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The Georgia Ambient Monitoring particulate program also includes total suspended particulates (TSP), sulfate, mass and lead monitoring.



Particulate matter is a controlled data set, and as such is subject to formal data quality objectives and federal and state regulations.

---

Accuracy (field): The accuracy of particulate samplers is determined by comparing the instrument's flow rate to a certified variable orifice (PM<sub>10</sub> and TSP), or a calibrated mass flow meter (TEOM, BAM, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> samplers) that is certified against a National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) traceable flow device or calibrator. Since an accurate measurement of particulate matter is dependent upon flow rate, the Ambient Monitoring Program conducts semi-annual flow rate audits at each site. The average percent difference between the sampler flow rates and the audit flow rates represents the combined differences from the certified value of all the individual audit points for each sampler. The upper and lower probability limits represent the expected flow rate accuracy for 95 percent of all the single analyzer's individual percent differences for all audit test levels at a single site.

Overall, the 2011 flow audit results indicate that the flow rates of samplers in the network are almost all within bounds. Approximately eighty-five percent of the instruments audited in 2011 operated within the Georgia Ambient Monitoring Program's control limits. The 2011 PM<sub>2.5</sub> yearly data quality assessment summary of integrated and analyzation using federal reference method, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> yearly data quality assessment summary semi-continuous measurements, and the PM<sub>10</sub> yearly data quality assessment summary of 24-hour integrated measurements and semi-continuous measurements are shown in the tables below.

PM <sub>2.5</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary of Integrated Sampling and Analyzation Using Federal Reference Method												
Site Code	Site Name	Collocated (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		One-Point Flow Rate Check (L/min)				Semi-Annual Flow Check (L/min) (Bias %)				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	Absolute Bias (%)	Signed Bias (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-021-0007	Macon - Allied Chemical	25	5.78	12	-0.43	1.27	+/-1.27	4	0.67	-0.95	2.30	86.00
13-021-0012	Macon - Macon SE	NA	NA	12	0.00	1.13	+/-1.13	2	0.60	-1.23	2.42	86.00
13-051-0017	Savannah - Market Street (Scott)	20	5.76	12	-0.55	1.37	+/-1.37	4	-0.79	-3.07	1.48	79.00
13-051-0091	Savannah - Mercer Jr. High School	NA	NA	12	-0.23	0.58	+/-0.58	2	-1.14	-2.97	0.69	78.00
13-059-0001	Athens - Fire Station 7	NA	NA	12	0.13	0.38	+/-0.38	4	1.59	-0.05	3.23	83.00
13-063-0091	Forest Park - D.O.T.	NA	NA	12	-0.11	0.54	+/-0.54	2	1.14	-3.84	6.12	84.00
13-067-0003	Kennesaw - National Guard	NA	NA	12	-0.33	1.32	+/-1.32	3	-2.24	-7.46	2.98	85.00
13-067-0004	Powder Springs - Macland Aquatic Center	NA	NA	13	-0.08	0.72	+/-0.72	2	-0.60	-7.91	6.71	87.00
13-089-2001	Doraville-Health Department	NA	NA	14	0.05	1.84	+/-1.84	8	0.61	-1.77	2.99	82.00
13-089-0002	Decatur - South DeKalb	21	3.91	12	-0.18	0.43	-0.43	2	-0.60	-0.93	-0.27	77.00
13-095-0007	Albany - Turner Elem. School	NA	NA	16	-0.03	0.47	+/-0.47	2	0.27	-0.64	1.18	90.00
13-115-0005	Rome - Coosa High School	NA	NA	14	-0.61	1.16	+/-1.16	2	-1.41	-1.66	-1.16	86.00
13-121-0032	Atlanta - E. Rivers School	222	4.08	13	0.37	0.57	+0.57	4	0.27	-2.52	3.06	85.00
13-121-0048	Atlanta - Georgia Tech	NA	NA	12	-0.43	0.76	-0.76	2	-0.12	-3.12	2.88	81.00
13-127-0006	Brunswick - Risley Middle Sch.	NA	NA	12	-0.17	1.00	-1	2	-1.50	-5.15	2.16	87.00
13-135-0002	Lawrenceville - Gwinnett Tech	NA	NA	14	-0.21	0.48	+/-0.48	2	-0.51	-0.59	-0.43	81.00
13-139-0003	Gainesville - Fair St. Elem. Sch.	NA	NA	14	-0.26	0.44	-0.44	3	0.40	-1.16	1.96	61.00
13-153-0001	Warner Robins – Air Base	NA	NA	12	0.01	0.46	+/-0.46	2	0.81	0.73	0.89	82.00
13-185-0003	Valdosta - S. L. Mason School	NA	NA	12	0.05	0.51	+/-0.51	2	0.18	-1.82	2.18	87.00
13-215-0001	Columbus - Health Department	NA	NA	13	-0.40	0.87	-0.87	2	0.60	-2.23	3.42	84.00
13-215-0008	Columbus - Airport	NA	NA	14	0.03	0.31	+/-0.31	2	0.42	-3.90	4.73	79.00
13-215-0011	Columbus - Cusseta Rd. Sch.	NA	NA	12	-0.41	0.61	-0.61	2	-0.69	-0.77	-0.61	85.00
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	NA	NA	13	0.10	0.45	+/-0.45	2	-0.87	-0.95	-0.79	85.00
13-245-0005	Augusta - Med. Col. Of GA	21	3.76	12	-0.42	0.75	-0.75	4	0.22	-0.35	0.80	86.00
13-245-0091	Augusta - Bungalow Rd. Sch.	NA	NA	12	-0.41	0.82	-0.82	2	0.27	-3.30	3.84	86.00
13-295-0002	Rossville – Maple Street	NA	NA	14	-0.43	0.90	+/-0.9	2	-1.86	NA	NA	83.00
13-303-0001	Sandersville - Health Department	NA	NA	12	-0.62	0.87	-0.87	2	-1.68	-4.17	0.81	81.00
13-319-0001	Gordon - Police Dept.	NA	NA	12	-0.11	0.37	+/-0.37	2	-0.78	-0.95	-0.61	83.00
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		309	23.29	356	-0.20	0.76		74	-0.10	-2.76	1.88	79.00
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit						95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit						

Table 11: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Data Quality Assessment for FRM Samplers

PM <sub>2.5</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary of Semi-Continuous Measurements										
Site Code	Site Name	One-Point Flow Rate Check (L/min)				Semi-Annual Flow Check (L/min) (Bias %)				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	Absolute Bias (%)	Signed Bias (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-021-0012	Macon - Macon SE	13	-0.05	0.42	+/-0.42	2	-0.12	-0.29	0.05	86
13-051-1002	Savannah - W. Lathrop & Augusta Ave.	12	-0.78	1.45	+/-1.45	2	-0.51	-1.58	0.56	89
13-059-0002	Athens - Fire Station 7	12	0.31	0.45	+0.45	2	-0.09	-0.17	-0.01	83
13-077-0002	Newnan - University of West Georgia	16	-0.12	0.23	-0.23	2	0.12	0.12	0.12	93
13-089-0002	Decatur - South DeKalb	14	-0.36	0.59	-0.59	2	-0.09	-0.17	-0.01	82
13-121-0055	Atlanta - Confederate Ave.	12	0.07	0.23	+0.23	2	0.03	-0.05	0.11	92
13-135-0002	Lawrenceville - Gwinnett Tech	12	-0.02	0.09	+/-0.09	2	-0.06	-0.22	0.11	82
13-151-0002	McDonough - County Extension Office	13	0.01	0.48	+/-0.48	2	0.24	-0.26	0.74	84
13-215-0008	Columbus - Airport	12	-2.29	2.84	-2.84	2	-0.24	-1.40	0.92	85
13-223-0003	Yorkville - King's Farm	12	1.31	1.52	+1.52	2	-0.09	-0.67	0.49	83
13-245-0091	Augusta - Bungalow Rd. Sch.	14	-0.77	1.32	-1.32	2	-2.46	-6.97	2.05	93
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program		142	-0.25	0.85		22	-0.30	-1.49	2.12	87
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit							

Table 12: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Data Quality Assessment for Semi-Continuous Samplers

PM <sub>10</sub> Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary of 24-Hour Integrated Measurements												
Site Code	Site Name	Collocated (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		One-Point Flow Rate Check (L/min)				Semi-Annual Flow Check (L/min)				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	Absolute Bias (%)	Signed Bias (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
13-021-0007	Macon - Allied Chemical	57	11.74	12	-0.60	1.14	+/-1.14	4	1.87	-1.48	3.14	97
13-051-0014	Savannah - Shuman School	NA	NA	12	-1.21	1.61	-1.61	2	-0.60	-4.94	3.92	92
13-055-0001	Summerville - DNR Fish Hatchery	NA	NA	13	-0.06	2.04	+/-2.04	2	-0.60	-2.26	1.06	95
13-089-2001	Doraville - Police Department	NA	NA	12	-0.52	0.71	-0.71	2	-0.60	0.00	0.00	92
13-095-0007	Albany - Turner Elem. School	NA	NA	16	-0.31	0.80	+/-0.8	3	16.65	-2.20	1.34	100
13-115-0005	Rome - Coosa High School	NA	NA	13	-0.41	1.94	-1.94	2	-0.60	-2.48	1.78	100
13-121-0032	Atlanta - E. Rivers School	57	14.82	12	-0.12	0.48	+/-0.48	4	-0.60	-1.95	0.76	92
13-115-0004	Brunswick - Arco Pump Station	NA	NA	12	-0.20	0.82	+/-0.82	2	-0.60	-3.11	2.17	98
13-121-0039	Columbus - Cusseta Rd. Elem. School	NA	NA	18	-0.64	1.18	-1.18	2	-0.60	-2.26	1.06	87
13-245-0091	Augusta - Bungalow Rd. Elem. School	NA	NA	13	-0.92	1.87	-1.87	2	-0.60	-1.33	4.72	80
13-303-0001	Sandersville - Health Department	NA	NA	12	-0.60	2.65	-2.65	3	-0.74	-3.58	3.88	98
13-121-0048	GA Tech	NA	NA	13	-0.97	1.64	-1.64	3	-0.74	0.75	-2.22	93
13-089-0002	South DeKalb	NA	NA	13	-0.92	1.87	-1.87	3	-0.74	3.47	-4.94	90
Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Program:		114	26.56	145	-0.51	1.37		28	1.59	-2.34	2.17	94
NA: Not Applicable												
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit				95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit								

Table 13: PM<sub>10</sub> Data Quality Assessment of 24-Hour Integrated and Semi-Continuous Samplers

**Precision (field):** Precision data for non-continuous particulate samplers is obtained through collocated sampling whereby two identical samplers are operated side-by-side and the same laboratory conducts filter analyses. Collocated samplers are located at selected sites and are intended to represent overall network precision. Validity of the data is based on the percent difference of the mass concentrations



of the two samplers. In 2011 collocated PM<sub>2.5</sub> samplers were operated at Augusta-Medical College, Atlanta-E. Rivers, Decatur-South DeKalb, Savannah-Market Street and Macon-Allied. Collocated PM<sub>10</sub> samplers were operated at Atlanta-E. Rivers and Macon-Allied. Collocated TSP-Lead samplers were operated at Atlanta-DMRC.

Particulate samplers (collocated PM<sub>10</sub> and TSP) must have mass concentrations greater than or equal to 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to be used in data validity calculations. The difference between the mass concentrations must be no greater than 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. If the mass concentrations are greater than 80 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, the difference must be within ±7% of each other. TSP (lead) samplers must have both mass concentrations greater than or equal to 0.15 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to be used in data validity calculations. For collocated PM<sub>2.5</sub> samplers, data *probability limits* validity is based on the sampler's coefficient of variation, which cannot exceed 10%. Both sample masses must also be greater than 6 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

Precision for continuous PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitors is based on the comparison of the sampler's/analyzer's indicated and actual flow rates. The differences between the flow rates must be within ±15.

**Accuracy (lab):** Annual performance audits for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass analysis programs include an on-site check and assessment of the filter weighing balance, relative humidity and temperature sensors, and their documentation. The performance audits conducted in 2011 found that the Ambient Monitoring Program was operating in accordance with U.S. EPA guidelines and that the data were of good quality and should be considered data-for-record.

**Precision (lab):** Laboratories perform various quality control tasks to ensure that quality data are produced. Tasks include duplicate weighing on exposed and unexposed filters, replicate analysis on every tenth filter, and a calibration of the balance before each weighing session. After samples are collected in the field, laboratory staff has up to 30 days to analyze the PM<sub>2.5</sub> samples. Filters are visually inspected for pinholes, loose material, poor workmanship, discoloration, non-uniformity, and irregularities, and are equilibrated in a controlled environment for a minimum of 24 hours prior to the filters being weighed. If room conditions are not within the established U.S. EPA control limits, weighing is done only after the proper environment is re-established and maintained for 24 hours.

The analytical precision results indicate that the Ambient Monitoring Program is providing precise particulate matter data. The tables below show the unexposed and exposed filter replicate results for the Air Protection Branch's (APB) laboratory in 2011.

QC Checks for Pre-weighed Filters	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Total # of sample analyzed	812	5921
Total # of replicates	54	652
Total % replicated	6.65%	11%
Total # out-of-range	0	0

Source: Laboratory Section, Quality Control Report

**Table 14: Summary of Unexposed Filter Mass Replicates**

QC Checks for Post-weighed Filters	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Total # of samples analyzed	748	5299
Total # of replicates	53	541
Total % replicated	7.08%	10.2%
Total # out-of-range	0	0

Source: Laboratory Section, Quality Control Report

**Table 15: Summary of Exposed Filter Mass Replicates**

---

## AIR TOXICS

In 1996, the Air Protection Branch established an Air Toxics Network in major urban areas of the state to determine the average annual concentrations of air toxics. The program was established to assess the effectiveness of control measures in reducing air toxics exposures. Compounds identified as air toxics vaporize at ambient temperatures, play a critical role in the formation of ozone, and have adverse chronic and acute health effects. Sources of air toxics include motor vehicle exhaust, waste burning, gasoline marketing, industrial and consumer products, pesticides, industrial processes, degreasing operations, pharmaceutical manufacturing, and dry cleaning operations. Under the current air toxic sampling schedule, ambient air is collected in a stainless steel canister, on a quartz filter, and on a multi-layer cartridge every 12 days over a 24-hour sampling period at each of the network stations. Toxic particulate samples are collected and analyzed for air toxic contaminants to support the Georgia Air Toxic Network. By using a low-flow multi-channel sampler capable of sampling onto filters or cartridges, ambient air is collected and analyzed for carbonyl and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) compounds (also called semi-volatile organic compounds) and toxic metals. The quality of the air toxic data set is governed by a series of quality assurance activities, including audits. The laboratory and monitoring staff are made aware of any exceedance found during an audit, and every effort is made to ensure that the data collected is as accurate as possible.

Flow audits of the toxic metal, VOCs, semi-VOCs and carbonyl samplers are conducted annually at each site to ensure the accuracy of measuring these compounds. Flow rates are a determining factor in calculating concentration and are included as part of the Quality Assurance Program. Although toxics data are a descriptive data set, completeness is issued based on the operating parameters of the sampler. Corrections are made to the samplers if an audit finds the sampler to be outside the Air Toxic Program control limits.

Precision (field and lab): As part of the Air Toxic Program laboratory analyses, internal QC techniques such as blanks, control samples, and duplicate samples are applied to ensure the precision of the analytical methods and that the toxics data are within statistical control. Precision data for non-continuous toxics particulate samplers are obtained through collocated sampling whereby two identical samplers operate side-by side simultaneously and the same laboratory conducts filter analyses. The collocated toxic sampler located at the Utoy Creek site was intended to represent overall network precision. However, in 2011, the Utoy Creek site did not collect samples. This was one of the sites that was shut down as explained earlier, due to budgetary constraints and lack of available personnel (see Table 2 for details).

Stainless steel canisters used to collect ambient air samples are also checked for contamination. Canisters are analyzed for aromatic and halogenated hydrocarbons. One canister per batch of eight is assayed to ensure individual compound measurements fall below the limit of detection. In the event a compound exceeds canister cleanliness criteria, the canister and all other canisters represented in the batch are re-cleaned until compounds meet the cleanliness criteria. In addition, Xontech 910A air samplers are checked for cleanliness. Failed air collection media are re-cleaned and re-tested until they pass Xontech 910A cleanliness criteria.

Accuracy (field): The accuracy of air toxic samples is determined by comparing the instrument's flow rate to a certified variable orifice, or a calibrated mass flow meter, that is certified against a National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) traceable flow device or calibrator. Since an accurate measurement of air toxics data is dependent upon flow rate, the Ambient Monitoring Program conducts annual flow rate audits at each site. The percent difference between the sampler flow rates and the audit flow rates is computed for each air toxics sampler.

---

## NATTS

There are currently 187 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), or air toxics, with emissions regulated under the Clean Air Act (CAA). These compounds have been associated with a wide variety of adverse human health and ecological effects, including cancer, neurological effects, reproductive effects, and developmental effects. According to the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is committed to reducing air toxics emissions by 75 percent from 1993 levels in order to significantly reduce Americans' risk of cancer and of other serious health effects caused by airborne toxic chemicals. Early efforts toward this end have focused on emissions reductions through the assessment of technical feasibility. However, as new assessment tools are developed, more attention is being placed on the goal of risk reduction associated with exposure to air toxics.

To meet the GPRA goals, the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) network has been established, consisting of 27 stations nationwide, with one in Georgia. Having data of sufficient quality is paramount for a network such as the NATTS. As such, Georgia has closely followed the Quality System (QS) for the NATTS, established by U.S. EPA, two aspects of which are Technical Systems Audits (TSAs) and Instrument Performance Audits (IPAs) of each network station and its affiliated sample analysis laboratory. Another integral part of the QS is the quarterly analysis of performance evaluation (PE) samples. Furthermore, the sampling and analytical techniques selected to collect and quantify the air toxics of concern must demonstrate acceptable analytical and overall sampling precision, as well as suitable overall method detection limits that are compatible with expected ambient air toxics concentrations.

There are 27 sites nationwide in the NATTS network. Georgia joined the network with one site established in Decatur at the South DeKalb Monitoring Station. The location of all sites, whether the site is located in an urban or rural area, the unique AQS identification code (site code), and current status for all the sites are given in Table 16, below. The list was taken from the U.S. EPA website, <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/natts.html>.

