



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765 - Room CC8**

MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York, Cities of Riverside County
MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez, Orange County Board of Supervisors
Martin Buford, Regional Rideshare Agency
Adriann Cardoso, Orange County Transportation Authority
Jenny Chan (Alt.), Riverside County Transportation Commission
Steven Hillman, City of Los Angeles
Jamie Lai, Cities of Orange County
Steven Lee, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Rongsheng Luo, Southern California Association of Governments
Kelly Lynn, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Nicholas Nairn-Birch, California Air Resources Board
Tim Olson, California Energy Commission
Andy Silva, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Vicki White, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas
John King, City of Paramount
Patricia Sanelen, Dodgers

SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant
Naveen Berry, Asst. Deputy Executive Officer
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison
Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor-Contractor
John Kampa, Financial Analyst
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel
Megan Lorenz, Principal Deputy District Counsel
Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant
Jennifer Nordbak, Secretary
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order
MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

OPENING COMMENTS

No opening comments.

STATUS REPORT

- Clean Transportation Policy Update –

The Clean Transportation Policy Update provides information on key legislative and regulatory initiatives of potential interest to the MSRC. The report can be viewed at www.cleantransportationfunding.org.

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 4) Receive and Approve

Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the October 4, 2018, MSRC-TAC Meeting

The Minutes for October 4, 2018, MSRC-TAC meeting were distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2018 MSRC-TAC MEETING.

ACTION: MSRC staff will place the approved meeting minutes on the MSRC's website.

Agenda Item #2 – Summary of Final Report by MSRC Contractors

Two final reports were submitted for MSRC-TAC review and approval during February:

- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, MS16092 (\$242,937 – Implement a Series of “Open Streets” Events)
- SCRRRA (Metrolink), MS18016 (\$87,764.00 - Special Train Service to Auto Club Speedway)

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT SUMMARIES LISTED ABOVE.

ACTION: The final report summaries will be included on the MSRC's next agenda for final action.

Information Only – Receive and File

Agenda Item #3 – MSRC Contracts Administrator’s Report

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for January 4 through January 30, 2019, was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR JANUARY 4 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2019.

ACTION: The Contracts Administrator’s Report will be included on the MSRC's next agenda for final action.

Agenda Item #4 – Financial Report on AB 2766 Discretionary Fund

The Financial Report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for January 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF JANUARY 2019.

ACTION: No further action is required.

ACTION CALENDAR (Items 5 through 10)

Agenda Item #5 – Consider Four-Month Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14030 (\$425,000 – Bicycle Racks, Outreach & Education)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. They were awarded \$425,000 as part of the FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program to install bicycle racks and conduct some associated

outreach and education. The County discovered that the first bicycle racks they ordered were composed of a grade of stainless steel which was not sufficient to withstand the environment. The specifications were revised for a higher and more appropriate grade, and the order was rebid, but installation was delayed. Over 500 racks have now been installed and the remaining installations are proceeding, weather permitting. The County requests a 4-month contract term extension to allow them to complete the work.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER JAMIE LAI, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14030, A FOUR-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include this contract term extension on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

Agenda Item #6 – Consider Eighteen-Month Term Extension for the City of Moreno Valley, Contract #ML16041 (\$20,000 – Install EV Charging Stations)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Moreno Valley. They were awarded \$20,000 as part of the FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program towards the installation of electric vehicle charging stations. No stations have been installed and nothing has been paid to date on this contract. The City originally proposed to install stations at their Public Safety Building parking lot and at City Hall parking lot. The City indicates that they have seen favorable usage of the two charging stations in the City Hall parking lot which were installed under a previous MSRC contract. Based on this, City staff are now recommending a capital improvement project which would consist of solar carport structures and electric vehicle charging stations at the City Hall Annex Building parking lot. Contract #ML16041 allows for location changes without the need for contract modification, but the City needs additional time to complete the environmental, design and permitting work before beginning construction. The City requests an 18-month contract term extension to allow them to complete the work.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER MARTIN BUFORD, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CONTRACT #ML16041, AN EIGHTEEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include this contract term extension on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

Agenda Item #7 – Consider Reduced Scope and Value for the City of Paramount, Contract #ML18053 (\$72,580 – Install EV Charging Stations)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Paramount. They were awarded \$72,580 as part of the FYs 2016-18 Local Government Partnership

Program towards the installation of five electric vehicle charging stations: two to be installed on the City's properties with full public access, and three to be installed on private properties with limited access. No stations have been installed and nothing has been paid to date on this contract. The City indicates that they have encountered higher than anticipated costs associated with ensuring Americans with Disabilities Act compliance for the two stations to be installed on their properties. In order to reduce the total budget for the project, the City proposes to reduce the scope to a total of three stations: two to be installed on City properties, and one to be installed on private property. However, the station on private property would now be publicly accessible twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week. The City also proposes to reduce the total MSRC contribution from \$72,580 to \$64,675, with \$7,905 reverting to the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund.

