Message

From: Miguel, Mike@ARB [michael.miguel@arb.ca.gov]
Sent: 3/15/2022 3:36:51 PM
To: Latigue, Angela [Latigue.Angela@epa.gov]; Robertson, Andrew@ARB [andrew.robertson@arb.ca.gov]
CC: McStocker, Andrea@ARB [Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov]; Yang, Jer@ARB [jer.yang@arb.ca.gov]; Yang, Adam@ARB [Adam.Yang@arb.ca.gov]; Yoshimura, Gwen [Yoshimura.Gwen@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: 105 grant information

Hi Angela – I approve of the additional funds being added to CARB's 105 grant to assist with the purchase of a continuous PM10 sampler on behalf of the Lake County Air Quality Management District for the Lakeport air monitoring station. Let me know if you need any additional information from me. I have included Andrew, Adam and Jer to this email thread as they over see our EPA grant process.

Thanks

Mike

Michael Miguel
Assistant Division Chief
Monitoring and Laboratory Division
(916) 322-0960(w) (916) 416-3407(c)

CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

From: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 4:50 PM
To: Miguel, Mike@ARB <michael.miguel@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: 105 grant information

Hi Mike-

From what I hear you handle the grants for MLD. It is EPA's idea that to get PM10 funding for Lake Co., CARB adds it to our 105 grant request. I reached out to Jer Yang, but he just directed me back to EPA. In Julia's email below, she says EPA will need an email request from CARB which should probably come from you ☺ . The EPA contact is:
EPA Project Officer
Angela Latigue
Latigue.angela@epa.gov

We've recommended to Lake Co. that they move to a BAM1020 for PM2.5 and they would like to run the same equipment for PM10. So that means, they would need money to buy another BAM1020 for PM10.

Let me know if you have any questions or want to chat about this.

Thanks,
Andrea

From: Carlstad, Julia <Carlstad.Julia@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 10:00 AM
To: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>; Yoshimura, Gwen <Yoshimura.Gwen@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: 105 grant information

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 Andrea,

This sounds right to me. Angie Latigue should be able to help us arrange for this funding to be included in the 105 grant. I think she will need an email with a request from ARB in order to include it in the 105 award.

Thanks!

Julia Carlstad, Ph.D. (she/her)
U.S. EPA, Region 9
Air Quality Analysis Office
Phone: (415) 947-4107
Email: carlstad.julia@epa.gov

From: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Yoshimura, Gwen <Yoshimura.Gwen@epa.gov>; Carlstad, Julia <Carlstad.Julia@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: 105 grant information

Hi Gwen and Julia-

Jer is having me reach out to EPA to ask about 105 funding. Does this sound right to you or is it all wrapped into a grant given to CARB? Sorry, I don't know how this all works.

Thanks,
Andrea

From: Yang, Jer@ARB <jer.yang@arb.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 2:07 PM
To: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: 105 grant information

Hi Andrea,

We applied for the Sec 105 grant annually. Projects that program would like to get funding for under this grant is usually coordinated and approved by US EPA. If the funding is going directly to the air district or 3rd party, then it would be via subgrant agreement. You may reach out to our Sec 105 US EPA contacts listed below to see if we may get additional FY21 funding for Lake Co.

EPA Project Officer:
Angela Latigue
Latigue.angela@epa.gov

EPA Grant Specialist:

Alba Espitia
Espitia.alba@epa.gov

Thank you,

Jer Yang
Administrative Services Division
Federal and Bond Funds Unit
(916) 445-1188

From: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 9:36 AM
To: Yang, Jer@ARB <jer.yang@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: 105 grant information

Hi Jer-

I've been instructed to contact you re the 105 grant process. Please see the email below. We are trying to figure out a way to help Lake Co. purchase continuous PM10 monitors. EPA thought that the 105 grant might be a way. Is this plausible? How does the 105 grant process work?

Thanks,
Andrea

Andrea McStocker (she/her)
(279) 208-7177
Quality Management Section
Monitoring and Laboratory Division
California Air Resources Board

From: Yoshimura, Gwen <Yoshimura.Gwen@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 3:28 PM
To: Singh, Manisha@ARB <Manisha.Singh@arb.ca.gov>
Cc: Carlstad, Julia <Carlstad.Julia@epa.gov>
Subject: FYI - left you a voice message

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 Manisha!

I just left you a voice message that cuts of abruptly haha. We're trying to find a path forward on Lake County – it seems like there are a lot of benefits to getting them switched over to continuous instruments, and we might have the funding available right now.

One question is: could we provide $$ for a new continuous PM10 instrument for Lake, by providing money for it as part of CARB's 105 grant? We don't have a 105 grant with Lake, and can't think of another way to get them $ for a PM10 instrument.