**National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) Network**

Last Update: 15Aug12

<i>Location</i>	<i>Operating Agency</i>	<i>AQS ID</i>	<i>Setting</i>
Roxbury MA	MA Department of Environmental Protection	25-025-0042	Urban
Providence RI	RI Department of Environmental Management	44-007-0022	Urban
Underhill VT	VT Department of Environmental Conservation	50-007-0007	Rural
Bronx NY	NY Department of Environmental Conservation	36-005-0110	Urban
Bronx NY	NY Department of Environmental Conservation	36-005-0080	Urban
Rochester NY	NY Department of Environmental Conservation	36-055-1007	Urban
Washington DC	DC Department of Health	11-001-0043	Urban
Richmond VA	VA Department of Environmental Quality	51-087-0014	Urban
Tampa FL	Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission	12-057-3002	Urban
Pinellas County FL	Pinellas County Department of Environmental Management	12-103-0026	Urban
Atlanta GA	GA Department of Natural Resources	13-089-0002	Urban
Hazard KY	KY Department of Environmental Protection	21-193-0003	Rural
Grayson Lake KY	KY Department of Environmental Protection	21-043-0500	Rural
Chesterfield SC	SC Department of Health and Environmental Conservation	45-025-0001	Rural
Detroit MI	MI Department of Environmental Quality	26-163-0033	Urban
Chicago IL	IL Environmental Protection Agency	17-031-4201	Urban
Mayville WI	WI Department of Natural Resources	55-027-0007	Rural
Horicon WI	WI Department of Natural Resources	55-027-0001	Rural
Houston TX	TX Commission on Environmental Quality	48-201-1039	Urban
Karnack TX	TX Commission on Environmental Quality	48-203-0002	Rural
St. Louis MO	MO Department of Natural Resources	29-510-0085	Urban
Bountiful UT	UT Department of Environmental Quality	49-011-0004	Urban
Grand Junction CO	CO Department of Health and Environment	08-077-0017/18	Urban
San Jose CA	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	06-085-0005	Urban
Phoenix AZ	AZ Department of Environmental Quality	04-013-9997	Urban
Los Angeles CA	South Coast Air Quality Management District	06-037-1103	Urban
Rubidoux CA	South Coast Air Quality Management District	06-065-8001	Urban
Seattle WA	WA Department of Ecology	53-033-0080	Urban
La Grande OR	OR Department of Environmental Quality	41-061-0119	Rural
Portland OR	OR Department of Environmental Quality	41-051-0246	Urban

Added January 2007

Added January 2008

Added July 2008

Discontinued June 2008

Discontinued December 2009

Added December 2009

Discontinued June 2010

Added July 2010

(Source: <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/natts.html>)**Table 16: Current List of NATTS Sites with AQS Site Codes**

Several Measurement Quality Objectives (MQOs) have been established for the NATTS network in order to ensure that only data of the highest quality are collected by the NATTS network, and to meet

the NATTS Data Quality Objective (DQO): “to be able to detect a 15 percent difference (trend) between two consecutive 3-year annual mean concentrations within acceptable levels of decision error”<sup>3</sup>. Initially, the four compounds of primary importance to the NATTS program were benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, and PM<sub>10</sub> arsenic. The Data Quality Objective MQOs for these four compounds are summarized in Table 17 below.

Compound	Completeness	Precision (Coefficient of Variation)	Laboratory Bias	Method Detection Limit (MDL)
Benzene	> 85 %	< 15 %	< 25 %	0.044 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
1,3-Butadiene	> 85 %	< 15 %	< 25 %	0.020 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Formaldehyde	> 85 %	< 15 %	< 25 %	0.014 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
Arsenic	> 85 %	< 15 %	< 25 %	0.046 ng/m <sup>3</sup>

**Table 17: Measurement Quality Objectives for the NATTS Program**

Other compounds have been added to the list of compounds, including hexavalent chromium, acrolein, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). GA EPD collects data to monitor for these compounds as part of the NATTS program, as well as organic carbon, additional carbonyls, and additional volatile organic compounds.

The MQOs require that: (1) sampling occurs every sixth day and is successful 85 percent of the time; (2) precision as measured by the coefficient of variation (CV) be controlled to less than 15 percent; and (3) that laboratory (measurement) bias be less than 25 percent. Data acquired to assess compliance with the above stated MQOs are derived from a variety of sources. These sources are given in Table 18.

Criteria	Data Source	MQO Limit
Completeness	Air Quality System (AQS)	< 15 %
Precision	AQS and Proficiency Testing	< 15 %
Bias - Laboratory	Proficiency Testing	< 25 %
Bias - Field	Audits of Sampler Flowrates	< 10 %
MDL	Laboratories	0.046 ng/m <sup>3</sup> to 0.044 µg/m <sup>3</sup>

**Table 18: MQO Data Sources for the Georgia NAATS Program**

The Air Quality System (AQS) database contains raw data that is used to assess data completeness, and to estimate precision from results of replicate analyses and collocated sampling. In addition, results from the analysis of proficiency testing samples allow one to calculate laboratory precision and bias.

Completeness (of NATTS Data): The AQS database was accessed and the raw data records analyzed for 23 compounds having the AQS codes given in Table 19 below. The completeness of the 2011 AQS dataset was assessed for four compounds: benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, and arsenic. The results are shown in Table 20, below. The percent completeness ranged from 87% to 95%, with sampling occurring every sixth day. Primary and collocated data are differentiated in AQS by use of parameter occurrence codes (POCs).

<sup>3</sup> Quality Assurance Handbook for Air Pollution Measurement System. Volume 1. Principles. EPA-600/R-94/038A, January 1994.



Compound Name	AQS Code
Benzene	45201
1,3-Butadiene	43218
Carbon Tetrachloride	43804
Chloroform	43803
1,2-Dibromoethane	43843
1,2-Dichloropropane	43829
1,2-Dichloroethane	43815
Dichloromethane	43802
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	43818
Tetrachloroethylene	43817
Trichloroethylene	43824
Vinyl Chloride	43860
Cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	43831
Trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	43830
Formaldehyde	43502
Acetaldehyde	43503
Arsenic	82103
Beryllium	82105
Cadmium	82110
Lead	82128
Manganese	82132
Mercury	82142
Nickel	82136

Table 19: 23 Selected HAPs and Their AQS Parameter Codes

Site	Completeness of Compound by AQS Number and by Name			
	45201	43218	43502	82103
	benzene	1,3-butadiene	formaldehyde	arsenic
Decatur, GA	93%	93%	95%	87%

Table 20: Percent Completeness of Georgia's 2011 AQS Data, Selected Compounds

## PHOTOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT MONITORING

In 1996, the Air Protection Branch began a routine seasonal sampling program to gather information about non-methane hydrocarbon (NMHC) species that were precursors to ozone formation in high ozone areas. In 1994, federal regulations required states to establish photochemical assessment monitoring stations (PAMS) as part of their State Implementation Plan (SIP) for monitoring networks in areas designated as serious or higher for ozone. Monitoring is to continue until the ozone standard is reached. The PAMS program is intended to supplement ozone monitoring and add detailed sampling for its precursors. PAMS sites collect data on real-time total NMHC, PAMS speciated VOCs, carbonyls, and various meteorological parameters at ground level and aloft. As this is a descriptive data set, there are currently no mandatory data quality objectives or regulations for the data. However, efforts are made to ensure that accurate data are collected and that the analyzers are operating within PAMS audit standards.

Accuracy (field and lab): Laboratory performance audits are conducted annually to assess the laboratory's ability to measure ambient levels of hydrocarbons. Through-the-probe *sampler*

performance audits are conducted semi-annually at each monitoring site to assess the integrity of the sampling, analysis, and transport system. The 2011 PAMS speciated VOCs yearly data quality assessment summary for the three PAMS sites on the tables below show that most results were within the PAMS' control limits of  $\pm 20\%$ .

**PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary for Decatur - South DeKalb Site**

Parameter Code	Parameter Name	2-Comp. Std. Weekly Check			Validation of Bias			Annual Perform, Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
43202	Ethane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	17.23	11.13	23.33	93.00
43204	Propane <sup>+</sup>	31	6.31	10.73	9.74	-1.10	19.38	6	15.37	10.57	20.16	93.00
43214	Isobutane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	16.35	10.82	21.88	93.00
43216	Trans-2-Butene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	12.38	4.57	20.20	93.00
43220	N-Pentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	14.81	7.88	21.75	93.00
43285	2-Methylpentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-4.51	-28.61	19.59	93.00
43243	Isoprene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-29.04	-38.58	-19.49	93.00
43231	N-Hexane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	31.07	25.43	36.70	93.00
45201	Benzene <sup>+</sup>	31	9.51	10.23	7.36	-7.62	23.28	6	12.47	6.18	18.76	93.00
43232	N-Heptane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	22.19	19.14	25.24	93.00
45202	Toluene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	10.22	5.67	14.78	93.00
45203	Ethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	5.13	-3.19	13.45	93.00
43238	N-Decane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-3.54	-28.63	21.56	93.00
45225	1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	0.55	-19.21	20.31	93.00
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit				95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit								
PQAO: Primary Quality Assurance Organization												
* NIST traceable												
+ Only NIST traceable by weight												

**Table 21: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for South DeKalb**

**PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary for Conyers - Monastery Site**

Parameter Code	Parameter Name	2-Comp. Std. Weekly Check			Validation of Bias			Annual Perform. Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
43202	Ethane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-30.68	-138.06	76.71	95.00
43204	Propane <sup>+</sup>	31	6.15	13.04	9.32	1.49	21.49	6	4.93	-24.39	34.26	95.00
43214	Isobutane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-9.33	-26.74	8.08	95.00
43216	Trans-2-Butene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-23.61	-62.42	15.19	95.00
43220	N-Pentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	0.08	-21.62	21.78	95.00
43285	2-Methylpentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-22.69	-45.59	0.21	95.00
43243	Isoprene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-28.33	-41.85	-14.80	95.00
43231	N-Hexane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	13.65	-23.39	50.69	95.00
45201	Benzene <sup>+</sup>	31	8.19	9.55	5.10	-5.81	20.78	6	5.43	-43.55	54.41	95.00
43232	N-Heptane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	16.71	-34.59	68.01	95.00
45202	Toluene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6.64	-44.15	57.43	95.00
45203	Ethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	0.54	-40.32	41.40	95.00
43238	N-Decane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-13.05	-40.30	14.20	95.00
45225	1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-25.59	-38.04	-13.14	95.00
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit				95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit								
PQAO: Primary Quality Assurance Organization												
* NIST traceable												
+ Only NIST traceable by weight												

**Table 22: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Conyers**

**PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary for Yorkville – King's Farm Site**

Parameter Code	Parameter Name	2-Comp. Std. Weekly Check			Validation of Bias			Annual Perform, Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
43202	Ethane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-2.79	-30.91	25.33	89.00
43204	Propane <sup>+</sup>	30	8.04	13.46	8.18	-1.60	24.40	6	-6.01	-35.52	23.50	89.00
43214	Isobutane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-6.99	-32.38	18.39	89.00
43216	Trans-2-Butene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-8.56	-35.92	18.79	89.00
43220	N-Pentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-6.48	-34.83	21.87	89.00
43285	2-Methylpentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-7.52	-32.27	17.22	89.00
43243	Isoprene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-29.64	-52.10	-7.17	89.00
43231	N-Hexane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	5.95	-27.23	39.13	89.00
45201	Benzene <sup>+</sup>	30	12.11	19.84	13.97	-2.86	36.34	6	-7.51	-36.11	21.09	89.00
43232	N-Heptane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	8.03	-18.58	34.64	89.00
45202	Toluene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-2.24	-28.58	24.11	89.00
45203	Ethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	1.88	-19.84	23.6	89.00
43238	N-Decane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-7.24	-41.43	26.95	89.00
45225	1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	-3.93	-32.04	24.18	89.00
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit				95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit								
PQAO: Primary Quality Assurance Organization												
* NIST traceable												
+ Only NIST traceable by weight												

**Table 23: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Yorkville**

**PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for GA EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program (as a PQA)**

Parameter Code	Parameter Name	2-Comp. Std. Weekly Check			Validation of Bias			Annual Perform. Evaluation Bias				Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	Precision Estimate CV (%)	Absolute Bias Estimate (%)	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	No. of Obs.	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
43202	Ethane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-5.41	-69.60	58.77	92.30
43204	Propane <sup>+</sup>	92	6.82	12.40	9.09	-2.05	20.23	18	4.76	-19.41	28.94	92.30
43214	Isobutane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	0.01	-18.05	18.07	92.30
43216	Trans-2-Butene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-6.60	-34.38	21.18	92.30
43220	N-Pentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	2.81	-18.19	23.80	92.30
43285	2-Methylpentane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-11.57	-35.50	12.35	92.30
43243	Isoprene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-29.00	-45.11	-12.89	92.30
43231	N-Hexane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	16.89	-12.01	45.78	92.30
45201	Benzene <sup>+</sup>	92	9.91	13.13	8.75	-7.53	25.04	18	3.46	-29.48	36.41	92.30
43232	N-Heptane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	15.64	-17.77	49.06	92.30
45202	Toluene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	4.88	-28.26	38.01	92.30
45203	Ethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	2.52	-24.63	29.66	92.30
43238	N-Decane <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-7.94	-37.04	21.16	92.30
45225	1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene <sup>+</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	-9.66	-30.76	11.44	92.30
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit				95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit								
PQAO: Primary Quality Assurance Organization												
* NIST traceable												
+ Only NIST traceable by weight												

**Table 24: PAMS Speciated VOCs Yearly Data Quality Assessment for Ambient Monitoring Program****METEOROLOGY**

The Ambient Monitoring Program monitors meteorological parameters such as wind speed, wind direction, ambient temperature, relative humidity, barometric pressure, total ultra violet radiation, precipitation and total solar radiation. Real-time meteorological data are generated to characterize meteorological processes such as transport and diffusion, and to make air quality forecasts and burn day decisions. The data are also used for control strategy modeling, case study analysis, and urban airshed modeling. A state/local meteorology subcommittee of the Air Monitoring Technical Advisory Commission (AMTAC) agreed to define the level of acceptability for meteorological data as those used by the U.S. EPA for both the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) programs. The Quality Assurance Unit audits to those levels.

The data variability collected by this element of the monitoring program is generally described as meeting or not meeting the PSD requirements. Station operators are notified if an exceedance is found during an audit, and every effort is made to ensure that the data meets the audit standards. The wind speed, wind direction, ambient temperature and relative humidity data sets are controlled data sets, and subject to meeting PAMS objectives. Since the inception of the meteorological audit program, the data quality has improved significantly.



**Accuracy (field):** The accuracy of meteorological sensors is checked by annual performance audits. Table 25 summarizes the 2011 data quality assessment results. The average difference (average degree difference with respect to ambient temperature) represents the combined differences from the certified value of all the individual audit points for each sensor. The upper and lower probability limits represent the expected accuracy of 95 percent of all the single sensor's individual percent differences for all audit test levels at a single site.

Meteorological Measurements Yearly Data Quality Assessment Summary for GA EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program (as a PQAQO)							
Parameter Code	Parameter Name	Annual Audit (Bias %)					Completeness (%)
		No. of Obs.	No. of Site	Avg (%)	95% LPL (%)	95% UPL (%)	
61101	Wind Speed	56	13	0.49	-1.20	2.19	99
61102	Wind Direction	56	13	0.75	-4.57	6.06	99
62101	Ambient Temperature	8	4	0.67	-1.96	3.29	100
64101	Barometric Pressure	6	4	0.00	-0.10	0.09	100
62201	Relative Humidity	8	4	-0.19	-7.25	6.87	100
95% LPL: 95% Lower Probability Limit			95% UPL: 95% Upper Probability Limit				
PQAQO: Primary Quality Assurance Organization							

**Table 25: Meteorological Measurements Accuracy Results**

## QUALITY CONTROL REPORTS

Quality Control (QC) reports are summaries of the quality control activities conducted by the laboratory to support accurate and precise measurements. These activities include: blanks, duplicates, controls, spiked samples, limits of detection, calibrations, and audit results.

## STANDARDS LABORATORY

The U.S. EPA Region IV Standards Laboratory yearly performs technical support and certification services for Georgia's ozone primary standard. Flow rate transfer standards and certification of compressed gas cylinders are sent to the manufacturers for re-certification to ensure that all are traceable to standards of the NIST. A calibration establishes a correction factor to adjust or correct the output of an instrument; a certification establishes traceability of a transfer standard to a NIST-traceable standard; and verification establishes comparability of a standard to a NIST-traceable standard of equal rank.

## LABORATORY AND FIELD STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are guidance documents for the operation of quality assurance programs used by the Georgia Ambient Monitoring Program. The SOPs are intended for field operators and supervisors; laboratory, data processing and engineering personnel; and program managers responsible for implementing, designing, and coordinating air quality monitoring projects. Each SOP has a specific method that must be followed to produce data-for-record. The SOPs are developed and published to ensure that, regardless of the person performing the operation, the results will be consistent.

## SITING EVALUATIONS

To generate accurate and representative data, ambient monitoring stations should meet specific siting requirements and conditions. It is assumed that the stations meet the siting criteria in place at the time

initial operation began. The siting requirements of the AMP Quality Assurance Manual Volume II; 40 CFR 58, Appendix E; U.S. EPA's Quality Assurance Handbook Volume IV: U.S. EPA's Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD); and U.S. EPA's PAMS guidelines present siting criteria to ensure the collection of accurate and representative data. The siting criterion for each pollutant varies depending on the pollutant's properties, monitoring objective and intended spatial scale. The U.S. EPA's siting criteria are stated as either "must meet" or "should meet". According to 40 CFR 58, Appendix E, the "must meet" requirements are necessary for high quality data. Any exception from the "must meet" requirements must be formally approved through the Appendix E waiver provision. The "should meet" criteria establish a goal for data consistency. Siting criteria are requirements for locating and establishing stations and samplers to meet selected monitoring objectives, and to help ensure that the data from each site are collected uniformly. There are four main monitoring objectives: to determine highest concentrations expected to occur in the area covered by the network; to determine representative concentrations in areas of high population density; to determine the impact on ambient pollution levels of significant sources or source categories; and to determine general background concentration levels. Typical siting designations are: micro, middle, neighborhood, urban, and regional. These designations represent the size of the area surrounding the monitoring site which experiences relatively uniform pollutant concentrations. Typical considerations for each of these site designations are, for example, the terrain, climate, population, existing emission sources, and distances from trees and roadways. The Quality Assurance Unit conducts siting evaluations annually. Physical measurements and observations include probe/sensor height above ground level, distance from trees, type of ground cover, residence time, obstructions to air flow, and distance to local sources. These measurements and observations are taken to determine compliance with 40 CFR Part 58, Appendix E requirements.

## RISK ASSESSMENT


### INTRODUCTION

In 2011, Georgia EPD collected air toxic samples from a total of five Air Toxics Network (ATN) sites, including two background (rural) sites, and one National Air Toxics Trend Station (NATTS). As a result of limited funding, nine of the 14 ATN sites were discontinued at the end of 2008 (refer to Table 2 for a complete list of discontinued samplers). The following risk assessment reflects data collected at the six sites. The compounds sampled at the ATN sites are shown in Table 26, on the next page. The list was derived from the 187 compounds EPA has designated as Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPS). Many of the HAPS do not have standardized ambient air sampling and analytical methods. In order to collect the compounds of interest for the Georgia network, at least three types of samplers are used at all locations: HIVOL, PUF, and canister. In addition, a carbonyls sampler was located at the Dawsonville, Savannah, and South DeKalb (NATTS and PAMS) sites in 2011. This equipment samples for metals, semi-volatile organic compounds, volatile organic compounds, and carbonyls once every twelve days following a pre-established schedule that corresponds to a nationwide sampling schedule. On the twelfth day the sampler runs midnight to midnight and takes a 24-hour composite sample. An exception to this sampling schedule is the South DeKalb site, which samples every six days as part of the National Air Toxics Trends Station (NATTS) and PAMS network.