PUBLIC COMMENT: John King, City of Paramount commented, thank you for your work and putting this program together. The grants will be well served, and Paramount just wants a little adjustment to make this work. We did come across some issues that we didn't expect from the ADA. With the added costs this would be a great asset. We were in touch with the DMV about a year ago to see how many electric vehicles are licensed in town. I believe there were 15 a year ago, so I intend to get the new numbers this year. I'm sure it's more and with the infrastructure it will help all those numbers.

MSRC-TAC Member Martin Buford commented on the two stations; the value associated with them is about \$8,000. It's gone down from 5, you're taking out 2, but we do see \$8,000.

PUBLIC COMMENT: John King, City of Paramount commented taking it as a whole, we're making the other planned station publicly accessible. From the outset the understanding was that the station on private property would be publicly accessible 12 hours a day, so that will now change to 24/7.

Mr. Budford asked it seems like for the five, the value was \$72,000 but then for two it's \$8,000 because of the reproduction, is it just because it's more expensive to put three on the public property?

PUBLIC COMMENT: John King, City of Paramount commented the two that we actually have numbers are from a subcontractor. Those are definitely higher and that was to make those work. We don't have a third location definitely secured. We have a few options and we're looking to narrow those down for a better fit based on the specific location closer to electrical. So, with this lesson with the first two stations, we'll be able to do the third one at this reduced price. We think that's a fair amount.

MSRC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso commented what I'm hearing is part of the reason for the cost increases is that there are ADA requirements associated with installing the stations which you weren't expecting. I just want to make sure that the ADA improvements are something that's directly tied to the stations and not something the City should have done anyway previously. Can you describe those a little bit and how they tie to the stations?

PUBLIC COMMENT: John King, City of Paramount commented for both of these locations it's on public property, one is at the Civic Center at City Hall, the other is at a Sheriff's substation that the City partners with. Both of those facilities are ADA compliant as far as parking, but the

stations do have to be accessible. So, it gives more accessibility to the facility, in addition to the already accessible stalls that are on other parts of the properties.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay commented when you install the EVSE, if it's public or for employees or mixed use, the first stall has to be 12 feet wide with by 5 foot and it has to be fully ADA compliant. You have to have that first space marked as ADA only. So, the magic number is, if you put in 5 to 25, the first space has to be ADA compliant. Can't have any cords on the ground. What you end up doing in those situations is maybe finding a different location for that particular one to comply with the ADA requirements, and so the siting becomes much more expensive and so does the construction.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE
CITY OF PARAMOUNT, A REDUCED SCOPE AND CONTRACT VALUE.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include this modification on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

Agenda Item #8 - Consider Contract Replacement for the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Contract #ML14060 (\$104,400 – Install EV Charging Stations)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. They were awarded \$104,400 as part of the FYs 2012-14 Local Government Match Program to install publicly accessible EV charging stations providing a total of at least 38 charging ports. On October 26, 2018, the County requested a one-year term extension due to delays associated with its procurement process. The County's agreement for EV charging stations was expiring and needed to be re-bid. An administrative modification to extend the contract was initiated and sent to the County for signature on November 7, 2018. However, the contract lapsed on January 5, 2019. On January 29, 2019, the County submitted a request to complete the project. SCAQMD recommends that a new contract be executed to complete the project, should the MSRC wish to grant the County's request. Nothing has been paid to date on the previous contract, so the new contract value would be \$104,400.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, THE MSRC-TAC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14060, A CONTRACT
REPLACEMENT.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include this recommendation on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

