Message

From: Amador, Fernando@ARB [fernando.amador@arb.ca.gov]
Sent: 6/4/2018 6:07:25 PM
To: Bauer, Jeremy [Bauer.Jeremy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Border grant

Jeremy, it seems the additional money is to contract out the data review, since this instrument will have hourly measurements. I am not sure if they would still want to continue with the project without the data review portion of the grant and since I am transitioning out of overseeing this site I recommend you reach out to Michael.

Thank you,

From: Bauer, Jeremy <Bauer.Jeremy@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Amador, Fernando@ARB <fernando.amador@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA Border grant

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Fernando,

I noticed in the last email from Michael, the cost estimate of $150K for the XRF had been replaced with $270K. Do you know what the additional amount would be for?

If $150K is all we are able to provide at this time, are you able to proceed with an aspect of the project using just the $150K?

Thanks,

Jeremy

From: Amador, Fernando@ARB [mailto:fernando.amador@arb.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 1:28 PM
To: Bauer, Jeremy <Bauer.Jeremy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: EPA Border grant

For the real time metals analysis at the border (Calexico Station) the XRF machine costs 150k.

From: Amador, Fernando@ARB
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:55 PM
To: Bauer, Jeremy <Bauer.Jeremy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: EPA Border grant

Jeremy, from Megan's explanation below I would say assume the same costs as before for the Mexicali PM2.5 grant.

From: McKay, Megan@ARB
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:53 PM

To: Amador, Fernando@ARB <fernando.amador@arb.ca.gov>; Stroud, Kenneth@ARB <kenneth.stroud@arb.ca.gov>; Ham, Walter@ARB <walter.ham@arb.ca.gov>
Cc: Guerrero, Joe@ARB <joe.guerrero@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: EPA Border grant

Hi Fernando,

My estimate is that it will be similar to the last RFP, plus increases in the cost of instrumentation and labor. Having turned over all the equipment to Mexico, it will need to be purchased again. Even if Mexico loaned the instruments back, most of the equipment would need to be serviced (at least new pumps and possibly other parts, especially as we'll need to wait for another RFP).

Note, it took about 1.5 years to post the last RFP (and I expect it will take longer this time if the changes and contracts reflect a similar increase in time for an RFP). In addition, both the lab and AQPS would need to agree to do their "in-kind" services again.

Cheers,

Megan

From: Amador, Fernando@ARB
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 2:04:58 PM
To: Stroud, Kenneth@ARB; McKay, Megan@ARB; Ham, Walter@ARB
Cc: Guerrero, Joe@ARB
Subject: EPA Border grant

Hi, I got a call from Jeremey Bauer of EPA asking about Border/Mexico projects we have requiring grant funding. The two I came up with for MLD are as follows:

1. Restart of the Mexicali PM2.5 Study. EPA is very interested in funding this next fiscal year.
2. Real time Speciation (GC) at Calexico. Michael Benjamin expressed interest in having this capability at Calexico.

I agreed to get Jeremy an estimate of the cost of these two projects for consideration in next year's grant.

Megan could you provide me with an estimate of what the cost would be to restart and operate the Mexicali PM2.5 Study, year 3 and year 4.

Walter do you have an idea of the cost of a GC for the Calexico station?

Thank you,

Fernando Amador
Air Resources Supervisor I
California Air Resources Board