Some of the chemicals monitored in the Air Toxics Network (ATN) are also monitored at sites in the Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) network. While the monitoring schedule and some analysis methods are different at the PAMS sites and ATN sites, several of the compounds from the PAMS sites were also evaluated and compared to concentrations measured at nearby ATN sites for this report.

To provide an idea of the size of risks from environmental hazards as risk analysts will describe them, the continuum below presents risk statistics for some familiar events. Risk analysts describe cancer risks numerically in scientific notation, for example  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  or  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  or 1.00E-05, which means that there is one chance in 100,000 of an event occurring. It is important to note that these risk statistics are population averages, while risk analysts usually estimate risk to the maximum exposed individual. Additionally, it should be noted that these risk values are considered additional risk. That is, risk above and beyond the normal background risk from exposure in everyday life.

#### Putting Risks in Perspective



### RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The air toxic data [volatile organic compounds (VOC), semi-volatile organic compounds, and metals] collected during 2011 from the Air Toxics Network was evaluated to assess the potential for health concerns. The data collected for the group of chemicals known as carbonyls were assessed separately from the other air toxics, with the exception of acrolein, because those chemicals were only monitored at two of the ATN sites and one of the PAMS locations.

The initial evaluation consisted of a comparison of the monitored results to “health based” screening values. These values were calculated using procedures recommended in EPA’s latest guidance on risk assessment for air toxics, ‘A Preliminary Risk-Based Screening Approach for Air Toxics Monitoring Data Sets’ (U.S. EPA, 2006). Briefly, EPA’s prioritized chronic dose-response values for both noncancer (reference concentrations, RfC) and cancer (inhalation unit risks, IUR) were used to generate screening air concentrations. To screen for noncancer effects, the reference concentration was used as a starting point. However, to account for possible exposure to multiple contaminants, the screening air concentration was obtained by dividing the RfC by 10. Screening values for the cancer endpoint were determined by calculating air concentrations equivalent to a risk level of one in one million. Most screening values utilized in this assessment are listed in Appendix A of the previously mentioned guidance document (U.S. EPA, 2006) and updated “Table 1. Prioritized Chronic Dose-Response Values for Screening Risk Assessments (5/21/2012)” (U.S. EPA, 2012). These screening values and the chemicals monitored are displayed in Table 26. For a limited number of chemicals, other resources such as toxicity values from the Regional Screening Table ([http://www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/risk/human/rb-concentration\\_table/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/risk/human/rb-concentration_table/index.htm)) were used to calculate conservative screening values. These compounds are indicated with an asterisk. When available, both the names derived from the International Union of Chemistry (IUC) and the common names are given. It is important to emphasize that the screening values were calculated in a very conservative manner. Assumptions were made that accounted for the potential for continuous exposure to air toxics for 24 hours per day for 70 years. The conservative screening process was utilized so that the chance of underestimating the potential for health impacts would be minimized, as chemicals were excluded from further quantitative analysis.

Because results for many of the chemicals assessed were routinely below detection limits of the analytical methods available, the initial review of the data was based on an assessment of the number of chemicals detected and the frequency with which they were detected. The process included determining how often (if at all) a chemical was detected (present), if it was present above detection limits, and if those concentrations were above screening values of concern.

Chemical	Screen Value (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Chemical	Screen Value (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
<b>Metals</b>			
Antimony	0.02	Cobalt	0.01
Arsenic	0.00023	Lead	0.15
Beryllium	0.00042	Manganese	0.005
Cadmium	0.00056	Nickel	0.0021
Chromium	0.000083	Selenium	2
Chromium VI	0.000083	Zinc	N/A
<b>Semi-Volatiles</b>			
Acenaphthene	0.3	Cyclopenta(cd)pyrene	N/A
Acenaphthylene	0.3	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.00083
Anthracene	0.3	Fluoranthene	0.3
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.0091	Fluorene	0.3
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.0091	9-Fluorenone	N/A
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.0091	Ideno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	0.0091
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.3	Naphthalene	0.029
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.00091	Phenanthrene	0.3
Benzo(e)pyrene	0.3	Perylene	N/A
Chrysene	0.091	Pyrene	0.3
Coronene	N/A	Retene	N/A
<b>Volatile Organic Compounds</b>			
Benzene	0.13	1,3 and 1,4-Dimethylbenzene (m/p-Xylene)	10
Benzenecarbonal (Benzaldehyde)	N/A	Ethanal (Acetaldehyde)	0.45
Benzyl chloride	0.02	Ethylbenzene	100
Bromomethane (Methyl bromide)	0.5	Ethenylbenzene (Styrene)	100
1,3-Butadiene	0.03	1-Ethyl,4-methyl benzene (4-Ethyltoluene)	N/A
Butanal (Butyraldehyde)	N/A	Freon 113	N/A
Chlorobenzene (Phenyl chloride)	100	Hexachloro-1,3-Butadiene(Hexachlorobutadiene)	0.045
Chloroethane (Ethyl chloride)	1000	n-Hexane	70
Chloroethene (Vinyl chloride)	0.11	Methanal (Formaldehyde)	0.0769
Chloromethane (Methyl chloride)	9.0	Methylbenzene/Phenylmethane (Toluene)	500
Cyclohexane	6300*	Propanal (Propionaldehyde)	0.8
1,2-Dibromoethane (Ethylene bromide)	0.002	2-Propanone (Acetone)	32000*
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.091	Propenal (Acrolein)	0.002
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	N/A	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.017
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.091	Tetrachloroethene (Perchloroethylene)	3.846
Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12)	210*	Tetrachlormethane (Carbon tetrachloride)	0.067
1,1-Dichloroethane (Ethylidene chloride)	0.63	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	20
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	370	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	7.3*
1,1-Dichloroethene (1,1-Dichloroethylene)	210*	1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	N/A
Dichloromethane (Methylene chloride)	100	1,1,1-Trichloroethane (Methylchloroform)	100
1,2-Dichloropropane (Propylene chloride)	0.3	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.063
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	N/A	Trichloroethene (Trichloroethylene)	0.244
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	N/A	Trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11)	730*
1,1-Dichloro-1,2,2,2-tetrafluoroethane(Freon 114)	N/A	Trichloromethane (Chloroform)	9.8
1,2-Dimethylbenzene (o-Xylene)	10		

\*From Regional Screening Table ([http://www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/risk/human/rb-concentration\\_table/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/risk/human/rb-concentration_table/index.htm))

**Table 26: Compounds Monitored and Screening Values Used in Initial Assessment**



Table 27 summarizes the total number of chemicals monitored at each site (excluding all carbonyls except acrolein), the number of chemicals detected, and the number of chemicals detected above the health based screening values for 2011. Seventy-one chemicals were monitored at all the Air Toxics sites, except the South DeKalb site, where 76 air toxic chemicals were monitored. In 2011, thirty of the 71 sampled compounds were not detected at the sites, and an additional 13 compounds had 2 or fewer sites with detections. The number of chemicals that were detected at concentrations above the screening levels was even less, with a mean value of 6. Of the three categories of chemicals measured at all sites (VOC, semi-VOC, metals), most of the chemicals that were detected above screening values belonged to the metals group.

Location	County	Number of Compounds Monitored	Number of Compounds Detected	Number Greater than Screening Value
Dawsonville	Dawson	71*	25	6
General Coffee	Coffee	71*	27	6
Macon	Bibb	71*	30	7
Savannah	Chatham	71*	22	8
South DeKalb	DeKalb	76*	37	5
Yorkville	Paulding	71	21	4

\* 6 additional chemicals were monitored at these locations, but that information is summarized in Table 32.

#### Table 27: Summary of Chemicals Analyzed in 2011

Table 28, on the following page, shows only the chemicals that were detected above screening values at each Air Toxics site in 2011. It also provides detailed information on how often they were detected (frequency), and the overall average (mean) in micrograms per cubic meter. The number of detects were counted as any number that was above half the method detection limit. The average was computed using the sample concentration when it was above half the method detection limit and substituting half the method detection limit if the sample concentration was below this limit.

Location	Chemical	Mean ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Detection Frequency
Dawsonville	Arsenic	$5.55 \times 10^{-4}$	22/29
	Benzene	$6.10 \times 10^{-1}$	19/30
	Chromium	$1.79 \times 10^{-3}$	29/29
	Nickel	$3.84 \times 10^{-3}$	29/29
	Carbon tetrachloride	$7.89 \times 10^{-1}$	1/30
	Acrolein	$8.61 \times 10^{-1}$	29/30
General Coffee	Arsenic	$9.70 \times 10^{-4}$	22/27
	Benzene	$4.12 \times 10^{-1}$	4/28
	Chromium	$1.99 \times 10^{-3}$	27/27
	Nickel	$4.60 \times 10^{-3}$	26/27
	Carbon tetrachloride	$7.89 \times 10^{-1}$	2/28
	Acrolein	$4.19 \times 10^{-1}$	20/28
Macon	Arsenic	$5.30 \times 10^{-4}$	17/24
	Benzene	$4.62 \times 10^{-1}$	7/31
	Chromium	$2.09 \times 10^{-3}$	24/24
	Manganese	$5.65 \times 10^{-3}$	24/24
	Naphthalene	$2.93 \times 10^{-2}$	21/21
	Nickel	$2.16 \times 10^{-3}$	24/24
	Acrolein	$5.56 \times 10^{-1}$	19/31
Savannah	Arsenic	$1.22 \times 10^{-3}$	24/26
	Benzene	$9.39 \times 10^{-1}$	19/30
	Chromium	$3.12 \times 10^{-3}$	26/26
	Manganese	$7.92 \times 10^{-3}$	26/26
	Nickel	$5.80 \times 10^{-3}$	26/26
	Vinyl chloride	$3.20 \times 10^{-1}$	1/30
	Carbon tetrachloride	$7.87 \times 10^{-1}$	1/30
	Acrolein	1.33	27/30
South DeKalb	Arsenic	$5.80 \times 10^{-4}$	47/57
	Benzene	$4.72 \times 10^{-1}$	19/57
	Chromium	$1.68 \times 10^{-3}$	57/57
	Naphthalene	$9.07 \times 10^{-2}$	61/61
	Acrolein	$5.14 \times 10^{-1}$	44/57
Yorkville	Arsenic	$3.7 \times 10^{-4}$	17/31
	Chromium	$2.00 \times 10^{-3}$	31/31
	Carbon tetrachloride	$7.92 \times 10^{-1}$	1/26
	Acrolein	$3.63 \times 10^{-1}$	10/26

Table 28: Site-Specific Detection Frequency and Mean Chemical Concentration, 2011

Formula For Calculating Risk Using IUR For Carcinogens

$$Risk = IUR * Conc$$

Formula For Calculating Hazard Quotient Using RfC For Noncarcinogens

$$HQ = \frac{Conc}{RfC}$$

**Equation Parameters**

Risk Theoretical lifetime cancer risk (unitless probability)

HQ Hazard quotient (unitless ratio)

Conc Measured ambient air concentration in  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

IUR Inhalation unit risk ( $1/(\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3)$ )

RfC Reference concentration ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )

**Figure 85: Formulas for Calculating Risk and Hazard Quotient**

Figure 85 shows the formulas used to calculate cancer risk and non-cancer hazard for chemicals that were carried beyond the screening process into the quantitative assessment.

On the following page, Table 29 shows the theoretical cancer risk and non-cancer hazard that would result from an individual breathing air containing the detected chemicals at the estimated concentrations daily for seventy years, or a full lifetime. These cancer risk and hazard quotient estimates are likely conservative because they were calculated assuming continuous exposure to outdoor air at breathing rates typical of moderate exertion. Real risk cannot be calculated, but may be substantially lower. Lifetime cancer risks for the limited number of chemicals exceeding screening values (and excluding that from carbonyls) exceeded  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  or one in one million, a value generally deemed as insignificant. However, lifetime cancer risks for these chemicals did not exceed  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  or one in ten thousand. This value is generally taken as a crude upper limit for “allowable” risk in many regulatory contexts.

Individual hazard quotients (HQs) are ratios that relate daily exposure concentrations, or dose, to a concentration or an amount thought to be without appreciable risks of causing deleterious non-cancer effects in sensitive individuals as well as the general population. HQ values less than 1.0 indicate the air “dose” is less than the amount required to cause toxic effects other than cancer.

In July of 2007, Georgia EPD changed the analysis method for acrolein. The sampling method changed from a dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) cartridge with high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) analysis to the VOCs canister collection with gas chromatograph with mass spectroscopy (GC/MS) analysis. This change occurred due to EPA’s findings during the School Air Toxics Monitoring Initiative. For more information on this study, please see EPA’s website, <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/airtoxschool.html>. With this GC/MS analysis method, there were several more detections of acrolein than have been seen in previous years, with the HPLC cartridge method. These results are shown along with the other hazard quotients for the Air Toxics sites. The HQ numbers for acrolein are significantly higher than for the other air toxic compounds. This may be due to methodological changes. Potential reasons for differences are still being investigated.

Location	Chemical	Cancer Risk	Hazard Quotient
Dawsonville	Arsenic	$2 \times 10^{-6}$	0.04
	Benzene	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.02
	Chromium	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	0.02
	Nickel		0.04
	Carbon tetrachloride	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.008
	Acrolein		28
General Coffee	Arsenic	$4 \times 10^{-6}$	0.07
	Benzene	$3 \times 10^{-6}$	0.01
	Chromium	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	0.02
	Nickel		0.05
	Carbon tetrachloride	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.008
	Acrolein		66
Macon	Arsenic	$2 \times 10^{-6}$	0.04
	Benzene	$4 \times 10^{-6}$	0.02
	Chromium	$3 \times 10^{-5}$	0.02
	Manganese		0.1
	Naphthalene	$1 \times 10^{-6}$	0.01
	Nickel		0.02
	Acrolein		21
Savannah	Arsenic	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.08
	Benzene	$7 \times 10^{-6}$	0.03
	Chromium	$4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.03
	Manganese		0.2
	Nickel		0.06
	Vinyl chloride	$3 \times 10^{-6}$	0.003
	Carbon tetrachloride	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.008
	Acrolein		43
South DeKalb	Arsenic	$2 \times 10^{-6}$	0.04
	Benzene	$4 \times 10^{-6}$	0.02
	Chromium	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	0.02
	Naphthalene	$3 \times 10^{-6}$	0.03
	Acrolein		26
Yorkville	Arsenic	$2 \times 10^{-6}$	0.03
	Chromium	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	0.02
	Carbon tetrachloride	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.008
	Acrolein		18

**Table 29: Cancer Risk and Hazard Quotient by Location and Chemical, 2011**


Table 30, on the next page, shows total or aggregate theoretical cancer risk and hazard indices (added hazard quotients) for the chemicals (VOCs, semi-VOCs, and metals) carried through the quantitative assessment. For screening purposes such as this, it is generally considered appropriate to treat the potential for effects in an additive manner and to sum cancer risk and hazard quotients, respectively. For example, if cancer risk for two separate chemicals were  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ , then the sum or aggregate cancer risk would equal  $3 \times 10^{-4}$ . Likewise, if cancer risk for two separate chemicals were  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ , then total cancer risk for the two would equal  $1.1 \times 10^{-4}$ , or rounded to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ . Similarly, if hazard quotients were 0.6 and 0.5 for two different chemicals, it would indicate that each chemical alone is not likely to result in detrimental effects. However, summing the two would yield a hazard index (HI) of 1.1 or rounded to 1. Comparing this value to the threshold value of 1.0, this HI suggests at least the potential for detrimental effects from the combination of the two chemicals.

In 2011, the aggregate theoretical cancer risk (excluding carbonyls) for all Air Toxics sites exceeded  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ , with risks ranging from  $3 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $6 \times 10^{-5}$ . Both the hazard indices (HIs) calculated without the acrolein data and calculated with the acrolein data are shown. The HIs ranged from 0.1 to 0.4 without the acrolein data, and the HIs ranged from 18 to 66 with the acrolein data.

Location	Cancer Risk	Hazard Index without Acrolein	Hazard Index with Acrolein
Dawsonville	$3 \times 10^{-5}$	0.1	28
General Coffee	$3 \times 10^{-5}$	0.2	66
Macon	$4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.2	21
Savannah	$6 \times 10^{-5}$	0.4	43
South DeKalb	$3 \times 10^{-5}$	0.1	26
Yorkville	$3 \times 10^{-5}$	0.1	18

**Table 30: Aggregate Cancer Risk and Hazard Indices for Each Site, Excluding Carbonyls, 2011**

The information from Table 30 is summarized in Figure 86, below, and also shows the previous four years of hazard indices and cancer risk for comparison. With the GC/MS analysis used for the acrolein compound, the hazard indices significantly increased starting with the 2007 data. Before this method change, the highest hazard index generally seen with the Air Toxics data was 0.5. In 2007, the lowest hazard index was 20, at the Savannah site, and the highest was 39, at the Dawsonville site. In 2008 and 2009, the hazard indices were lower overall, with values ranging from 12 at the Macon site to 34 at the South DeKalb site. Then in 2010, there was a dramatic increase at all the sites, and the highest hazard index was 213 at the Savannah site. Subsequently, in 2011, the hazard indices decreased drastically, with the lowest value of 18 at the Yorkville site, and the highest value of 66 at the General Coffee site.



**Figure 86: Aggregate Cancer Risk and Hazard Index by Site for 2007-2011**

A few of the compounds collected from the PAMS network were evaluated in conjunction with the Air Toxics data. The PAMS network is a federally mandated network required to monitor for ozone precursors in those areas classified as serious, severe, or extreme for ozone nonattainment. Fifty-six



(56) chemicals are monitored on six-day intervals at these sites. In Georgia, the PAMS sites are located in Conyers, South DeKalb, and Yorkville. Of the 56 chemicals monitored at these sites, many are ozone precursors, and have not had a screening value developed for determining the toxicity of those compounds. Therefore, for this study, only twelve chemicals were assessed for their potential to have detrimental effects on human health if present in ambient air. Those twelve chemicals were benzene, cyclohexane, ethyl benzene, p-ethyltoluene, n-hexane, 1,2,3-trimethylbenzene, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, styrene, toluene, m/p-xylenes, and o-xylene.

Of those twelve chemicals evaluated from the PAMS network, only benzene was found in concentrations above the screening values in 2011. Table 31, below, shows the number of samples collected, first and second highest sample concentrations (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Max), averages (means) in micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), hazard quotients (HQ) and cancer risk (CR) for chemicals evaluated in the quantitative assessment at each of the three PAMS sites for 2011. Benzene was detected consistently and when evaluated as a potential carcinogen, produced theoretical cancer risks as great as  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  and hazard quotient of 0.09 at the Conyers site. The lowest theoretical cancer risk was at the Yorkville site with  $9 \times 10^{-6}$  and hazard quotient of 0.04.