Agenda Item #9 – Consider Contract Replacement for the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Contract #ML14093 (\$150,000 – San Gabriel Bike Trail Underpass Improvements)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. They were awarded \$150,000 as part of the FYs 2012-14 Local Government Match Program to complete improvements to the San Gabriel River Bike Trail where it passes under the Interstate 10 freeway. On December 10, 2018, the County requested an extension to August 13, 2019, due to delays associated with obtaining local agency encroachment permits and associated agency requested design revisions. An administrative modification to extend the contract was initiated and sent to the County for signature on January 4, 2019. However, the contract lapsed on January 13, 2019. On January 29, 2019, the County submitted a request to complete the project. SCAQMD recommends that a new contract be executed to complete the project, should the MSRC wish to grant the County's request. Nothing has been paid to date on the previous contract, so the new contract value would be \$150,000.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER KELLY LYNN, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14093, A CONTRACT REPLACEMENT.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include this recommendation on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

FYs 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM

Agenda Item #10 – Discuss Guidance from MSRC and Consider Recommendations for FYs 2018-21 Work Program

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York reported, we spent a lot of work here as a group talking about the merits of some kind of leveraging. We presented this to the MSRC. They asked a lot of questions similar to those that the TAC asked. So, the good news is, we're really well aligned with what the MSRC would be concerned about. When they started understanding the merits of a three-year program, that was really a no-brainer to them. When they started looking at some of the goals that the region needs to achieve, some of the programs that we talked about maybe scaling back seemed to be a no-brainer to them as well. And then we received feedback from various members of the MSRC. For example, for some of these large-scale projects, as MSRC-TAC Member Rick Teebay said at the last meeting, we really needed to identify what is needed and that's we're going to talk about today. But members of the AQMD have already done a lot of studies. There's a lot of good work that has been done that we could leverage to move forward to the next step. They were very open and very excited about a large-scale program that could do something very significant within our Basin, but they said you guys need to get back with us in February. We need to understand what we're doing because they don't want this money just to sit. They're putting us to work and that's what we're going to do today. With that I'd like to turn it over to Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor because there's a lot of groundwork and

coordination that has been done since that meeting and I think Ray would be the best one to share.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor commented that he would give some of the highlights from the MSRC meeting and some of the direction that they initially provided to talk about some of the action items and the timing of those action items. The MSRC did approve a three-year Work Program. It means that the total value of the 2018-21 Work Program is approximately \$64.2 million. They also supported a program that is a large-scale regional program and they asked the MSRC-TAC to develop the program options--the external funding opportunities--which would allow the MSRC to leverage that \$64.2 million and then come back with an action plan. They would like the TAC to move out quickly. They've asked us to come back at their next meeting in two weeks and provide some additional detail as to what options are available. How we would go out and implement those options? There was definitely quite a bit of discussion amongst the MSRC members and we have members that are suggesting specific programs. They wanted the TAC to vet these ideas and bring back additional information.

The first option is, the Regional Goods Movement Clean Corridor. This one is a logical program just because there's so much going on through efforts of multiple sources to do components of a Goods Movement Clean Corridor. This would include as key elements the implementation of zero- and near-zero goods movement transportation starting at the Ports on the west side of the basin and going all the way into the warehouse distribution centers in the Inland Empire, and potentially even opportunities to do the last mile distribution, which would be from the distribution warehouses to the retail centers. Different classes of clean fuel and electric vehicles would perform each of those segments, but the MSRC's vision of all the components that could be included within a project of this sort was very broad. This would include not only the transportation technologies but also the infrastructure which would support them. It would potentially be looking at demonstrations of some of the emerging technologies, such as fuel cell heavy-duty class 8 tractors, as well as the more commercially available but still emerging near-zero technologies which are primarily the Cummins near-zero natural gas drayage trucks. This would also be looking at some of the smaller vehicles which could be electric. This is a pretty ambitious program. The partners would be many. You're looking at the Ports, the regulatory agencies, the licensed motor carriers, the folks that actually drive the goods, the distribution centers, the infrastructure providers, and the MSRC's Outreach Coordinator. This is certainly the most ambitious program which the MSRC put on the table but there's already a lot of emphasis on goods movement, both through the RTP from SCAG as well as the South Coast AQMD's 2016 AQMP, which is highly focused on goods movement and cleaning up goods movement-related transportation.