Let me know what you think! And if you'd like to chat about it, feel free to give me a call or let me know what time(s) might work for us to connect.

Thanks!

-Gwen

Gwen M. Yoshimura (pronouns: she/her)
Manager, Air Quality Analysis Office
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Phone: 415.947.4134
Email: yoshimura.gwen@epa.gov

mailing address:
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Air Quality Analysis Office (AIR-4-2)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

From: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 3:23 PM
To: dougg@lcaqmd.net
Cc: Yoshimura, Gwen <Yoshimura.Gwen@epa.gov>; Carlstad, Julia <Carlstad.Julia@epa.gov>; Singh, Manisha@ARB <Manisha.Singh@arb.ca.gov>; Smith, Reginald@ARB <reggie.smith@arb.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: PM2.5 issues

Hi Doug-

Thanks for your email. Please see answers to your questions below in red:

1. Can you put together a list of continuous samplers that are used int he PQAO and who uses them, so we can contact them to start evaluating options? CARB recommends that the district switch over to a BAM 1020 as they are used widespread in the PQAO. CARB is not recommending the BAM 1022 at this time as some districts have had trouble with them and are removing them from their network. You can contact Nathan Trevino at San Joaquin Valley APCD to discuss their experience with the instrument.

2. Can you add to that list the equipment models that we could utilize in the PQAO that would not trigger co-location with and FEM or FRM unit? If we switch over, we do not have the staff to operate both FEM and FRM or multiple FEMS... So this is important. i.e. Shasta had to continue operating their FRM as a colocated sampler to their 1022 BAM. The BAM 1020 or BAM 1022 are the only models that the district could switch over to without the need to collocate. There was a presentation by Shasta at last year's PQAO Training that may help in making a decision. *Click here to watch this presentation*

3. Is there someone at CARB that has extensive experience with continuous samples that we can contact to discuss pros and cons of different units, setup and configuration options and requirements, etc.. All of which will help expedite our decision making processes. Please reach out to Reggie Smith, who is copied.

4. Does CARB have any training programs for operations and maintenance of continuous samplers? We have no experience with these, so we will require training as part of any transition. CARB does not have a training program for continuous monitors, however, the vendor may have formal training resources available. Many vendors have videos on YouTube.com. Also, there are some presentations from past PQAO trainings that you might find helpful Air Monitoring Training Modules | California Air Resources Board.

5. Is there any funding available to replace our PM10 FRM with a continuous unit at the same time as we replace the PM2.5 unit? We can't operate two different sets of equipment, we just don't have staff time, so if we do one, we have to do both. EPA is looking into sources of PM10 funding and will be in touch with you.

Please don't hesitate to reach out with more questions.

Best,

Andrea McStocker (she/her)
(279) 208-7177
Quality Management Section
Monitoring and Laboratory Division
California Air Resources Board

From: Douglas Gearhart <dougg@lcaqmd.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 1:23 PM
To: McStocker, Andrea@ARB <Andrea.McStocker@arb.ca.gov>
Cc: Elizabeth Knight <elizabethk@lcaqmd.net>
Subject: PM2.5 issues

Andrea,

We have met with Gwen at EPA and had a discussion regarding the PM2.5 issues. There are several items she will be getting back to us on, but there are a couple questions / requests I need to ask you.

First, can you put together a list of continuous samplers that are used int he PQAO and who uses them, so we can contact them to start evaluating options?

Second, can you add to that list the equipment models that we could utilize in the PQAO that would not trigger co-location with and FEM or FRM unit? If we switch over, we do not have the staff to operate both FEM and FRM or multiple FEMS... So this is important. i.e. Shasta had to continue operating their FRM as a colocated sampler to their 1022 BAM.

Third, is there someone at CARB that has extensive experience with continuous samples that we can contact to discuss pros and cons of different units, setup and configuration options and requirements, etc.. All of which will help expedite our decision making processes.

Fourth, Does CARB have any training programs for operations and maintenance of continuous samplers? We have no experience with these, so we will require training as part of any transition.

And Lastly, is there any funding available to replace our PM10 FRM with a continuous unit at the same time as we replace the PM2.5 unit? We can't operate two different sets of equipment, we just don't have staff time, so if we do one, we have to do both.

We may have a few more questions or requests coming but these are a priority.

Please let us know on these issues, and we can have a meeting in 2 weeks.

Thanks,

Doug

Douglas Gearhart, APCO
Lake County Air Quality Management District
2617 S. Main St.
Lakeport, CA 95453

Ph. (707) 263-7000
Fx. (707) 263-0421

Web: WWW.LCAQMD.NET

dougg@lcaqmd.net