Location	Chemical	Detection Frequency	1 <sup>st</sup> Max ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Mean ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	HQ	CR
Conyers	Benzene	48/58	9.26	6.39	2.78	0.09	$2 \times 10^{-5}$
South DeKalb	Benzene	53/57	4.79	3.19	1.44	0.05	$1 \times 10^{-5}$
Yorkville	Benzene	37/54	3.51	3.51	1.21	0.04	$9 \times 10^{-6}$

**Table 31: Summary Data for Select VOCs at PAMS Sites, 2011**

With the exclusion of acrolein, the carbonyls (acetaldehyde, acetone, benzaldehyde, butyraldehyde, formaldehyde, and propionaldehyde) were measured at only two of the ATN sites (Savannah and Dawsonville) and one PAMS/NATTS site (South DeKalb) in 2011. For that reason, their results are displayed separately from the rest of the data. Detection frequency, average (mean) concentration in micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), cancer risk, and non-cancer HQs for the carbonyls are shown in Table 32. This table also shows the sum of the cancer risk and hazard quotients, which are the aggregate cancer risk and hazard index (HI), per site. Of the six carbonyls sampled, acetaldehyde and formaldehyde were detected above the screening value in 2011. All the sites monitoring for acetaldehyde and formaldehyde detected these compounds with a relatively high detection frequency. Formaldehyde was detected 90% to 100% of the time, with Dawsonville having the lowest detection frequency, and the Savannah site having the highest detection frequency. Acetaldehyde was detected 33% to 88% of the time, with the Dawsonville site having the lowest detection rate and the South DeKalb site having the highest. Acetaldehyde had relatively low theoretical cancer risks, ranging from  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $9 \times 10^{-6}$ , and relatively low hazard quotients, ranging from 0.1 to 0.5. Formaldehyde had theoretical cancer risks, ranging from  $4 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ , and hazard quotients, ranging from 0.3 to 2.

Location	Chemical	Detection Frequency	Mean ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	Cancer Risk	Hazard Quotient
Dawsonville	Acetaldehyde	10/30	1.17	$3 \times 10^{-6}$	0.1
	Formaldehyde	27/30	2.84	$4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.3
	SUM			$4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.4
Savannah	Acetaldehyde	23/29	4.20	$9 \times 10^{-6}$	0.5
	Formaldehyde	29/29	9.14	$1 \times 10^{-4}$	0.9
	SUM			$1 \times 10^{-4}$	1
South DeKalb	Acetaldehyde	52/59	2.39	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.3
	Formaldehyde	58/59	14.84	$2 \times 10^{-4}$	2
	SUM			$2 \times 10^{-4}$	2

**Table 32: Summary Observations, Cancer Risk, and Hazard Quotient for Carbonyls, 2011**

---

## SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In 2011, there were 71 air toxics compounds monitored at the 6 sites across the state, with the exception of the South DeKalb site that monitored 76 air toxic compounds. Of these compounds monitored, 30 were not detected and 13 compounds were detected at two sites or less. 50% of the compounds detected above the screening value were in the metals category, 38% were in the volatile organic compounds category, and 12% were in the semi-volatile organic compounds category. For the 2011 data, there was an average of 6 compounds per site that were above the screening value.

In 2011, three volatile organic compounds, benzene, carbon tetrachloride, and vinyl chloride, were evaluated in the quantitative assessment. (Acrolein is discussed along with the carbonyls, as it was previously detected with the carbonyls). Benzene was found above the screening value at five Air Toxics sites. Average benzene concentrations at the Air Toxics sites ranged from 0.4 to 0.9  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . These concentrations correspond to the predicted theoretical lifetime cancer risk in the range of  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $7 \times 10^{-6}$ . All three PAMS sites detected benzene above the screening value. Average concentrations of benzene measured in the PAMS network ranged from 1.2 to 2.8  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . These concentrations correspond to predicted theoretical lifetime cancer risks in the range of  $9 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  for the PAMS sites. Major sources of benzene to the environment include automobile service stations, exhaust from motor vehicles, and industrial emissions (ATSDR, 1997a). Most data relating effects of long-term exposure to benzene are from studies of workers employed in industries that make or use benzene, where people were exposed to amounts hundreds or thousands of times greater than those reported herein. Under these circumstances of high exposure, benzene can cause problems in the blood, including anemia, excessive bleeding, and harm to the immune system. Exposure to large amounts of benzene for long periods of time may also cause cancer of the blood-forming organs, or leukemia (ATSDR, 1997a). The potential for these types of health effects from exposure to low levels of benzene, as reported in this study, are not well understood. Benzene has been determined to be a known carcinogen (U.S. EPA, 2000) and was evaluated as such in this study.

Another volatile organic compound found above the screening value was carbon tetrachloride ( $\text{CCl}_4$ ). It was detected above the screening value at four sites (Dawsonville, General Coffee, Savannah, and Yorkville) and with a low detection frequency, approximately up to 7%. Lifetime theoretical cancer risk calculated from the mean concentrations of carbon tetrachloride was  $5 \times 10^{-6}$  with a non-cancer hazard quotient of 0.008 for each site. Carbon tetrachloride was used to produce refrigeration fluids, as propellants for aerosol cans, as a pesticide, in fire extinguishers, as a spot cleaner, and as a degreasing agent (ATSDR, 2005a). Because of concerns regarding carbon tetrachloride's toxicity, these uses have been stopped or severely restricted. When exposures to carbon tetrachloride are relatively large, it can damage the liver, kidneys, and nervous system. U.S. EPA has classified carbon tetrachloride as a probable human carcinogen (U.S. EPA, 1991a).

Vinyl chloride is also a volatile organic compound that was detected above the screening level in 2011. It was detected at the Savannah site in one out of 30 samples, or a detection frequency of 3%. Vinyl chloride is used to make polyvinyl chloride, or PVC, which is used to make plastic products, pipes, coatings for wires and cables, and packaging materials (ATSDR, 2006c). Breathing high levels of vinyl chloride for short periods of time can cause dizziness, sleepiness, unconsciousness, and at extremely high levels can cause death. Long term exposure to vinyl chloride can result in permanent liver damage, immune reactions, nerve damage, and liver cancer (ATSDR, 2006c). The lifetime theoretical cancer risk calculated from the mean concentration of vinyl chloride at the Savannah site was  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  with a non-cancer hazard quotient of 0.003.

In 2011, naphthalene was the only compound in the semi-volatile organic group found above the screening value. It was detected at the Macon and South DeKalb sites with every sample taken, or 100% detection frequency. The theoretical lifetime cancer risk for the Macon site was  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ , with a non-cancer hazard quotient of 0.01. The South DeKalb site's theoretical lifetime cancer risk was  $3 \times$

$10^{-6}$ , with a non-cancer hazard quotient of 0.03. Naphthalene is found in moth repellents, petroleum, coal, and is used in making polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastics. Exposure to large amounts can cause hemolytic anemia (ATSDR, 2005e).

Four metals, manganese, arsenic, chromium, and nickel, were evaluated in the quantitative assessment. Manganese was detected above the screening value for two of the six Air Toxics sites. Manganese is a trace element, and small amounts are needed to support good health. However, exposure to very large amounts through inhalation can result in neurological effects (ATSDR, 2000a). Manganese was evaluated as a neurotoxin, but did not contribute significantly in the quantitative assessment with a HQ of 0.1 at the Macon site and 0.2 at the Savannah site. These HQs suggest that there is little potential for neurological effects from ambient air concentrations of manganese.

Arsenic was found above the screening value at all six Air Toxics sites. Arsenic occurs naturally in soil and rocks, and was used extensively in the past as a pesticide on cotton fields and in orchards (ATSDR, 2005b). However, the majority of arsenic found in the atmosphere comes from the burning of coal and oil, incineration, and smelting operations. Arsenic has been recognized as a human poison since ancient times. Inhalation of large quantities of some forms of arsenic may cause irritation of the throat and upper respiratory tract. Long-term exposure either by inhalation or ingestion may result in a unique pattern of skin changes, and circulatory and peripheral nervous disorders (ATSDR, 2005b). Inhalation of some forms of arsenic may also cause cancer, so arsenic was evaluated as a carcinogen in this assessment. The detection frequency was relatively high, with the lowest, 55%, at the Yorkville and highest at the Savannah site, 92%. Theoretical lifetime cancer risks estimated from the data collected in 2011 ranged from  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $5 \times 10^{-6}$ , and the HQs ranged from 0.03 to 0.08.

In 2011, total chromium was detected at all six Air Toxics sites. Total chromium had a high detection frequency, with 100% detections at all six sites. The theoretical cancer risk ranged from  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $4 \times 10^{-5}$ . The site with the highest theoretical cancer risk was the Savannah site, with  $4 \times 10^{-5}$ . Chromium is a naturally occurring element and is common in low amounts in foodstuffs (ATSDR, 2000b). Natural processes such as wind generating dust and even volcanoes may release chromium into the atmosphere. However, many human activities such as coal and oil combustion, electroplating, smelting, and iron and steel production also release it into the atmosphere.

The chemistry of chromium is complex. It may occur in different forms or oxidation states in the environment, having very different degrees of toxicity. Chromium+3 is the form that often predominates in the natural environment, and is also an essential element required for good nutrition. Hexavalent chromium (chromium+6) is the most toxic form of chromium and is often related to releases from industrial activities (ATSDR, 2000b). Inhaling large amounts of chromium+6 may cause upper respiratory track irritation, and chromium+6 has also been shown to be a carcinogen, causing increases in the risk of lung cancer (ATSDR, 2000b).

Studies have shown that in ambient air, even near industrial sites, chromium+6 is usually only a small portion of total chromium, with measured concentrations for chromium+6 accounting for a range of values from 1 to 25% of total chromium (ATSDR, 2000b). As part of the NATTS network, sampling for chromium+6 takes place at the South DeKalb site. When the 2011 concentration of chromium+6 is compared to the total chromium concentration, it shows that the chromium+6 is 0.6% of the total chromium accounted for at the South DeKalb site. However the concentrations of chromium+6 detected were below the screening value and were not evaluated further as a potential cancer risk. The South DeKalb site is located within and representative of an urban area. Since the chromium+6 concentrations were below the screening value for the South DeKalb site, this could indicate that chromium+6 levels are low throughout the network. The other sites that measure for chromium, measure for the total form. Therefore, the measurements used in this study were for the total form, and distinctions cannot be made as to how much of the different states of chromium are present at the other Air Toxics sites. In the interest of conservativeness, chromium was evaluated with the most stringent toxicity index, as chromium+6, even though the chromium metal measured was not in this

most toxic form. Data collected on the ratio of chromium+6 to total chromium (ATSDR, 2000b) indicates that this process may appreciably overestimate risk. Further work is needed to better understand chemical forms of chromium in Georgia's air, and determine if chromium is an important contributor to risk.

In 2011, nickel was detected above the screening value at four of the six Air Toxics sites, with hazard quotients ranging from 0.02 to 0.06. When detected, nickel had a high detection frequency, occurring 96% to 100% of the collected samples. Nickel is a naturally occurring element used in many consumer and industrial products such as stainless steel, alloys, and coins, and is also released in the burning of oil and coal. If large amounts are breathed, nickel can cause damage to the lungs and nasal cavities, and can be carcinogenic (ATSDR, 2005d).

Carbonyls were monitored at three sites in Georgia in 2011. Two sites, Dawsonville and Savannah are ATN sites, while the other site, South DeKalb, is in the PAMS/NATTS network. Three carbonyls, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, and acrolein, were detected above the screening level and included in the quantitative assessment.

Formaldehyde, the simplest of the aldehydes, is produced by natural processes, and from the fertilizer, paper, and manufactured wood products industries (ATSDR, 1999). It is also found in vehicle emissions. Formaldehyde is a health concern because of its respiratory irritancy and as a possible carcinogen. It may cause irritation of the eye, nose, throat, and skin, and has the potential under certain exposure scenarios to cause cancers of the nose and throat (ATSDR, 1999). Acetaldehyde, like formaldehyde, is also a concern as an upper respiratory irritant, and because of its potential to cause nasal tumors in animal studies. However, research has shown it to be significantly less potent than formaldehyde. Acetaldehyde, as an intermediate product of plant respiration and a product of incomplete combustion, is ubiquitous in the environment. (U.S. EPA, 1987; U.S. EPA 1991b). Recent studies of acetaldehyde background levels have found average background concentrations at  $0.16 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in remote areas of North America (McCarthy, Hafner, & Montzka, 2006).


In 2011, formaldehyde and acetaldehyde were detected at all three locations where carbonyls were assessed. The highest average concentration of formaldehyde was found at the South DeKalb site,  $14.84 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , and the highest concentration of acetaldehyde was found at the Savannah site,  $4.20 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . As shown above,  $0.16 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  of the acetaldehyde average concentration could be attributed to the background concentration. When the theoretical cancer risk for formaldehyde was evaluated, the risk ranged from  $4 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-4}$  for 2011. The hazard quotients ranged from 0.3 to 2. When acetaldehyde was evaluated for theoretical cancer risk, the risk ranged from  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $9 \times 10^{-6}$ . The hazard quotients ranged from 0.1 to 0.5.

In 2007, GA EPD began collecting acrolein with the other VOCs in a canister and analyzed it using a GC/MS method. This method was started in July of 2007, drastically changing the number of detections that were found across the state. In previous years, acrolein was analyzed along with the carbonyls, at select sites. With the GC/MS and canister method, this allowed acrolein to be sampled at all of the air toxics sites. In 2011, it was detected at all the sites, with the detection frequency ranging from 38% to 97% of samples. Acrolein was evaluated as a potential non-carcinogen, and the hazard quotients ranged from 18 to 66, shown in Figure 86, above. The average concentrations ranged from  $0.36 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $1.33 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (using half the detection limit for non-detected samples). The highest acrolein average was found at the Savannah site, which could be attributed to local industries, airports, and hospitals. Acrolein may enter the environment as a result of combustion of trees and other plants, tobacco, gasoline, and oil. Additionally, it can be used as a pesticide for algae, weeds, bacteria, and mollusks (ATSDR, 2007c). The potential for acrolein to cause health effects is not well understood. At very low concentrations, it is an upper respiratory irritant. At very high concentrations it may produce more serious damage to the lining of the upper respiratory tract and lungs (ATSDR, 2007c; U.S. EPA, 2003).




Of the PAMS compounds assessed, benzene was the only compound detected above the screening value, and it was found at all three sites (Conyers, South DeKalb and Yorkville) in 2011. When evaluated as a theoretical cancer risk, benzene's levels ranged from  $9 \times 10^{-6}$  at Yorkville to  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  at Conyers. The hazard quotients ranged from 0.04 at the Yorkville site to 0.09 at the Conyers site. As stated earlier, major sources of benzene to the environment include automobile service stations, exhaust from motor vehicles, and industrial emissions (ATSDR, 1997a).

In Figure 87 and Figure 88, below, maps are shown of the most recent official National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) that was based on 2005 air toxics emissions inventory. The estimated total cancer risk levels and estimated total respiratory hazard index are given per tract across the United States. The maps indicate that the estimated tract level total cancer risk and estimated tract level total respiratory hazard index, respectively, are higher in more populated areas and along transportation corridors.



([http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata2005/05pdf/sum\\_results.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata2005/05pdf/sum_results.pdf))

**Figure 87: Estimated Tract-Level Cancer Risk from the 2005 National Air Toxics Assessment**



([http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata2005/05pdf/sum\\_results.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata2005/05pdf/sum_results.pdf))

**Figure 88: Estimated Tract-Level Total Respiratory Hazard Index from the 2005 National Air Toxics Assessment**

As stated previously, the estimates of risk presented herein are likely overestimates due to conservative assumptions used in this exercise. Conservative assumptions were used to estimate the potential for possible exposures (high inhalation rates and long term exposure) and toxicity values. In the absence of good exposure information, this practice is warranted to decrease the potential for underestimating risk.

The results presented herein suggest that the majority of calculated risk is due to a small number of chemicals. The risk values presented in this report should not be interpreted as indicators of true or “real” risk, but for relative comparisons of a chemical’s contribution to aggregate risk, or for comparisons of risk between locations within the monitoring network or in other areas of the country.



## OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

Maintaining effective public outreach and education is important to the Ambient Monitoring Program's mission. The Ambient Monitoring Program (AMP) seeks to address the air quality issues that are most vital to the citizens of Georgia by identifying the pollutants that represent the greatest risks, continually monitoring the pollutants, and then communicating the monitoring results directly to the public. The goal is to provide an understanding of the presence of air pollution throughout the state, and to educate the public on the steps they can take to improve air quality and protect health. AMP accomplishes this goal by issuing smog alerts and providing information about the Air Quality Index (AQI), maintaining a partnership with the Clean Air Campaign, and conducting other outreach strategies aimed at keeping the public up to date on air quality issues.

### What is the Clean Air Campaign®?

The Clean Air Campaign® (CAC) is a not-for-profit organization that works to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the metro Atlanta nonattainment area through a variety of voluntary programs and services, including free employer assistance, incentive programs, public information and children's education.



The Clean Air Campaign and its partners offer assistance to more than 1,600 employers to design and implement commute options programs that make business sense; protect public health; offer targeted incentives to commuters and employers; and work with elementary, middle and high schools to protect children from harmful pollution and empower children to take a positive role in reducing traffic and cleaning the air.

In addition to addressing commuters' driving habits, CAC utilizes the AQI to relay air quality information to metro Atlanta residents by providing Smog Alert notifications.

### The Air Quality Index



The Air Quality Index (AQI) is a national air standard rating system developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The AQI is used state wide to provide the public, on a daily basis, with an analysis of air pollution levels and possible related health risks. Generally, an index scale of 0 to 500 is used to assess the quality of air, and these numbers are synchronized with a corresponding descriptor word such as: Good, Moderate, Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups, Unhealthy and

Very Unhealthy. To protect public health the EPA has set an AQI value of 100 to correspond to the NAAQS for the following pollutants: Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Particulate Matter 10 (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). For Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), the AQI is set up for the range of 15.5 to 40.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to be equivalent to the 51 to 100 AQI value. The AQI for a reporting region equates to the highest rating recorded for any pollutant within that region. Therefore, the larger the AQI value, the greater level of air pollution present, and the greater expectation of potential health concerns. However, this system only addresses air pollution in terms of acute health effects over time periods of 24 hours or less and does not provide an indication of chronic pollution exposure over months or years. Figure 89, on the next page, shows how the recorded concentrations correspond to the AQI values, descriptors and health advisories.

Maximum Pollutant Concentration							AQI Value	Descriptor	EPA Health Advisory
PM <sub>2.5</sub> (24hr) µg/m <sup>3</sup>	PM <sub>10</sub> (24hr) µg/m <sup>3</sup>	SO <sub>2</sub> (1hr)* ppm	O <sub>3</sub> (8hr)^ ppm	O <sub>3</sub> (1hr) ppm	CO (8hr) ppm	NO <sub>2</sub> (1hr) ppm			
0.0 – 15.4	0 – 54	0 – 0.035	0.000– 0.059	None	0.0 – 4.4	0 – 0.053	0 to 50	<b>Good (green)</b>	Air quality is considered satisfactory, and air pollution poses little or no risk.
15.5 – 40.4	55 – 154	0.036 – 0.075	0.060 – 0.075	None	4.5 – 9.4	0.054– 0.100	51 to 100	<b>Moderate (yellow)</b>	Air quality is acceptable; however, for some pollutants there may be a moderate health concern for a very small number of people. For example, people who are unusually sensitive to the condition of the air may experience respiratory symptoms.
40.5 – 65.4	155 – 254	0.076 – 0.185	0.076 – 0.095	0.125 – 0.164	9.5 – 12.4	0.101– 0.360	101 to 150	<b>Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (orange)</b>	Members of sensitive groups (people with lung or heart disease) are at greater risk from exposure to particle pollution. Those with lung disease are at risk from exposure to ozone. The general public is not likely to be affected in this range.
65.5 – 150.4	255 – 354	0.186 – 0.304*	0.096 – 0.115	0.165 – 0.204	12.5 – 15.4	0.361– 0.64	151 to 200	<b>Unhealthy (red)</b>	Everyone may begin to experience health effects in this range. Members of sensitive groups may experience more serious health effects.
150.5 – 250.4	355 – 424	0.305 – 0.604*	0.116 – 0.374	0.205 – 0.404	15.5 – 30.4	0.65 – 1.24	201 to 300	<b>Very Unhealthy (purple)</b>	AQI values in this range trigger a health alert. Everyone may experience more serious health effects. When the AQI is in this range because of ozone, most people should restrict their outdoor exertion to morning or late evening hours to avoid high ozone exposures.
250.5 – 350.4	425 – 504	0.605 – 0.804*	None^	0.405 – 0.504	30.5 – 40.4	1.25 – 1.64	301 to 400	<b>Hazardous (maroon)</b>	AQI values over 300 trigger health warnings of emergency conditions. The entire population is more likely to be affected.
350.5 – 500.4	505 – 604	0.805 – 1.004*	None^	0.505 – 0.604	40.5 – 50.4	1.65 – 2.04	401 to 500		

\*AQI values of 200 or greater are calculated with 24-hr SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.