The second option put on the table was to have an EV Ready Electric School Bus Program. This would be a regional program to prepare school districts for the coming of electric school buses. Now, this would have a very strong focus on infrastructure as well as education, but it also has the potential to include the actual school buses. The partnerships would be many. We have school districts within the South Coast region, technology providers, transportation providers, etc. This would be a very ambitious program to ensure we have broad-based participation, but the focus here would be the school districts which are at some point going to be compelled, or at least encouraged, to transition their fleets to zero-emission electric buses. This program would be some preparatory work, to get the infrastructure in place, to get the education and then help make it an easier transition for them to clean up their fleets.

The third option, which was not suggested by the MSRC members but has been discussed at the staff level internally, is EV Ready Communities. There's a lot of work in this and this would really look more broadly. Instead of just preparing school districts for the coming of large numbers of electric vehicles, this would work with our local jurisdictions to make sure they're prepared. This would have a focus on infrastructure and education primarily, and a lesser emphasis on vehicle incentives. It's a very large region, so the program would have numerous players. There's an opportunity here to have a Local Government Partnership component with this type of strategy.

Those are just three ideas. The MSRCs initial charge to the TAC was, what other ideas should we be considering for a Large-Scale Regional Program which has significant impact, meaning that the air quality benefits are going to be demonstrable and really manageable for the region and also could set the stage for follow-on programs which would leverage off the MSRCs initial investments? So that's the first call to action that the MSRC has given the TAC--what other ideas should we be considering?

The other theme that was very strong throughout the MSRCs discussion was the need to leverage the MSRC funding. Now \$62.4 million is a lot of money, but it is spread over three years and the ambitious program will require substantial resources. They've also charged the TAC, staff and the agencies which comprise the MSRC and the MSRC-TAC to look within to find out what funding partnerships we can secure. It's looking to leverage at a minimum dollar-for-dollar and hopefully much more than that. Instead of having a \$62.4 million Work Program, it should be \$100 million or more of real cash money that can be further leveraged with in-kind contributions. We cannot do this alone because the TAC and the MSRC themselves are not legal entities, meaning they cannot enter into contracts and most cases they cannot submit a proposal for funding. The discussion centered on the involvement that the South Coast AQMD can have in partnership with the MSRC. The South Coast AQMD will be the legal entity to help secure funds, but also and most importantly, to provide additional resources. We demonstrated in the prior Local Government Partnership Program that the agencies can work very well together and very closely. We utilized to the maximum extent the Public Affairs group here at the South Coast District. We intend to work with the legislative staff here, and with the MSRC's Outreach Coordinator, to make sure that as we move forward we're doing so in an efficient manner, taking advantage of any resource which can be brought to the table. The MSRC also discussed having other Work Program categories, in addition to a large-scale regional program, and the MSRC is open to that. They do not want to put all of their eggs in one basket. It's incumbent upon the MSRC-TAC to start to come out and propose other areas that could be included in the Work Program to fund projects that are both in need of funding and also provide an air quality benefit. The MRSC does expect to have a progress report at their February meeting in two weeks, as staff will be happy to work with the TAC to provide that. We do need to come up with a short list of both the regional programs that should be pursued, as well as some other programmatic ideas for other work program categories. We would like to have that, if possible, discussed in real time over the next week or so. We have already engaged our Outreach Coordinator, the Better World Group. We've met with them they and are putting together their action plan to go off and support the TAC in this quest to leverage MSRC funds for a regional program which has benefits to and from multiple agencies.

Mr. York commented that working backward up to the big project might be somewhat easier for us to start with. We had an existing Local Partnership Program, Infrastructure, and Major Event Centers. We briefly talked to the MSRC about that and they're open to that because they agree that there may still be certain programs that have an expectation over the next couple of years. They also understand that some of those programs may not foster the same air quality benefits that other programs can and so they're very amenable to a phase-out type process. Maybe if we tackle that one first and if the group could weigh in on that and make a recommendation for discussion.

MSRC-TAC Adriann Cardoso commented that at our last meeting, there were several of us that expressed that we wanted to continue with the Major Event Centers Program, understanding that there would be some tweaking or refining to that program. OCTA, at least, would like to see Local Partnership and Major Event Centers move forward. I don't know if we're talking about funding. We'd like to see them over the three-year period achieve at least what they had in the two-year period. They had \$14 or \$15 million for Local Programs and \$5 million for the Major Event Centers, maybe we take that and spread it over three-years, kind of keep that funding the same. The other program that OCTA likes is the County Transportation Commission funding. So if there's some way to fold some formula piece into the Local Programs, which would help us deliver some of the projects that may have previously lived under those programs, if you're going to take away some of the other programs that would help us. All three of the proposals are worth studying. Just speaking for Orange County, typically, we don't have a lot of freight, but I understand the reason why we want to go there.