^AQI values of 301 or greater are calculated with 1-hr O<sub>3</sub> concentrations.

**Figure 89: The AQI**

Each day the AQI values for Athens, Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, Macon, North Georgia Mountains, and Savannah are available to the public through GA EPD's website <http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp/>. The following table shows a summary of the 2011 AQI values for


these sites, as well as all sites that collect criteria data in Georgia. The majority of days had an AQI value in the 'Good' (0-50) category for all the sites.

Air Quality Index Summary by MSA							
Number of Days							
AQI Category	Good (0-50)	Moderate (51-100)	Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (101-150)**	Unhealthy (151-200)**	Very Unhealthy (201-300)**	Hazardous (>300)**	Pollutants Monitored in 2010
<b>Albany MSA</b>							
2011	221	138	2	0	0	0	PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Athens-Clark County MSA</b>							
2011	260	101	4	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta MSA</b>							
2011	185	136	44	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , CO, NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC MSA</b>							
2011	245	114	4	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Brunswick MSA</b>							
2011	345	17	0	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Chattanooga, TN-GA MSA</b>							
2011	214	140	5	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Columbus GA-AL MSA</b>							
2011	256	107	2	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Dalton MSA</b>							
2011	188	52	3	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub>
<b>Gainesville MSA</b>							
2011	240	111	0	0	0	0	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Macon MSA</b>							
2011	215	143	6	0	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Rome MSA</b>							
2011	242	116	6	1	0	0	SO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Savannah MSA</b>							
2011	221	134	8	2	0	0	O <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Valdosta MSA</b>							
2011	182	150	7	0	0	0	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Warner Robins MSA</b>							
2011	236	127	0	0	0	0	PM <sub>2.5</sub>

\*\*AQI numbers above 100 may not be equivalent to a violation of the standard.

**Table 33: AQI Summary Data, 2011**

In the following graph, the number of days that the AQI value was above 100 is plotted for each metropolitan statistical area (MSA) in Georgia where an AQI value is produced. The data was produced starting in 1972 and is shown through 2011. To be consistent, the most current standards were applied throughout the historical dataset. As one would expect, the Atlanta-Sandy-Springs-Marietta MSA (shown in red) has historically had the highest number of days with the AQI above 100. The pattern across the timeframe seems to be cyclic over the past forty years. However, the number of days above 100 for the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta MSA decreased dramatically from 2006 to 2009. The number dropped from 63 days in 2006 to 15 days in 2009. In the past two years, there has been an uptick in the trend. The Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta MSA's number of days with AQI above 100 increased from 25 days in 2010 to 44 days in 2011. The remaining sites had ten or fewer days with the AQI above 100 in 2011. The Brunswick, Gainesville, and Warner Robins MSAs did not have any days with the AQI above 100 in 2011.



**Figure 90: Number of Days with an AQI Value Above 100**

## How does Georgia's Ambient Monitoring Program (AMP) Cooperate with The Clean Air Campaign® (CAC)?

The Ambient Monitoring Program is responsible for measuring air pollutant levels in metro Atlanta and throughout the state. Equipment at fourteen continuous monitoring stations across metro Atlanta is used for these measurements of particulate matter (PM), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). This data is reported hourly on a website which is maintained and updated by the Ambient Monitoring Program. Based on these levels, AMP calculates the Air Quality Index (AQI), which represents overall air quality in a way that is quick and easy for the general public to understand. The Ambient Monitoring Program's website is linked to a website maintained by CAC. The AQI is then displayed on The Clean Air Campaign's website. The CAC also distributes AQI information to people who have signed up to receive daily air quality forecasts via e-mail. When a smog alert is forecasted, an automated fax blast informs all local media as well. Through these connections, thousands of metro Atlanta citizens and businesses keep abreast of current air quality conditions. The Ambient Monitoring Program also encourages the public to access the CAC's website and learn about voluntary measures that are available locally to improve air quality.



The Ambient Monitoring Program's website is linked to a website maintained by CAC. The AQI is then displayed on The Clean Air Campaign's website. The CAC also distributes AQI information to people who have signed up to receive daily air quality forecasts via e-mail. When a smog alert is forecasted, an automated fax blast informs all local media as well. Through these connections, thousands of metro Atlanta citizens and businesses keep abreast of current air quality conditions. The Ambient Monitoring Program also encourages the public to access the CAC's website and learn about voluntary measures that are available locally to improve air quality.

## MEDIA OUTREACH

The Ambient Monitoring Program continuously contacts citizens as well as the news media through phone calls, website updates and media interviews. At many times throughout the year, the demand for

a story puts AMP in the spotlight. The Program Manager and staff of the Ambient Monitoring Program make themselves available to television and newspaper reporters, thus educating the public about the AQI, the statewide air monitors, and the Clean Air Campaign.

## OTHER OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES

### Meteorologists

Forecasters from the Ambient Monitoring Program issue air quality forecasts on a daily basis. In addition, forecasters answer questions for the news media and calls from the public. For more information regarding the work done by the Ambient Monitoring Program's meteorologists, refer to the Meteorological Section of this report.

### Elementary and Middle Schools

Educating school children and incorporating air quality information into the classroom-learning environment is also an outreach strategy for the Ambient Monitoring Program. AMP staff visit Georgia classrooms to discuss air quality, forecasting, and monitoring. Each program presented by the AMP is designed to supplement grade-specific curricula. Learning opportunities include meteorological lessons and forecasting techniques, among other relevant topics.

In many situations, these lessons involve hands-on activities and mini-field trips to the monitoring sites. High School students simulate forecasting conditions and use scientific methods to create their own forecasts. AMP staff also participate in Career Days at both elementary and high schools to promote environmental and meteorological careers.

### Colleges and Universities

The Ambient Monitoring Program works with colleges and universities in several capacities. Utilizing a more technical, advanced approach, AMP has participated in several college-level seminars, providing scientific expertise on the subject of meteorology and forecasting. Through this close



contact with university staff, AMP staff have co-authored scientific papers in peer-reviewed scientific journals. AMP staff provide technical data to professors as well as students, thus incorporating real-time data into college courses and projects. Additionally, AMP works with Georgia Institute of Technology in a joint forecasting effort.

AMP also hosts an annual Air Quality Seminar and Air Monitoring Station fieldtrip for college interns in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Environmental Health Summer Intern Program, thereby reaching top college students from all over the country.

### Monitoring Data Requests

AMP also regularly receives requests for specific, detailed monitoring data from members of the research community and the broader public. Completely fulfilling the needs of these data users often requires not just data, but also providing guidance on how the data can be interpreted and what the limitations of the data set may be. AMP welcomes these opportunities to serve the public and the research community, and to ensure that the data collected is put to its fullest and most advantageous use in protecting the health and welfare of Georgia's citizens and the state's natural environment.

### EPA AIRNOW Website

Georgia supplies ozone and particulate matter data to the U.S. EPA every hour for pollution mapping activities. AIRNOW is a cooperative effort between EPA, states, and local air pollution control agencies to provide near real-time information on ground level ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations. EPA uses the data to produce maps that display ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> contours covering the Midwest, New England, Mid-Atlantic, Southeastern, South central and Pacific coastal regions of the country. Color-coded, animated concentration gradient AQI maps are created that show daily ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> formation and transport at various spatial scales. The information is available on the EPA's AIRNOW website at: <http://www.airnow.gov/>. See Figure 91 for a sample map.




Figure 91: Sample AIRNOW Ozone Concentration Map

The AIRNOW Data Management Center (DMC) regularly evaluates the performance of monitoring agencies that participate in the AIRNOW project based on three criteria:

1. Percent of hourly data files received
2. Average arrival time (earlier in the hour is better)
3. Percent completeness of the data within the submission files

There is a three-tier system set up to evaluate each agency based on these performance criteria. An agency is placed in a tier based on how it performs these three criteria, with respect to all participating agencies. The three tiers are top, middle, and lower. Georgia's evaluation results are shown in Table 34.

Evaluation Criteria	Ozone Season (May 1-September 30, 2011)	PM2.5 Season (whole year)
Percent of Data Files Received	Middle Tier (94%)	Middle Tier (95%)
Average Data Arrival Time (minutes)	Top Tier (13 minutes)	Top Tier (14 minutes)
Percent Completeness of Files	Lower Tier (93%)	Lower Tier (94%)

**Table 34: AIRNOW Participation Evaluation Results**

#### **GA EPD Website and Call-In System**

The Ambient Monitoring Program also provides a public-access website with Georgia-specific current and historical air quality data, often more promptly and with more detail than what is available at the AIRNOW website. AMP's website provides hourly information about current pollutant concentrations from Georgia's continuous and semi-continuous monitoring equipment, and is updated with each hour's data only 15 minutes after the hour ends. The site also offers downloads of bulk data, and electronic copies of archived Annual Reports such as this one, on a self-serve basis to facilitate research projects and satisfy public interest on these topics. Finally, the Ambient Monitoring Program also maintains an automated dial-in system that provides current air quality information for those who may not have ready access to the internet. These resources are listed below.

Ambient Monitoring Program Website:

<http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp>

Call-In System:

(800) 427-9605 (statewide)

(404) 362-4909 (metro Atlanta free calling zone)

## Appendix A: Additional Criteria Pollutant Data

### Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Units: parts per million

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 1 - Hour		Obs. $\geq 35$	Max 8 - Hour		Obs. $\geq 9$
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
130890002	Atlanta	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8528	1.665	1.649	0	1.5	1.5	0
131210099	Atlanta	Fulton	Roswell Road	8530	1.9	1.8	0	1.3	1.3	0
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	8524	0.634	0.634	0	0.6	0.5	0

### Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)

Units: parts per billion

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 1-Hour		Annual Arithmetic Mean
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8539	68.0	60.9	13.43
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	8396	30.0	23.3	2.80
132470001	Conyers	Rockdale	Monastery	8525	35.5	31.0	4.00

### Nitric Oxide (NO)

Units: parts per billion

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 1-Hour		Annual Arithmetic Mean
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8539	377.7	362.1	20.31
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	8396	16.0	8.5	1.03
132470001	Conyers	Rockdale	Monastery	8525	55.6	51.6	1.51

## Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>)

Units: parts per billion

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 1-Hour		Annual Arithmetic Mean
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8539	404.0	398.2	33.05
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	8396	36.0	32.0	3.06
132470001	Conyers	Rockdale	Monastery	8525	81.0	69.9	4.82

## Reactive Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>y</sub>)

Units: parts per billion

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 1-Hour		Annual Arithmetic Mean
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8012	200.0	200.0	31.99

\*\* The NO<sub>y</sub> instrument is specialized for measurement of trace concentrations, so its range is only 0-200 ppb. Actual 1<sup>st</sup> Max appears to have exceeded the instrument's measurement range. Since all ambient concentrations exceeding the instrument's range are recorded as 200 instead of the actual (higher) value, the reported annual arithmetic mean may be biased slightly downward from the true concentration.

**Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)****24-Hour, 3-Hour, 1-Hour Maximum Observations and 99<sup>th</sup> Percentile 1-hour**

Units: parts per billion

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Hours Measured	Max 24 - Hour		Obs. ≥ 140	Max 3 -Hour		Obs. ≥ 500	Max 1-Hour		99 <sup>th</sup> Pctl 1- Hr	Annual Arithmetic Mean
					1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		
130210012	Macon	Bibb	Georgia Forestry Comm.	8376	5.7	4.7	0	15.9	15.0	0	25.2	24.0	20.7	1.27
130510021	Savannah	Chatham	East President St.	8314	20.4	17.5	0	63.7	57.6	0	93.0	71.6	62.2	2.59
130511002	Savannah	Chatham	W. Lathrop & Augusta Ave.	8228	20.2	18.1	0	62.1	50.5	0	94.8	94.2	71.5	2.61
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8606	4.3	3.9	0	13.2	12.7	0	18.6	18.0	17.0	0.90
131150003	Rome	Floyd	Coosa Elem. School	8514	24.1	21.8	0	114.5	68.9	0	161.8	153.1	96.0	1.84
131210055	Atlanta	Fulton	Confederate Ave.	8621	6.2	5.6	0	17.6	16.0	0	29.4	25.9	25.0	1.70
131270006	Brunswick	Glynn	Risley Middle School	8499	2.4	2.3	0	6.6	5.3	0	10.0	9.0	8.0	1.09
132150008	Columbus	Muscogee	Columbus Airport	8477	3.4	3.4	0	10.3	8.8	0	16.0	12.0	10.1	1.20



**Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)****1-Hour Averages**

Units: parts per million

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Days Measured	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
130210012	Macon	Bibb	GA Forestry Comm.	237	0.106	0.099
130510021	Savannah	Chatham	E. President Street	243	0.091	0.076
130550001	Summerville	Chattooga	DNR Fish Hatchery	238	0.087	0.086
130590002	Athens	Clarke	College Station Rd.	245	0.090	0.086
130670003	Kennesaw	Cobb	Georgia National Guard	241	0.099	0.099
130730001	Evans	Columbia	Riverside Park	235	0.091	0.091
130770002	Newnan	Coweta	Univ. of West Georgia	242	0.086	0.085
130850001	Dawsonville	Dawson	GA Forestry Comm.	242	0.082	0.075
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	243	0.103	0.100
130970004	Douglasville	Douglas	W. Strickland St.	245	0.105	0.094
131210055	Atlanta	Fulton	Confederate Ave.	245	0.099	0.099
131270006	Brunswick	Glynn	Risley Middle School	239	0.077	0.076
131350002	Lawrenceville	Gwinnett	Gwinnett Tech.	243	0.106	0.105
131510002	McDonough	Henry	County Extension Office	242	0.103	0.102
132130003	Chatsworth	Murray	Fort Mountain	233	0.084	0.083
132150008	Columbus	Muscogee	Columbus Airport	239	0.087	0.085
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	243	0.112	0.097
132450091	Augusta	Richmond	Bungalow Road Elementary School	244	0.102	0.089
132470001	Conyers	Rockdale	Conyers Monastery	244	0.104	0.101
132611001	Leslie	Sumter	Leslie Community Center	232	0.081	0.075

**Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)****8-Hour Averages**

Units: parts per million

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Days Measured	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max	3 <sup>rd</sup> Max	4 <sup>th</sup> Max	Number of Days ≥ 0.075
130210012	Macon	Bibb	GA Forestry Comm.	236	0.086	0.084	0.080	0.078	<b>6</b>
130510021	Savannah	Chatham	E. President Street	241	0.068	0.065	0.065	0.065	0
130550001	Summerville	Chattooga	DNR Fish Hatchery	237	0.075	0.072	0.071	0.069	0
130590002	Athens	Clarke	College Station Road	245	0.078	0.078	0.077	0.075	3
130670003	Kennesaw	Cobb	Georgia National Guard	238	0.082	0.079	0.079	0.079	<b>11</b>
130730001	Evans	Columbia	Riverside Park	230	0.078	0.075	0.075	0.073	1
130770002	Newnan	Coweta	Univ. of West Georgia	242	0.075	0.075	0.073	0.072	0
130850001	Dawsonville	Dawson	GA Forestry Comm.	234	0.068	0.068	0.068	0.066	0
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	243	0.094	0.088	0.081	0.080	<b>9</b>
130970004	Douglasville	Douglas	W. Strickland St.	245	0.084	0.082	0.081	0.078	<b>6</b>
131210055	Atlanta	Fulton	Confederate Ave.	245	0.093	0.092	0.086	0.084	<b>15</b>
131270006	Brunswick	Glynn	Risley Middle School	238	0.068	0.067	0.063	0.062	0
131350002	Lawrenceville	Gwinnett	Gwinnett Tech.	242	0.088	0.085	0.082	0.082	<b>8</b>
131510002	McDonough	Henry	County Extension Office	241	0.088	0.084	0.082	0.082	<b>8</b>
132130003	Chatsworth	Murray	Fort Mountain	232	0.080	0.078	0.077	0.073	3
132150008	Columbus	Muscogee	Columbus Airport	238	0.071	0.069	0.069	0.068	0
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	242	0.087	0.082	0.076	0.075	3
132450091	Augusta	Richmond	Bungalow Road Elementary School	238	0.078	0.078	0.074	0.072	2
132470001	Conyers	Rockdale	Conyers Monastery	244	0.091	0.084	0.082	0.081	<b>15</b>
132611001	Leslie	Sumter	Community Center	228	0.070	0.066	0.066	0.066	0

4<sup>th</sup> max used in 3-year average, therefore if number above 0.075 is more than 4 per site, it is shown in bold.

**Lead (Pb)****3-Month Rolling Averages Using Federal Equivalent Method**

Units: micrograms per cubic meter

<b>Site ID</b>	130150003	130890003	132150011
<b>City</b>	Cartersville	Atlanta	Columbus
<b>County</b>	Bartow	DeKalb	Muscogee
<b>Site Name</b>	Cartersville	DMRC	Cusseta School
<b>Number of Observations</b>	60	60	58
<b>Nov 2010-Jan 2011</b>	0.0154	0.0031	0.0581
<b>Dec 2010-Feb 2011</b>	0.0141	0.0031	0.0708
<b>Jan 2011-Mar 2011</b>	0.0166	0.0026	0.0638
<b>Feb 2011-Apr 2011</b>	0.0135	0.0025	0.0264
<b>Mar 2011-May 2011</b>	0.0135	0.0024	0.0066
<b>Apr 2011-Jun 2011</b>	0.0132	0.0039	0.0091
<b>May 2011-Jul 2011</b>	0.0143	0.0038	0.0077
<b>Jun 2011-Aug 2011</b>	0.0143	0.0038	0.0075
<b>Jul 2011-Sep 2011</b>	0.0129	0.0027	0.0048
<b>Aug 2011-Oct 2011</b>	0.0186	0.0027	0.0074
<b>Sep 2011-Nov 2011</b>	0.0162	0.0027	0.0077
<b>Oct 2011-Dec 2011</b>	0.0158	0.0025	0.0075
<b>Number of Values <math>\geq 0.15</math></b>	0	0	0

**Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

**98<sup>th</sup>% and Annual Arithmetic Mean  
Integrated Sampling (midnight to midnight) Using Federal Reference Method**

**Units: micrograms per cubic meter**

<b>Site ID</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Days Measured</b>	<b>98th Percentile</b>	<b>Values Exceeding Applicable Daily Standard</b>	<b>Annual Arithmetic Mean</b>
130210007	Macon	Bibb	Allied Chemical	314	29.7	0	14.16
130210012	Macon	Bibb	GA Forestry Comm.	104	23.9	0	10.99
130510017	Savannah	Chatham	Market St.	96	42.8	4	11.58
130510091	Savannah	Chatham	Mercer School	94	44.6	5	12.16
130590002	Athens	Clarke	College Station Rd.	101	23.5	0	10.66
130630091	Forest Park	Clayton	Georgia DOT	102	25.5	0	12.70
130670003	Kennesaw	Cobb	GA National Guard	311	24.5	0	11.54
130670004	Powder Springs	Cobb	Macland Aquatic Center	105	24.0	0	11.34
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	301	23.2	0	11.85
130892001	Doraville	DeKalb	Police Dept.	313	24.5	0	11.61
130950007	Albany	Dougherty	Turner Elem. School	312	28.8	1	12.09
131150003	Rome	Floyd	Coosa Elementary	297	25.8	1	12.47
131210032	Atlanta	Fulton	E. Rivers School	316	22.9	0	11.67
131210039	Atlanta	Fulton	Fire Station #8	98	26.8	0	13.08
131270006	Brunswick	Glynn	Risley Middle School	74	26.9	1	8.93

**Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (continued)**

**98<sup>th</sup>% and Annual Arithmetic Mean  
Integrated Sampling (midnight to midnight) Using Federal Reference Method**

Units: micrograms per cubic meter

Site ID	City	County	Site Name	Days Measured	98th Percentile	Values Exceeding Applicable Daily Standard	Annual Arithmetic Mean
131350002	Lawrenceville	Gwinnett	Gwinnett Tech	99	25.9	0	11.03
131390003	Gainesville	Hall	Fair St. Elem.	105	24.8	0	10.66
131530001	Warner Robins	Houston	Robins AFB	102	22.9	0	11.44
131850003	Valdosta	Lowndes	S.L. Mason Elem.	95	32.5	1	10.48
132150001	Columbus	Muscogee	Health Dept.	103	24.2	0	11.83
132150008	Columbus	Muscogee	Columbus Airport	52	27.3	0	11.40
132150011	Columbus	Muscogee	Cusseta Rd. School	104	26.2	1	11.88
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	104	22.4	0	10.70
132450005	Augusta	Richmond	Medical College	100	27.0	1	11.88
132450091	Augusta	Richmond	Bungalow Rd. School	99	27.6	0	11.71
132950002	Rossville	Walker	Health Dept.	98	24.5	0	10.77
133030001	Sandersville	Washington	Health Dept.	101	27.2	1	11.32
133190001	Gordon	Wilkinson	Police Dept.	101	24.7	1	12.92



**Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)****Hourly Averages of Semi-Continuous Measurements****Units: micrograms per cubic meter**

<b>Site ID</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Hours Measured</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>	<b>Annual Arithmetic Mean</b>
130210012	Macon	Bibb	GA Forestry Comm.	8457	95.8	84.8	11.07
130511002	Savannah	Chatham	Lathrop & Augusta Avenues	8526	463.8	384.7	12.07
130590002	Athens	Clarke	College Station Rd.	8565	72.7	57.6	10.77
130770002	Newnan	Coweta	Univ. of West Georgia	8489	75.3	62.8	10.69
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	7856	53.0	50.0	12.49
130950007	Albany	Dougherty	Turner Elem	7944	200.0	156.0	15.11
131150003	Rome	Floyd	Coosa Elem	8469	216.7	202.1	11.39
131210055	Atlanta	Fulton	Confederate Avenue	8594	73.8	66.8	11.94
131350002	Lawrenceville	Gwinnett	Gwinnett Tech	8567	116.7	111.5	12.70
131390003	Gainesville	Hall	Gainesville	8292	255.0	251.0	12.95
131510002	McDonough	Henry	County Extension Office	8576	123.6	103.7	11.58
131530001	Warner Robins	Houston	Warner Robins	8641	91.0	88.0	13.49
131850003	Valdosta	Lowndes	Valdosta	8078	218.0	197.5	16.68
132150008	Columbus	Muscogee	Columbus Airport	8566	85.9	73.6	11.57
132230003	Yorkville	Paulding	Yorkville	8355	73.7	73.3	12.64
132450091	Augusta	Richmond	Bungalow Rd. School	8500	153.3	133.4	11.76
132950002	Rossville	Walker	Health Department	8482	118.0	74.2	13.77

Except for the South DeKalb monitor, these semi-continuous methods for measuring PM<sub>2.5</sub> are not approved for use in making attainment determinations.

**Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>)****24-Hour Integrated Measurements****Units: micrograms per cubic meter**

<b>Site ID</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Days Measured</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>Number Values ≥150</b>	<b>Annual Arithmetic Mean</b>
130210007	Macon	Bibb	Allied Chemical	59	55	0	20.7
130510014	Savannah	Chatham	Shuman School	56	65	0	17.8
130550001	Summerville	Chattooga	DNR Fish Hatchery	58	32	0	14.6
130892001	Doraville	DeKalb	Police Dept.	61	40	0	16.9
130950007	Albany	Dougherty	Turner Elementary	61	38	0	18.3
131150003	Rome	Floyd	Coosa Elem School	56	40	0	18.6
131210032	Atlanta	Fulton	E. Rivers School	60	42	0	16.6
131270004	Brunswick	Glynn	Arco Pump Station	49	54	0	19.4
132150011	Columbus	Muscogee	Cusseta Rd. Elem. School	60	43	0	17.7
132450091	Augusta	Richmond	Bungalow Rd. Elem. School	58	46	0	16.6
133030001	Sandersville	Washington	Health Dept.	55	47	0	18.7

**Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>)****Hourly Averages of Semi-Continuous Measurements****Units: micrograms per cubic meter**


<b>Site ID</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Hours Measured</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>Annual Arithmetic Mean</b>
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	8050	46	20.5
131210048	Atlanta	Fulton	Georgia Tech	7596	49	20.5

**Coarse Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10-2.5</sub>)****Hourly Averages of Semi-Continuous Measurements****Units: micrograms per cubic meter**


<b>Site ID</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Hours Measured</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>Annual Arithmetic Mean</b>
130890002	Decatur	DeKalb	South DeKalb	7907	104.0	9.31

## Appendix B: Additional PM<sub>2.5</sub> Particle Speciation Data


Particle Speciation- 2011 Statewide Average





Particle Speciation - Macon 2011




Particle Speciation - Athens 2011






**Particle Speciation - Douglas 2011****Particle Speciation- Atlanta 2011**


Particle Speciation - Rome 2011




Particle Speciation - Columbus 2011



Particle Speciation - Augusta 2011



Particle Speciation - Rossville 2011



## Appendix C: Additional PAMS Data

<b>PAMS Continuous Hydrocarbon Data (June-August 2011)</b> (concentrations in parts per billion Carbon (ppbC))					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>PAMSHC</i>	S. DeKalb	1979	59.39	376.7	281.0
	Conyers	1926	32.81	148.9	144.7
	Yorkville	1580	27.13	152.5	138.6
<i>TNMOC</i>	S. DeKalb	1979	74.46	428.4	346.6
	Conyers	1926	41.30	289.5	167.9
	Yorkville	1580	45.39	274.3	183.4
<i>Ethane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	4.029	14.23	14.08
	Conyers	548	3.334	9.31	9.21
	Yorkville	1580	3.227	31.80	24.83
<i>Ethylene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	1.714	9.12	9.09
	Conyers	551	0.768	4.62	3.56
	Yorkville	1579	0.327	4.83	4.81
<i>Propane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	4.437	40.69	36.48
	Conyers	1883	2.904	18.29	17.17
	Yorkville	1579	2.558	12.46	11.56
<i>Propylene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	1.020	4.34	4.31
	Conyers	1883	0.489	3.34	2.34
	Yorkville	1579	0.481	12.15	3.75
<i>Acetylene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.70	7.1	6.0
	Conyers	1147	0.22	4.9	2.0
	Yorkville	1579	0.24	2.3	2.1
<i>n-Butane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	2.293	21.86	16.88
	Conyers	1883	0.890	3.36	3.25
	Yorkville	1579	0.789	3.36	3.32
<i>Isobutane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	1.167	8.16	8.14
	Conyers	1883	0.411	3.71	3.08
	Yorkville	1579	0.360	5.53	5.13
<i>trans-2-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.053	2.95	2.62
	Conyers	1883	0.007	0.57	0.53
	Yorkville	1579	0.113	10.42	7.76
<i>cis-2-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	N/A			
	Conyers	1883	0.069	1.69	1.65
	Yorkville	1579	0.091	0.93	0.91
<i>n-Pentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	5.936	53.24	31.93
	Conyers	1883	1.214	11.23	9.38
	Yorkville	1579	0.655	3.68	3.18
<i>Isopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	4.714	75.03	68.89
	Conyers	1883	1.724	11.54	11.17
	Yorkville	1579	1.020	7.42	5.02
<i>1-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.034	1.23	1.07
	Conyers	1883	0.007	0.92	0.53
	Yorkville	1579	0.006	0.40	0.31

<b>PAMS Continuous Hydrocarbon Data (June-August 2011)(continued)</b>					
(concentrations in ppbC)					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>trans-2-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.053	2.81	2.16
	Conyers	1883	0.008	0.89	0.69
	Yorkville	1579	0.012	2.59	2.21
<i>cis-2-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.020	1.30	1.06
	Conyers	1883	0.006	0.57	0.39
	Yorkville	1579	0.006	0.64	0.27
<i>3-Methylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.627	10.68	6.39
	Conyers	1883	0.194	1.62	1.53
	Yorkville	1579	0.106	13.13	1.39
<i>n-Hexane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	1.006	18.14	8.48
	Conyers	1831	0.289	2.77	2.48
	Yorkville	1573	0.402	18.91	13.25
<i>n-Heptane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.503	5.80	3.14
	Conyers	1831	0.183	1.96	1.68
	Yorkville	1573	0.035	2.70	1.63
<i>n-Octane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.220	3.63	2.54
	Conyers	1831	0.033	0.72	0.59
	Yorkville	1573	0.473	11.66	11.62
<i>n-Nonane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.161	2.01	1.87
	Conyers	1831	0.040	0.82	0.76
	Yorkville	1573	0.060	2.85	2.34
<i>n-Decane</i>	S. DeKalb	1975	0.196	3.07	2.66
	Conyers	1831	0.048	1.05	1.00
	Yorkville	1573	0.412	6.84	5.09
<i>Cyclopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.188	11.14	3.63
	Conyers	1883	0.056	4.13	3.58
	Yorkville	1579	0.026	1.52	1.28
<i>Isoprene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	8.364	49.27	47.82
	Conyers	1883	9.691	68.30	61.53
	Yorkville	1580	9.033	80.58	77.90
<i>2,2-Dimethylbutane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.035	1.60	0.87
	Conyers	1883	0.020	1.80	1.23
	Yorkville	1579	0.009	1.81	0.75
<i>2,4-Dimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.180	2.59	1.59
	Conyers	1831	0.016	0.63	0.45
	Yorkville	1573	0.017	5.33	3.18
<i>Cyclohexane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.179	2.71	1.36
	Conyers	1831	0.038	0.94	0.89
	Yorkville	1573	0.029	5.37	2.21
<i>3-Methylhexane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.688	7.24	4.49
	Conyers	1831	0.177	1.74	1.29
	Yorkville	1573	0.032	1.06	0.86
<i>2,2,4-Trimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	1.536	9.88	8.98
	Conyers	1831	0.627	5.04	3.72
	Yorkville	1573	0.227	5.64	2.02

<b>PAMS Continuous Hydrocarbon Data (June-August 2011)(continued)</b>					
(concentrations in ppbC)					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>2,3,4-Trimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.385	3.38	2.71
	Conyers	1831	0.095	1.00	0.89
	Yorkville	1573	0.042	7.21	7.00
<i>3-Methylheptane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.172	2.71	1.65
	Conyers	1830	0.020	0.60	0.55
	Yorkville	1573	0.133	4.47	4.10
<i>Methylcyclohexane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.308	3.41	2.52
	Conyers	1831	0.080	1.16	0.98
	Yorkville	1573	0.016	0.83	0.80
<i>Methylcyclopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.520	6.63	4.02
	Conyers	1831	0.062	0.81	0.79
	Yorkville	1573	0.016	5.81	0.90
<i>2-Methylhexane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.441	4.83	3.08
	Conyers	1831	0.024	0.76	0.65
	Yorkville	1573	0.009	1.04	0.84
<i>1-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.215	2.52	1.75
	Conyers	1883	0.055	1.24	0.66
	Yorkville	1579	0.038	0.87	0.73
<i>2,3-Dimethylbutane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.154	3.83	2.03
	Conyers	1883	0.042	0.66	0.61
	Yorkville	1579	0.010	0.78	0.56
<i>2-Methylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1956	0.734	14.90	6.63
	Conyers	1883	0.359	2.21	2.14
	Yorkville	1579	0.159	0.91	0.88
<i>2,3-Dimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.256	2.96	1.98
	Conyers	1831	0.011	0.86	0.83
	Yorkville	1573	0.011	1.54	1.54
<i>n-Undecane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.410	3.74	3.49
	Conyers	1831	0.089	1.56	1.35
	Yorkville	1573	0.548	8.23	7.66
<i>2-Methylheptane</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.105	2.18	1.21
	Conyers	1830	0.019	0.64	0.63
	Yorkville	1573	0.085	7.87	3.19
<i>m &amp; p Xylenes</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	1.551	15.58	11.06
	Conyers	1831	0.545	5.10	4.32
	Yorkville	1573	0.272	12.66	2.09
<i>Benzene</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.932	6.34	5.19
	Conyers	1831	0.404	2.13	2.00
	Yorkville	1573	0.276	7.05	6.03
<i>Toluene</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	3.843	30.98	25.04
	Conyers	1831	1.792	9.95	9.17
	Yorkville	1573	0.751	7.61	7.33
<i>Ethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.500	4.58	3.90
	Conyers	1831	0.159	1.54	1.53
	Yorkville	1573	0.096	4.05	1.91



<b>PAMS Continuous Hydrocarbon Data (June-August 2011)(continued)</b>					
(concentrations in ppbC)					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>o</i> -Xylene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.606	4.77	3.93
	Conyers	1831	0.182	1.76	1.55
	Yorkville	1573	0.052	1.08	1.00
<i>1,3,5</i> -Trimethylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.250	2.11	1.85
	Conyers	1831	0.112	2.53	2.35
	Yorkville	1573	0.049	2.41	1.95
<i>1,2,4</i> -Trimethylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1975	0.746	5.22	4.87
	Conyers	1831	0.413	1.72	1.72
	Yorkville	1573	0.226	2.45	2.07
<i>n</i> -Propylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.106	1.53	1.52
	Conyers	1831	0.068	0.77	0.77
	Yorkville	1573	0.311	7.00	6.24
<i>Isopropylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	1976	0.018	0.80	0.50
	Conyers	1831	0.013	0.74	0.58
	Yorkville	1571	0.145	2.42	2.12
<i>o</i> -Ethyltoluene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.170	1.80	1.43
	Conyers	1831	0.034	0.51	0.49
	Yorkville	1573	0.083	1.79	1.32
<i>m</i> -Ethyltoluene	S. DeKalb	N/A			
	Conyers	N/A			
	Yorkville	N/A			
<i>m</i> -Diethylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.079	2.96	1.84
	Conyers	1831	0.016	0.49	0.40
	Yorkville	1573	0.031	2.84	2.76
<i>p</i> -Diethylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.174	1.49	1.28
	Conyers	1831	0.012	0.51	0.37
	Yorkville	1573	0.041	3.06	2.68
Styrene	S. DeKalb	1976	0.198	2.65	2.15
	Conyers	1831	0.115	1.50	1.35
	Yorkville	1573	0.294	6.49	3.28
<i>Beta Pinene and 1,2,3</i> -Trimethylbenzene	S. DeKalb	1976	3.852	31.31	25.13
	Conyers	1832	4.946	36.32	33.51
	Yorkville	1574	1.234	7.18	6.90
<i>Pinene and p</i> -Ethyltoluene	S. DeKalb	N/A			
	Conyers	N/A			
	Yorkville	N/A			
<i>m and p</i> -Ethyltoluene	S. DeKalb	23	2.640	8.00	7.83
	Conyers	N/A			
	Yorkville	1573	0.732	4.88	4.25
<i>m/p</i> -Ethyltoluene	S. DeKalb	1953	3.130	18.50	17.54
	Conyers	1831	4.027	33.48	30.79
	Yorkville	N/A			

N/A indicates not applicable

<b>PAMS 2011 24-hour Canister Hydrocarbons</b> (concentrations in parts per billion Carbon (ppbC))						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects^</b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>PAMSHC</i>	S. DeKalb	57	57	50.54	130.0	110.0
	Conyers	58	58	33.73	70.0	65.0
	Yorkville	54	54	22.19	40.0	37.0
<i>TNMOC</i>	S. DeKalb	57	57	136.75	260.0	230.0
	Conyers	58	57	99.07	190.0	180.0
	Yorkville	54	54	73.22	240.0	120.0
<i>Ethane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	56	5.83	13.0	11.0
	Conyers	58	56	5.06	12.0	10.0
	Yorkville	54	54	5.06	11.0	11.0
<i>Ethylene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	ND			
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>Propane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	57	5.86	18.0	12.0
	Conyers	58	58	4.57	13.0	10.0
	Yorkville	54	52	4.35	9.8	9.4
<i>Propylene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	53	0.93	3.9	2.1
	Conyers	58	49	0.43	1.5	1.1
	Yorkville	54	23	0.18	0.4	0.4
<i>Acetylene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	54	1.71	7.0	4.3
	Conyers	58	54	0.87	3.2	2.1
	Yorkville	54	52	0.72	1.6	1.5
<i>n-Butane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	55	4.14	17.0	11.0
	Conyers	58	54	2.01	6.3	5.4
	Yorkville	54	52	1.65	4.5	4.3
<i>Isobutane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	49	1.38	5.4	4.0
	Conyers	58	46	0.71	2.1	2.1
	Yorkville	54	42	0.56	1.7	1.7
<i>trans-2-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	4	0.11	0.3	0.3
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>cis-2-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	2	0.11	0.3	0.3
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>n-Pentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	57	2.55	7.2	6.8
	Conyers	58	57	1.88	27.0	3.3
	Yorkville	54	52	0.74	1.6	1.3
<i>Isopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	57	4.27	12.0	12.0
	Conyers	58	58	1.86	3.7	3.5
	Yorkville	54	54	1.09	1.9	1.8
<i>1-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	12	0.26	4.7	2.8
	Conyers	58	1	0.10	0.3	
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>trans-2-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	36	1.31	15.0	12.0
	Conyers	58	33	2.45	19.0	16.0
	Yorkville	54	25	0.93	10.0	3.8