MSRC-TAC Member Jamie Lai commented from the Orange County perspective--from the local governments who don't have a lot of freight--we have a lot of people drive cars and it's a challenge to get people out of the cars and even on another alternative means of transportation. So, having those Major Event and Local Government components would be great just from the educational outreach standpoint. Like the Dodgers Express, where people can jump on and know that that's their reduced rate just to incentivize them. We could revisit it in the next Work Program but at least for this one, maybe we can work with the Better World Group to see what we could do to better outreach it. From just a local government perspective, at least from the Orange County cities, it would be good to engage with the Better World Group to see what cities actually applied. I don't know in the last exercise if you actually knew how many of the cities knew about the program. For a city like Anaheim, we have grant writers that help us pursue grants and look for grants, but the general city out there doesn't do that. And so just from that perspective a lot of cities may not even know.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan commented I agree with what MSRC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso was proposing for the Major Event Centers Program. I really do like the regional large-scale program that the TAC has proposed. I'm not sure the cities themselves would be well-equipped to apply for these kinds of projects. It is very much focused on freight and clean technologies; not sure the cities are the best type of agencies to go after these kinds of funding. I think we have to also look at opening up the applications to others.

MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn commented in San Bernardino, we are currently finishing up a grant that we received from the CEC, which is an EV Readiness and Implementation Plan grant. We have been working very closely with our cities that are part of our working group. The idea of the plan is to see what is currently out there, where are the gaps and at the end to have a

number of shovel-ready sites identified in each of the areas. In our little bit of the woods, Option 3, the EV Ready Communities option, would work very well. Mr. York commented what you just mentioned I think is something that we had talked about even before we got into some of these bigger type programs. The idea was, could we come up with a plan within our Basin or within each region, if we were to continue the readiness of municipalities or local agencies, but instead of just doling out little dimes at a time, actually have a plan and know where the gaps are and understand how we fulfill that. There may still be that ongoing need for a Local Partnership Program, and that may be something that we would bring back to the MSRC. It sounded like the other transportation commissions would be very interested in something like that and that would be a good presentation to present to the whole group. And then see how the transportation commissions can get on board. Maybe part of the local program for this first couple year program is to actually have that generated for each region, and then have some priority projects so that when we introduce the next Work Program, we'll still have a component for local programs but very specific. I don't know if that is resonating with most of the group but that seems to be consistent with things that we started talking about last November if you recall. Ms. Lynn commented, what has been interesting with the cities is, some know very little about it, but they were very welcoming having these working group sessions and some like the City of Colton, were very progressive. So, it's been a chance for us to work a little closer with those cities on this issue.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay commented one of the things that I've found problematic over the years, is we fund something, and it's a good idea and it works. Then we continue to fund that as opposed to finding something, getting it out and getting it running and then weaning it off that funding source. That's something we should be thinking about. Do we fund something in perpetuity or do we help it get up and running and then do we wean them off? Mr. York commented we identify what the projects are, we use part of these funds to do an educational component to identify there's a lot of other pots out there, the MSRC doesn't have to be the leader, there are more pots. So, here's all your grant opportunities, here's a Regional Plan. This is the benefit of all the locals and here's the next step to educate them, then that would kind of fall in line with what I hear you saying.

Mr. York commented, one of the other things that Ray had mentioned, the Better World Group has already hit the ground running on a lot of these various components. Cynthia mentioned at the last meeting, that we have to as a group revisit that contract, would it be Better World Group or a comparable person. What we have been talking about throughout the months is we need to use that resource more than maybe we have in the past, to get the word out to all communities including the disadvantaged communities and I think that's echoing with what I'm hearing here. I'm hearing some support for kind of a Regional EV Readiness type plan plus an educational component, that would be under that lower tier. Mr. Luo commented the Local Government Partnership Program last time was \$20 million. For the large program option we're talking about, is there any possibility some of the past Local Government Program could be partially under this large option? If that could be done, you could have some portion moving to whatever the large option is, then the other remaining would be much at a smaller scale. Mr. York commented I think you're spot on and so here's one thing I would like to suggest. If, for example, the MSRC were doing the Regional EV Readiness Plan, we probably could work with Kelly and say "what would that take soup to nuts" and then kind of use that as a gauge to set a budget to create something uniform for the whole region. So, that we're not locking ourselves

into the past of saying well, we've spent \$15 or we spent \$20, now we're saying this is what we need to spend to deliver that program and we'll see how it falls.