<b>PAMS 2011 24-hour Canister Hydrocarbons (continued)</b> (concentrations in ppbC)						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>cis-2-Pentene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	7	0.42	3.8	3.4
	Conyers	58	6	0.47	4.6	3.7
	Yorkville	54	16	1.07	5.1	4.7
<i>3-Methylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	39	0.51	1.9	1.8
	Conyers	58	43	1.65	11.0	11.0
	Yorkville	54	14	0.37	7.8	5.0
<i>n-Hexane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	55	0.82	2.5	2.2
	Conyers	58	45	0.39	1.8	1.7
	Yorkville	54	34	0.30	1.2	1.1
<i>n-Heptane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	37	0.33	1.1	0.9
	Conyers	58	4	0.11	0.4	0.2
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>n-Octane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	25	0.21	1.1	0.6
	Conyers	58	1	0.10	0.3	
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>n-Nonane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	9	0.13	0.4	0.4
	Conyers	58	1	0.10	0.2	
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>n-Decane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	17	0.16	0.7	0.5
	Conyers	58	2	0.11	0.3	0.2
	Yorkville	54	1	0.10	0.2	
<i>Cyclopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	10	0.15	1.2	0.3
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>Isoprene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	37	3.91	24.0	14.0
	Conyers	58	38	4.55	20.0	20.0
	Yorkville	54	32	2.48	17.0	13.0
<i>2,2-Dimethylbutane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	47	0.47	1.1	1.1
	Conyers	58	16	0.14	0.4	0.4
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>2,4-Dimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	22	0.23	1.2	0.9
	Conyers	58	4	0.11	0.3	0.3
	Yorkville	54	2	0.11	0.3	0.2
<i>Cyclohexane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	15	0.15	0.5	0.4
	Conyers	58	1	0.10	0.2	
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>3-Methylhexane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	38	0.41	1.5	1.2
	Conyers	58	7	0.12	0.5	0.3
	Yorkville	54	2	0.11	0.5	0.2
<i>2,2,4-Trimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	51	1.15	3.4	3.3
	Conyers	58	34	0.32	1.0	1.0
	Yorkville	54	11	0.14	0.4	0.4
<i>2,3,4-Trimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	31	0.31	0.8	0.8
	Conyers	58	3	0.11	0.3	0.3
	Yorkville	54	ND			

<b>PAMS 2011 24-hour Canister Hydrocarbons (continued)</b> (concentrations in ppbC)						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>3-Methylheptane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	3	0.13	1.2	0.4
	Conyers	58	3	0.11	0.2	0.2
	Yorkville	54	1	0.11	0.4	
<i>Methylcyclohexane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	19	0.18	0.6	0.5
	Conyers	58	1	0.10	0.3	
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>Methylcyclopentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	33	0.35	1.4	1.1
	Conyers	58	11	0.12	0.4	0.2
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>2-Methylhexane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	27	0.30	1.3	0.9
	Conyers	58	3	0.11	0.4	0.2
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>1-Butene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	31	0.27	1.0	0.7
	Conyers	58	3	0.11	0.4	0.2
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>2,3-Dimethylbutane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	31	0.48	1.9	1.9
	Conyers	58	16	0.50	2.9	2.6
	Yorkville	54	4	0.20	2.2	1.8
<i>2-Methylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	51	0.91	3.2	2.7
	Conyers	58	45	0.39	1.4	1.0
	Yorkville	54	28	0.25	2.3	0.4
<i>2,3-Dimethylpentane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	31	0.27	1.0	0.9
	Conyers	58	8	0.13	0.8	0.3
	Yorkville	54	1	0.10	0.2	
<i>n-Undecane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	23	0.32	7.1	1.0
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	3	0.11	0.3	0.2
<i>2-Methylheptane</i>	S. DeKalb	57	10	0.14	0.9	0.4
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	2	0.11	0.3	0.2
<i>m &amp; p Xylenes</i>	S. DeKalb	57	55	1.39	4.4	3.7
	Conyers	58	51	0.49	1.5	1.2
	Yorkville	54	26	0.20	0.6	0.6
<i>Benzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	53	0.87	2.9	2.0
	Conyers	58	48	0.45	1.5	1.0
	Yorkville	54	37	0.38	1.1	1.1
<i>Toluene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	56	3.13	8.3	8.2
	Conyers	58	55	1.21	2.7	2.6
	Yorkville	54	50	0.62	1.2	1.2
<i>Ethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	40	0.40	1.1	1.0
	Conyers	58	9	0.13	0.5	0.3
	Yorkville	54	2	0.10	0.2	0.2
<i>o-Xylene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	43	0.49	1.5	1.3
	Conyers	58	31	0.23	1.0	0.8
	Yorkville	54	3	0.11	0.6	0.2

<b>PAMS 2011 24-hour Canister Hydrocarbons (continued)</b> (concentrations in ppbC)						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	16	0.15	0.5	0.4
	Conyers	58	2	0.11	0.6	0.3
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	43	0.71	4.8	4.3
	Conyers	58	22	0.43	6.7	4.0
	Yorkville	54	6	0.49	7.9	7.2
<i>n-Propylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	5	0.11	0.2	0.2
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>Isopropylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	ND			
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>o-Ethyltoluene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	27	0.25	0.9	0.7
	Conyers	58	23	0.22	0.7	0.6
	Yorkville	54	7	0.14	0.8	0.4
<i>m-Ethyltoluene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	38	0.39	1.2	1.1
	Conyers	58	20	0.16	0.4	0.4
	Yorkville	54	1	0.10	0.2	
<i>p-Ethyltoluene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	37	0.36	1.2	1.0
	Conyers	58	42	0.47	1.7	1.4
	Yorkville	54	4	0.12	0.5	0.3
<i>m-Diethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	7	0.12	0.3	0.3
	Conyers	58	ND			
	Yorkville	54	ND			
<i>p-Diethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	17	0.17	0.6	0.4
	Conyers	58	5	0.12	0.4	0.4
	Yorkville	54	7	0.12	0.3	0.3
<i>Styrene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	51	0.67	4.5	1.3
	Conyers	58	46	0.61	2.0	1.5
	Yorkville	54	43	0.58	3.5	1.8
<i>1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene</i>	S. DeKalb	57	29	0.25	0.8	0.7
	Conyers	58	12	0.15	0.6	0.5
	Yorkville	54	ND			

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

\*When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.

## Appendix D: Additional Toxics Data

<b>2011 Metals</b> (concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ))						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Antimony</i>	Macon	24	24	0.00125	0.01033	0.00234
	Savannah	26	26	0.00072	0.00301	0.00197
	General Coffee	27	27	0.00082	0.00983	0.00188
	Dawsonville	29	27	0.00113	0.01612	0.00144
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.00115	0.00548	0.00408
	Yorkville	31	31	0.00068	0.00228	0.00138
<i>Arsenic</i>	Macon	24	17	0.00053	0.00097	0.00096
	Savannah	26	24	0.00122	0.00639	0.00535
	General Coffee	27	22	0.00097	0.00698	0.00207
	Dawsonville	29	22	0.00055	0.00105	0.00101
	South DeKalb**	57	47	0.00058	0.00200	0.00154
	Yorkville	31	17	0.00037	0.00063	0.00062
<i>Beryllium</i>	Macon	24	ND			
	Savannah	26	4	0.00006	0.00088	0.00004
	General Coffee	27	1	0.00003	0.00010	
	Dawsonville	29	2	0.00003	0.00017	0.00009
	South DeKalb**	57	2	0.00006	0.00141	0.00042
	Yorkville	31	1	0.00004	0.00034	
<i>Cadmium</i>	Macon	24	23	0.00011	0.00022	0.00020
	Savannah	26	25	0.00034	0.00128	0.00070
	General Coffee	27	24	0.00013	0.00067	0.00026
	Dawsonville	29	27	0.00010	0.00042	0.00020
	South DeKalb**	57	55	0.00009	0.00046	0.00046
	Yorkville	31	29	0.00008	0.00020	0.00019
<i>Chromium</i>	Macon	24	24	0.00209	0.00353	0.00344
	Savannah	26	26	0.00312	0.02078	0.00378
	General Coffee	27	27	0.00199	0.00309	0.00299
	Dawsonville	29	29	0.00179	0.00343	0.00338
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.00168	0.00289	0.00275
	Yorkville	31	31	0.00200	0.00351	0.00316
<i>Chromium+6***</i>	South DeKalb	61	47	0.00001	0.00004	0.00004
<i>Cobalt</i>	Macon	24	19	0.00008	0.00013	0.00013
	Savannah	26	25	0.00013	0.00085	0.00016
	General Coffee	27	23	0.00008	0.00013	0.00011
	Dawsonville	29	18	0.00007	0.00018	0.00012
	South DeKalb**	57	29	0.00006	0.00016	0.00011
	Yorkville	31	12	0.00006	0.00012	0.00011



<b>2011 Metals (continued)</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.*</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Lead</i>	Macon	24	24	0.00256	0.00836	0.00633
	Savannah	26	26	0.00330	0.02398	0.00457
	General Coffee	27	26	0.00185	0.00915	0.00477
	Dawsonville	29	29	0.00156	0.00328	0.00300
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.00144	0.00254	0.00249
	Yorkville	31	31	0.00183	0.00608	0.00397
<i>Manganese</i>	Macon	24	24	0.00565	0.01159	0.01129
	Savannah	26	26	0.00792	0.09059	0.01003
	General Coffee	27	26	0.00334	0.01123	0.00569
	Dawsonville	29	29	0.00353	0.00878	0.00833
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.00271	0.00825	0.00576
	Yorkville	31	31	0.00237	0.00534	0.00397
<i>Nickel</i>	Macon	24	24	0.00216	0.00405	0.00380
	Savannah	26	26	0.00580	0.05045	0.01806
	General Coffee	27	26	0.00460	0.05025	0.00905
	Dawsonville	29	29	0.00384	0.04318	0.01261
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.00183	0.01111	0.00940
	Yorkville	31	31	0.00191	0.00801	0.00543
<i>Selenium</i>	Macon	24	23	0.00051	0.00145	0.00098
	Savannah	26	25	0.00082	0.00432	0.00336
	General Coffee	27	25	0.00041	0.00073	0.00065
	Dawsonville	29	26	0.00048	0.00116	0.00083
	South DeKalb**	57	54	0.00049	0.00531	0.00199
	Yorkville	31	26	0.00038	0.00181	0.00109
<i>Zinc</i>	Macon	24	24	0.02309	0.05847	0.03984
	Savannah	26	26	0.03701	0.23446	0.09265
	General Coffee	27	26	0.03062	0.13009	0.07078
	Dawsonville	29	29	0.01450	0.04414	0.03763
	South DeKalb**	57	57	0.01746	0.06409	0.06076
	Yorkville	31	31	0.01626	0.04852	0.04817

\*When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.

\*\* Selected PM<sub>10</sub> Hi-Vol, sample collected every 6 days

\*\*\* Hexavalent Chromium, sample collected every 6 days

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

<b>2011 Semi-Volatile Compounds</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
Name	Site	#Samples	#Detects^	Avg.**	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
<i>Acenaphthene</i>	Macon	21	18	0.00381	0.01674	0.01165
	Savannah	21	19	0.00223	0.00681	0.00605
	General Coffee	24	14	0.00249	0.01541	0.01012
	Dawsonville	27	6	0.00046	0.00385	0.00139
	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00242	0.01190	0.00670
	Yorkville	28	2	0.00021	0.00136	0.00067
<i>Acenaphthylene</i>	Macon	21	2	0.00022	0.00130	0.00040
	Savannah	21	1	0.00021	0.00147	
	General Coffee	24	1	0.00019	0.00102	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	28	0.00060	0.00596	0.00407
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Anthracene</i>	Macon	21	1	0.00016	0.00042	
	Savannah	21	15	0.00100	0.00341	0.00332
	General Coffee	24	ND			
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	30	0.00010	0.00057	0.00049
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Benzo(a)anthracene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	21	2	0.00020	0.00075	0.00049
	General Coffee	24	1	0.00017	0.00053	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	28	0.00006	0.00036	0.00027
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Benzo(b)fluoranthene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	1	0.00017	0.00059	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	39	0.00015	0.00090	0.00087
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	1	0.00017	0.00062	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	22	0.00005	0.00024	0.00023
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Benzo(a)pyrene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	1	0.00016	0.00043	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	22	0.00007	0.00045	0.00029
	Yorkville	28	ND			

<b>2011 Semi-Volatile Compounds (continued)</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.**</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Benzo(e)pyrene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	1	0.00016	0.00043	
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	34	0.00009	0.00045	0.00044
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Benzo(g,h,i)perylene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	ND			
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	22	0.00009	0.00047	0.00044
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Chrysene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	21	ND			
	General Coffee	24	2	0.00020	0.00088	0.00059
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	51	0.00012	0.00068	0.00063
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	ND			
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	2	0.00005	0.00012	0.00008
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Fluoranthene</i>	Macon	21	14	0.00142	0.00853	0.00413
	Savannah	21	17	0.00225	0.00725	0.00650
	General Coffee	24	2	0.00020	0.00085	0.00067
	Dawsonville	27	3	0.00019	0.00087	0.00041
	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00083	0.00213	0.00199
	Yorkville	28	5	0.00021	0.00066	0.00052
<i>Fluorene</i>	Macon	20	15	0.00383	0.01579	0.00921
	Savannah	20	18	0.00520	0.01455	0.01189
	General Coffee	23	11	0.00174	0.00705	0.00537
	Dawsonville	26	11	0.00136	0.00756	0.00527
	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00314	0.01210	0.00766
	Yorkville	28	12	0.00113	0.00388	0.00336
<i>Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene</i>	Macon	21	ND			
	Savannah	20	ND			
	General Coffee	23	ND			
	Dawsonville	27	ND			
	South DeKalb*	61	23	0.00036	0.00042	0.00041
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Naphthalene</i>	Macon	21	21	0.02930	0.07203	0.06581
	Savannah	19	17	0.01716	0.03498	0.03326
	General Coffee	23	22	0.01736	0.07549	0.03772
	Dawsonville	26	20	0.00981	0.02791	0.02529

<b>2011 Semi-Volatile Compounds (continued)</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.**</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Naphthalene (continued)</i>	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.09066	0.29400	0.25400
	Yorkville	26	26	0.01189	0.01901	0.01877
<i>Phenanthrene</i>	Macon	21	20	0.00728	0.03665	0.01968
	Savannah	21	18	0.00916	0.03023	0.02663
	General Coffee	24	20	0.00183	0.00613	0.00442
	Dawsonville	26	21	0.00905	0.18320	0.01149
	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00440	0.01510	0.01020
	Yorkville	28	27	0.00175	0.00505	0.00388
<i>Pyrene</i>	Macon	21	9	0.00044	0.00249	0.00113
	Savannah	20	14	0.00121	0.00341	0.00332
	General Coffee	23	2	0.00019	0.00071	0.00050
	Dawsonville	27	2	0.00017	0.00039	0.00035
	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00044	0.00100	0.00096
	Yorkville	28	ND			
<i>Retene</i>	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00044	0.01060	0.00125
<i>9-fluorenone</i>	South DeKalb*	61	61	0.00087	0.00253	0.00242
<i>Cyclopenta(cd)pyrene</i>	South DeKalb*	61	7	0.00007	0.00024	0.00014
<i>Coronene</i>	South DeKalb*	61	8	0.00007	0.00022	0.00022
<i>Perylene</i>	South DeKalb*	61	6	0.00004	0.00011	0.00007

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

\*Sample collected every 6 days and analyzed at ERG laboratory with gas chromatography.

\*\*When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.

<b>2011 Volatile Organic Compounds</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.**</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Freon 113</i>	Macon	31	1	0.9766	1.5329	
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	2	0.9663	1.3796	0.9964
	Yorkville	26	1	0.9713	1.3030	
<i>Freon 114</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,3-Butadiene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Cyclohexane</i>	Macon	31	1	0.4444	0.8609	
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Chloromethane</i>	Macon	31	31	1.1560	1.8589	1.5697
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	28	1.3403	1.9828	1.6524
	Dawsonville	30	30	1.2310	1.6937	1.5904
	South DeKalb*	56	56	1.1707	1.6730	1.5491
	Yorkville	26	26	1.2091	1.7763	1.4871
<i>Dichloromethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	23	8.8189	65.9755	62.5031
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Chloroform</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Carbon tetrachloride</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	1	0.7873	0.8178	
	General Coffee	28	2	0.7885	0.8178	0.8178
	Dawsonville	30	1	0.7894	0.8807	

2011 Volatile Organic Compounds (continued)						
(concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
Name	Site	#Samples	#Detects^	Avg.**	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
<i>Carbon tetrachloride (continued)</i>	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	1	0.7923	0.9436	
<i>Trichlorofluoromethane</i>	Macon	31	30	1.1067	1.6859	1.3487
	Savannah	30	28	1.1745	2.0231	1.4049
	General Coffee	28	27	1.1410	1.6297	1.5173
	Dawsonville	30	30	1.1052	1.4611	1.2925
	South DeKalb*	56	54	1.2714	1.9107	1.8545
	Yorkville	26	25	1.1445	1.6859	1.5735
<i>Chloroethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,1-Dichloroethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Methyl chloroform</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Ethylene dichloride</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Tetrachloroethylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			



2011 Volatile Organic Compounds (continued)						
(concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
Name	Site	#Samples	#Detects^	Avg.**	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
<i>Bromomethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,1,2-Trichloroethane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Dichlorodifluoromethane</i>	Macon	31	31	1.9444	3.3625	3.3130
	Savannah	30	24	1.8774	2.6207	2.5218
	General Coffee	28	28	2.0742	3.1152	2.5713
	Dawsonville	30	30	1.8543	2.4229	2.3735
	South DeKalb*	57	57	2.1618	3.1647	2.9174
	Yorkville	26	26	2.0844	3.2141	2.8185
<i>Trichloroethylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,1-Dichloroethylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,2-Dichloropropane</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>trans-1,3-Dichloropropylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>cis-1,3-Dichloropropylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			

<b>2011 Volatile Organic Compounds (continued)</b>						
(concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.**</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>cis-1,3-Dichloropropylene</i> (continued)	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>cis-1,2-Dichloroethene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Ethylene dibromide</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Hexachlorobutadiene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Vinyl chloride</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	1	0.3200	0.3323	0.3195
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>m/p Xylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	1	0.5519	1.0425	
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Benzene</i>	Macon	31	7	0.4616	0.9263	0.7347
	Savannah	30	19	0.9386	2.8748	2.6193
	General Coffee	28	4	0.4121	0.6389	0.4791
	Dawsonville	30	19	0.6096	1.2458	1.2458
	South DeKalb*	57	19	0.4719	1.5333	0.9902
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Toluene</i>	Macon	31	3	0.5456	2.2601	0.9417
	Savannah	30	18	1.7830	33.1485	1.5067
	General Coffee	28	1	0.5361	2.2978	
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	25	0.7084	3.1035	2.0341
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Ethylbenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			

<b>2011 Volatile Organic Compounds (continued)</b>						
(concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )						
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.**</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>Ethylbenzene</i> (continued)	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>o- Xylene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Styrene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Benzene, 1-ethenyl-4-methyl</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>Chlorobenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND	1.3517	2.3948	2.2106
	Savannah	30	23			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	56	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			
<i>1,2-Dichlorobenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND			
	Savannah	30	ND			
	General Coffee	28	ND			
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	South DeKalb*	57	ND			
	Yorkville	26	ND			

<b>2011 Volatile Organic Compounds (continued)</b> (concentrations in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>#Samples</b>	<b>#Detects<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>Avg.<sup>**</sup></b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Max    2<sup>nd</sup> Max</b>
<i>1,3-Dichlorobenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND		
	Savannah	30	ND		
	General Coffee	28	ND		
	Dawsonville	30	ND		
	South DeKalb*	57	ND		
	Yorkville	26	ND		
<i>1,4-Dichlorobenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND		
	Savannah	30	ND		
	General Coffee	28	ND		
	Dawsonville	30	ND		
	South DeKalb*	56	ND		
	Yorkville	26	ND		
<i>Benzyl chloride</i>	Macon	31	ND		
	Savannah	30	ND		
	General Coffee	28	ND		
	Dawsonville	30	ND		
	South DeKalb*	57	ND		
	Yorkville	26	ND		
<i>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</i>	Macon	31	ND		
	Savannah	30	ND		
	General Coffee	28	ND		
	Dawsonville	30	ND		
	South DeKalb*	57	ND		
	Yorkville	26	ND		

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

\*Sample collected every 6 days

\*\*When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.