Mr. Gorski commented, everything needs to look at time phasing, how much time will it take to do necessary upfront work or how much time will it take to do the outreach? When are you really going to be in the position to write the first check? So, phasing is going to be important, especially when we talk about having multiple categories simultaneously. They're really not going to be simultaneous because some require more upfront work while others are ready to hit the ground running. So, it's really looking at how we're going to put this jigsaw puzzle together and then apportion money throughout the program life, realizing that some needs to be retained for those elements which need more upfront planning and will be deployed later and then securing and having those resources available for those which are for all intents and purposes shovel ready today. It's something that the MSRC would want to know and we can probably have something along those lines for February. Lay out three years, meet their goals, find the money and show us how it all can play together, and everyone gets something out of this package.

Mr. York commented, I think we got the Regional EV piece, but for the Major Event piece, what I think I was hearing was, if we are able to still be a partner with the education component. We expand out to all areas, to better use these resources and to know that they're available, is that in line with what Orange County was thinking or were you thinking of it a little bit more than that as well for this next three-year program? Ms. Cardoso replied, I think education is a component of all of the MSRC programs and we talked about that a lot actually at the last meeting, but I know my agency likes the existing program. We know that the goal is to taper it back but we use that for education because we do things like the Fair shuttle. And that gets folks on the bus who don't normally ride the bus, who start to get comfortable with our bus and then maybe they might be willing to look at our schedule and think about taking the bus at some point. It gets them used to our mobile reading app, it gets them used to a bus experience and in my mind, that's like one of the greatest benefits of that type of event program.

Ms. Lai added one of the challenges in Orange County is, unlike LA, the only public transportation available is the rail lines and the bus lines. And the rail lines aren't very frequent. It's true a lot of the local everyday residents don't use it and that's the only time you hear them use it. Mr. York replied this conversation also happened with your transportation commissioner, he expressed his interest in that. I think he understood the facts, I think he realized that the Program's days are short. My question is if the MSRC wasn't at the point to incentivize this Program anymore, would any of those programs stop? That was a discussion where we're thinking, no they probably wouldn't because they have been successful, and they are a good component for OCTA. There's got to be that day and maybe it's not today, maybe it's over the next couple of years. If it was over the next couple of years, could you maybe share with this committee what you consider a taper down program and then maybe something that would still give us a better positive air quality benefit, maybe there are other requirements and maybe that's part of this program is to tighten up those requirements. Ms. Cardoso replied we'd have to look at things we could do to incentivize the folks using the shuttle to try and get on our bus, we could do something. I can't speak for my agency. In terms of a taper down, we've talked about leveraging and match and maybe a higher match over the three years. The first year is 25%, second year 50%, etc. Those are odd matches for a funding program, you could taper that and then just make it very clear under the next Work Program, we don't expect this to continue,

something like that would be helpful. I think we would continue the service without the funding but the funding guarantees that we will continue. I've been getting the question from my transit side; do we have the funding or not? We're trying to budget it. Should we budget it? Should we not? I think the public would be very upset if we didn't provide it.

Mr. York asked, is there a congestion management component that we've overlooked, and would the transportation commissions be a good leader on that? You already have some incentive. Is there a way that you could make those programs much stronger and partner with folks like rideshare and the others and really make that a much stronger? We've not really heard the details of that proposal. I don't know if there's interest or if that's something that you guys feel like a committee could work on and could suggest back to the MSRC that one of these local programs might very well be that, a Congestion Management Plan on a regional basis that brings in some of our other partners like Rideshare. MSRC-TAC Member Martin Buford commented, in my perspective the less car idle time you have, the less air pollution that you produce. If you can reduce congestion, you are in effect improving air quality. The converse can't be said and that's not to say anything negative, but if you've got all electric cars doesn't mean it has reduced congestion but reducing congestion will by nature improve air quality. Not to segue a little bit into the large-scale projects, for California Transportation Commission's (CTC) that are involved with the vanpool program, Enterprise has looked at making all their vehicles electric, but because of the cost of that, they would have to pass it down to the vanpool rider and that's being met with great resistance. There's a program map that could help mitigate that cost so that the end user wouldn't feel it and then net into incentivizing other people to join more vanpools. You're helping with congestion; you're not passing the cost down to the end user and you're helping affect air quality in a positive way like with Metro. These are cross-regional riderships.