2011 Carbonyl Compounds, 3-hour (June-August)							
(concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter)							
Name	Site	Time	#Samples	#Detects <sup>^</sup>	Avg.*	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
Formaldehyde	S. DeKalb	0600	29	29	15.4897	23.3889	21.9444
		0900	29	29	12.5356	16.9832	16.9273
		1200	31	31	14.7317	19.4413	18.8268
		1500	30	30	14.9637	19.2737	17.7222
Acetaldehyde	S. DeKalb	0600	29	23	1.6898	3.1056	2.9944
		0900	29	27	2.6552	6.2778	4.9056
		1200	31	31	3.2567	5.3944	5.0278
		1500	30	30	3.1043	4.8278	4.6611
Propionaldehyde	S. DeKalb	0600	29	ND			
		0900	29	ND			
		1200	31	ND			
		1500	30	ND			
Butyraldehyde	S. DeKalb	0600	29	ND			
		0900	29	ND			
		1200	31	ND			
		1500	30	ND			
Acetone	S. DeKalb	0600	29	29	6.9034	11.4444	10.6667
		0900	29	29	8.1570	13.8333	11.3889
		1200	31	31	9.1034	15.5556	14.2222
		1500	30	30	8.8295	13.2778	12.4444
Benzaldehyde	S. DeKalb	0600	29	ND			
		0900	29	ND			
		1200	31	ND			
		1500	30	ND			

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

\* When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.

<b>2011 Carbonyl Compounds, 24-hour</b> (concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter)						
Name	Site	#Samples	#Detects <sup>^</sup>	Avg. <sup>**</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup> Max	2 <sup>nd</sup> Max
<i>Formaldehyde</i>	Savannah	29	29	9.1351	38.3529	18.0000
	Dawsonville	30	27	2.8404	14.7647	7.8889
	S. DeKalb*	59	58	14.8373	52.1177	37.4118
<i>Acetaldehyde</i>	Savannah	29	23	4.2002	16.6875	9.1250
	Dawsonville	20	10	1.1744	3.8353	3.8177
	S. DeKalb*	59	52	2.3941	5.6824	5.2471
<i>Propionaldehyde</i>	Savannah	29	4	0.5925	0.8313	0.7813
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	S. DeKalb*	59	ND			
<i>Butyraldehyde</i>	Savannah	29	4	1.0000	4.9125	4.4938
	Dawsonville	30	1	0.5792	1.0778	
	S. DeKalb*	59	ND			
<i>Acetone</i>	Savannah	29	27	8.3430	16.6875	16.6875
	Dawsonville	30	25	3.0618	13.8889	5.1944
	S. DeKalb*	59	56	6.0095	14.6471	13.4706
<i>Benzaldehyde</i>	Savannah	29	7	0.8397	2.0313	1.9688
	Dawsonville	30	ND			
	S. DeKalb*	59	2	0.5887	1.3529	1.3471
<i>Acrolein</i> (with canister method)	Macon	31	19	0.5559	4.8184	1.1472
	Savannah	30	27	1.3289	8.9485	8.7190
	General Coffee	28	20	0.4187	0.9178	0.8031
	Dawsonville	30	29	0.8616	4.8184	4.5890
	South DeKalb*	57	44	0.5143	4.1301	1.6979
	Yorkville	26	10	0.3630	0.7801	0.7572

ND indicates no detection

<sup>^</sup>Detect is counted as any value above half method detection limit.

\* When a detected concentration is below one half of the method detection limit, then one half of the method detection level is used to calculate the average.



## Appendix E: Monitoring Network Survey

(40 CFR 58, Appendix D)

### Georgia Gaseous Criteria Pollutant Monitoring as of January 2011

Parameter Measured	Ozone	Nitrogen Dioxide	Carbon Monoxide	Sulfur Dioxide
Sampling Schedule	Continuous hourly average			
Number of GASN Sites	20	3	3	7
Method Used	Ultraviolet photometry	Ultraviolet photometry	Non-dispersive Infrared photometry	Ultraviolet fluorescence detector
EPA Reference Method	Ultraviolet photometry	Ultraviolet photometry	Non-dispersive Infrared photometry	Spectrophotometry (pararosaniline method)
Data Availability	U.S. EPA Air Quality System (AQS) ( <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/</a> ) and GA DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program ( <a href="http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp">http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp</a> )			

## Georgia Ambient Air Particulate Matter Monitoring as of January 2011

Parameter Measured	PM <sub>10</sub>		PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
	Mass (integrated)	Mass (semi-continuous)	Mass (integrated)	Mass (semi-continuous)	Speciated
Sampling Schedule	Every 6 days	Continuous hourly averages	Varies; daily, every day, every third day, or every sixth day	Continuous hourly averages	1 in 6 days; 1 in 3 days for South DeKalb
Collection Method	Mass sequential, single channel	BAM	FRM sampler	TEOM; BAM	Speciation air sampling system (SASS)
Sampling Media	Teflon filter – 46.2mm,	Proprietary filter; filter tape	Teflon filter – 46.2mm	Proprietary filter; filter tape	Teflon, nylon & quartz filter – 46.2mm
Number of Sites Analyzed	11	2	28	17	8
Number of Collocated Sites	2	0	5	1	0
Analysis Method	Method 016 Electronic analytical balance	Method 079; TEOM gravimetric at 50 degrees C; Method 122 Beta Attenuation Monitor	Method 055 Electronic analytical balance	Method 703 R&P TEOM with SCC at 30 degrees C; Beta Attenuation Monitor	Method 055 Electronic analytical balance Method 014 x-ray fluorescence Method 062 filter preparation Method 064 Ion chromatography Method 065 Thermal/optical carbon
Data Availability	U.S. EPA Air Quality System (AQS) ( <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/</a> ) and GA DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program ( <a href="http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp">http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp</a> )				

## Georgia Organic Air Toxic Contaminant Monitoring as of January 2011

Parameter Measured	Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	Carbonyls	Semi - VOCs	Metals
Method	TO-15	TO-11A	TO – 13A	10-2.I
Sampling Schedule	Every 12 days, 24-hour; 1 in 6 day schedule for South DeKalb	Every 12 days, 24-hour; 1 in 6 day schedule for South DeKalb	Every 12 days, 24-hour; 1 in 6 day schedule for South DeKalb	Every 12 days, 24-hour; 1 in 6 day schedule for South DeKalb*
Collection Equipment	AVOCS or ATEC2200	ATEC100 and or ATEC2200	PUF sampler	High volume TSP
Sampling Media	Polished stainless steel canister	DNPH-coated silica cartridges and Polished stainless steel canister	Polyurethane Foam filter	Quartz micro-fiber filter 8 x 10 inch
Number of Sites Analyzed	6**	3	6**	6**
Number of Collocated Sites	1	1	1	1
Data Availability	U.S. EPA Air Quality System (AQS) ( <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/</a> ) and GA DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program ( <a href="http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp">http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp</a> )			

\* Sampler at this site is a PM<sub>10</sub> Hi-Vol

\*\* 5 GA ATN sites, 1 NATTS (South DeKalb)

**PAMS Monitoring as of January 2011**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>56 PAMS-Speciated VOCs &amp; Total NMHC</b>	<b>Continuous 56-PAMS Speciated VOCs &amp; Total NMHC</b>	<b>Carbonyl Compounds</b>
Sampling Schedule	24-hour 1 in 6 day schedule (all year)	Continuous hourly average (June-August)	3-hour sample (June-August); 24-hour, 1 in 6 day (all year)
Collection Equipment	ATEC 2200	Perkin-Elmer HC GC	ATEC 8000; PUF Sampler
Sampling Media	Polished stainless steel canister	Direct injection	DNPH – coated silica gel Cartridge; Polyurethane Foam
Number of Sites	3	3	1
Analysis Method	PAMS GC/FID	GC/FID	High performance liquid chromatograph/ultraviolet detector
Data Availability	U.S. EPA Air Quality System (AQS) ( <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/</a> ) and GA DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program ( <a href="http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp">http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp</a> )		

## Georgia Meteorological Monitoring as of January 2011

Parameter Measured	Wind Speed (m/s)	Wind Direction (degrees)	Ambient Temperature (°C)	Relative Humidity (%)	Atmosphere Pressure (mb)	Solar Radiation (w/m <sup>2</sup> )	Precip (in)	Sig. Theta (deg)	Total Ultraviolet Radiation
Sampling Schedule	Continuous hourly average								
Number of Sites	17	17	8	8	6	3	6	1	3
Method Used	Propeller or cup anemometer	Wind vane potentiometer	Aspirated Thermocouple or thermistor	Thin film capacitor	Pressure transducer	Thermopile or pyranometer	Tipping bucket	Wind direction	UV radiometer
Data Availability	U.S. EPA Air Quality System (AQS) ( <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/airs/airsaqs/</a> ) and GA DNR/EPD Ambient Air Monitoring Program ( <a href="http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp">http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/amp</a> )								

## Appendix F: Siting Criteria

(40 CFR 58, Appendix E)

Instrument	Height Above Ground		Space Between Samplers	Height Above Obstructions	Distance From Obstacles	Distance From Tree Dripline	Distance from Walls, Parapets, etc.	Airflow Arc
	Micro	Other						
PM <sub>10</sub> , AISI Nephelometer	2-7m	2-15m	2m		2 times height or obstacle above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	2m	270
Dichot, TEOM, PM <sub>2.5</sub>	2-7m	2-15m	1m		2 times height or obstacles above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	2m	270
Lead, TSP	207m	2-15m	2m		2 times height of obstacles above inlet	Micro and middle: no trees between sampler and source Neighborhood: should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	2m	270
O <sub>3</sub>	3-15m	3-15m		1m	2 times height of obstacles above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	1m	270, or on side of building 180
CO	2.5–3.5m	3-5m	1m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet	Micro: must be no trees between sampler and road Others: must be 10m if trees, 5m above sampler	Micro: must be no trees between sampler and road Others: must be 10m if trees, 5m above sampler	1m	270, or on side of building 180
NO <sub>2</sub>	3-15m	3-15m		1m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet	Should be 20m, if individual tree 5m above probe, must be 10m from dripline	1m	270, or on side of building 180



Instrument	Height Above Ground		Space Between Samplers	Height Above Obstructions	Distance From Obstacles	Distance From Tree Dripline	Distance from Walls, Parapets, etc.	Airflow Arc
	Micro	Other						
SO <sub>2</sub>	3-15m	3-15m		1m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	1m	270, or on side of building 180
H <sub>2</sub> S	3-15m	3-15m		1m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m if considered an obstruction	1m	270, or on side of building 180
CH <sub>4</sub> , THC, NMHC, PAMS	3-15m	3-15m		1m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet	Should be 20m, must be 10m in direction of urban core	1m	270, or on side of building 180
Toxics: Gaseous 910, 910A, 929, 920	3-15m	3-15m		2m	2 times height of obstacle above inlet			
Temperature and Relative Humidity	1.25-2m	2.25-2m			4 times height of obstacle above sensor	1 tower width from tower side	4.5m	
Wind Speed and Direction	10m	10m			1.5 times height of obstacle above sensor	2 tower widths from tower side, 1 tower width from tower top		
Solar Radiation	1.5m	1.5m						

## Appendix G: Instrument and Sensor Control Limits

(from manuals)

CONTROL AND WARNING LIMITS		
LIMITS		INSTRUMENT
Control	Warning	
±15%	±10%	All gaseous criteria and non-criteria analyzers
±15%	±10%	Total suspended particulate (TSP) samplers
±10%	±7%	PM <sub>10</sub> Dichotomous (Dichot), Lead (Pb), Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance (TEOM), Toxic Air Contaminant (XonTech920) Samplers, Beta Attenuation Monitors (BAM), and Carbonyl (XonTech9250) Samplers
±4% (Flow)	None	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
±5% (Design)	None	
±20%	None	
		Laboratory audits (Toxics, PAMS, Motor Vehicle Exhaust and Total Metals)

ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR METEOROLOGICAL (MET) SENSORS	
LIMITS	SENSOR
±1.0° Celsius (±0.5°C PAMS only)	Ambient Temperature
±1mb~ _ 0.75mm Mercury (Hg)	Barometric Pressure
±5% RH for <10% or >90% RH	Relative Humidity
±5% Watts/m <sup>2</sup>	Solar Radiation and Total UV Radiation
Less than or equal to 5° combined accuracy and orientation error	Wind Direction
Between 0.5 and 5m/s and less 0.2m/s ±5% difference above 5 m/s	Horizontal Wind Speed
Less than or equal to 0.5m/s	Horizontal Wind Speed Starting Threshold
±0.25 m/s between 0.5 and 5 m/s and less than 5% difference above 5 m/s	Vertical Wind Speed
Less than or equal to 0.5 m/s	Vertical wind Speed Starting Threshold

---

## References

<http://www.airnow.gov/index.cfm?action=static.aqi>. "Air Quality Index (AQI) - A Guide to Air Quality and Your Health."

<http://www.airnowtech.org/2011pollingsummary.htm> AIRNOW Data Management Center. 2011 Data Polling Summary. Sonoma Technology, Petaluma, California.

<http://www.epa.gov/region4/waste/ots/> U.S. EPA Region 4: Superfund. Technical Services-Risk Assessment and Hydrology.

<http://www.epa.gov/air/emissions/> U.S. EPA. Air Emission Sources.

<http://www.epa.gov/cleanschoolbus/retrofit.htm> U.S. EPA. Clean School Bus U.S.A.

<http://www.georgiaair.org/retrofit/index.htm> Georgia Retrofit Program. Georgia Environmental Protection Division.

<http://www.gfc.state.ga.us/GFCNews/CFI.cfm> Georgia Forestry Commission.

ATSDR, 1992. Toxicological Profile for 1,3-Butadiene. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 1996. ToxFAQS for Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 1997a. Toxicological Profile for Benzene. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 1997b. ToxFAQs for Tetrachloroethylene (PERC). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 1999. Toxicological Profile for Formaldehyde. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2000a. Toxicological Profile for Manganese. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2000b. Toxicological Profile for Chromium. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2001a. Toxicological Profile for 1,2-Dichloroethane. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2001b. ToxFAQS for Methylene Chloride. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2003. ToxFAQS for Trichloroethylene (TCE). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

ATSDR, 2005a. Toxicological Profile for Carbon Tetrachloride. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.

- ATSDR, 2005b. Toxicological Profile for Arsenic, Draft For Public Comment. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2005d. ToxFAQS for Nickel. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2005e. Toxicological Profile for Naphthalene, 1-Methylnaphthalene, and 2-Methylnaphthalene. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2006a. ToxFAQS for 1,1,1-Trichloroethane. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2006b. Toxicological Profile for Dichlorobenzenes. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2006c. ToxFAQS for Vinyl Chloride. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2007a. Case Studies in Environmental Medicine (CSEM) Nitrite/Nitrate Toxicity. What Are Nitrate and Nitrite? U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2007b. ToxFAQs for Xylene. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2007c. ToxFAQs for Acrolein. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ATSDR, 2009. ToxFAQS for 1,3-Butadiene. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Registry, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Protection of the Environment, Parts 50, 51, 53, and 58.
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Georgia Ambient Monitoring Network Plan.
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Georgia Ambient Air Monitoring Quality Assurance Manual, Quality Assurance Plan.
- GADNR, 1993. Toxic Release Inventory Report, 1991. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Atlanta, Georgia.
- GADNR, 1996a. The 1994 Chatham County Air Toxics Study, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Atlanta, Georgia.
- GADNR, 1996b. 1996 Glynn county Initiative: Air Toxics Dataset Ground Level Measurements, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Atlanta, Georgia.
- GADNR, 2006. 2005 Ambient Air Surveillance Report. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. Atlanta, Georgia.
- McCarthy, M. C., Hafner, H. R., & Montzka, S. A. (2006). Background Concentrations of 18 Air Toxics for North America. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 56, 3-11.

- U.S. EPA, 1987. Health Assessment Document for Acetaldehyde. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 1991a. Integrated Risk Information System, Carbon Tetrachloride. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 1991b. Integrated Risk Information System, Acetaldehyde. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 1994a. OPPT Chemical Fact Sheet, Chemicals in the environment: 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene (CAS No. 95-63-6). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 1994b. Quality Assurance Handbook for Air Pollution Measurement System. Volume 1: Principles. EPA-600/R-94/038A, January 1994.
- U.S. EPA, 1998. Quality Assurance Handbook for Air Pollution Measurement System. Volume 1: Principles. EPA-600/R-94/038B, April 1998.
- U.S. EPA, 2000. Integrated Risk Information System, Benzene. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2002. Integrated Risk Information System, 1,3-Butadiene. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2003. Integrated Risk Information System, Acrolein. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2004a. Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2004b. Provisional Peer Reviewed Toxicity Value Database. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. EPA, 2006. A Preliminary Risk-Based Screening Approach for Air Toxics Monitoring Data Sets. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2007. Latest Findings on National Air Quality: Status and Trends through 2006, No. EPA-454/R-07-007. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards EPA Publication Air Quality Assessment Division Research Triangle Park, NC.
- U.S. EPA, 2008. National Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2007, No. EPA-454/R-08-006. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards EPA Publication Air Quality Assessment Division Research Triangle Park, NC.
- U.S. EPA, 2008b. Toxicological Review of Propionaldehyde (CAS No. 123-38-6), In Support of Summary Information on the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. EPA, 2009. Air Toxics Data Analysis Workbook, STI:908304.03-3224. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Research Triangle Park, NC.
- U.S. EPA, 2010. Our Nation's Air Quality-Status and Trends through 2008, No. EPA-454/R-09-002. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards EPA Publication Air Quality Assessment Division Research Triangle Park, NC.

U.S. EPA, 2012. "Table 1. Prioritized Chronic Dose-Response Values for Screening Risk Assessments (5/21/2012)". <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/toxsource/summary.html> Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards EPA Publication Air Quality Assessment Division Research Triangle Park, NC.