Mr. York commented, that's positive input. We've talked about a Regional EV Readiness Program. I think education is uniform. We talked about some kind of a Major Event Program with looking at the criteria to participate in that. We've now also talked about a Congestion Management type plan. At the last couple of meetings, we had a representative from the Gas Company who continued to share their desire for a local program for some other kind of alternative fuels, there's been some discussion back and forth. We heard what the community said, but before this committee dismisses it and does not move it forward, I wanted to give you all a chance again to talk about that. Should that be part of this three-year program discussion or are we ready to move on from that as a fuel source that we would incentivize in this committee?

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented, with the large-scale regional program, particularly for the goods movement corridor, that's going to be targeting trucks. And if you're looking at the next three years, the most available technology will be the .02 gram natural gas engine. It's kind of inherent that if we go with that option, we're going to be incentivizing natural gas. Mr. York replied, if that's similar, I didn't want to short that discussion because they took the time to share with us and I don't think we had a fair opportunity to discuss it. Ms. Cardoso asked in regard to the Carl Moyer program, that's just diesel to compressed natural gas (CNG). Do you envision in the future that you're going to do old CNG to new cleaner CNG? Ms. White replied, we can now do that under the Carl Moyer Program. With Board approval, we will be releasing the next round of the Carl Moyer Program on March 1st, and it will stay open for 90 days. Ms. Cardoso, added that's a good place to potentially direct some of those folks who are here. Naveen Berry, Asst. Deputy Executive Officer commented, we should also consider renewable natural gas as part of this discussion. Mr. York asked would renewable natural gas be part of the larger

scale project or under this smaller portion that we're talking about right now? Mr. Gorski added I think the future is RNG because if you talk to the actual fuel providers, that's what they're advocating also. Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP) just made an adjustment for very small operators to be able to purchase vehicles and not give the RNG guarantee. Mr. York commented it's going to be in the bigger program but there may still be an opportunity in a smaller scale program. It sounds like a pot could cover these four categories and staff can share that with MSRC. In December when I was absent you guys took the leadership, which I think was perfect and you formed a Local Programs Committee. My question is of these four components that we just talked about, is that committee appropriate to cover one or all of these or do we want to as a group re-look at that? Do we need to have a couple of other committees? MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair AJ Marquez observed wasn't the Local Partnership pretty broad-based, with municipalities bringing us projects of all different types? Or are you saying to tailor the program just for these programs? Mr. York replied, I think we're going to have a lot of work to develop these four smaller ones. We should be active over the next several months and the committee could probably help flesh out some of these thoughts. Those who voiced their preferences on some of these groups, I would strongly encourage be part of those committees because you have a lot to add. That one committee you formed, does it need to stay intact or do we just scrap that one and maybe rethink these four categories? We have four separate committees that would talk about these specific categories.

Mr. Gorski replied, the MSRC has charged us with some relatively quick turnaround things. The first one is the regional program options. We're also hearing today, and I think was also brought up at the MSRC, that there is an interest in looking at what should be the next phase of the Event Center because there's advocacy for that. I would suggest that we consider having a subcommittee be formed immediately to address the Major Event Center Program, given that we have been made aware that the need is immediate. The Transportation Commissions that implement programs need certainty as to whether or not the MSRC will continue to fund them. We're not going to necessarily be able to understand what the answer is until we bring it to the MSRC, but I think it's incumbent upon us to at least have the materials for the MSRC to make that decision. It would be probably a good idea to evaluate the Major Event Program as a parallel first priority, and be able to deliver to the MSRC at least the indication in February that in March you should expect a report from the TAC relative to how to move forward with that program. I would suggest, given again the information that we are receiving, that it should be absolutely no later than the March MSRC meeting. This committee doesn't have to be forever, it's just going to quickly do the necessary work. The regional program is going to be a long-term committee. That's something which is an original program and is not going to be implemented overnight. It's going to have to dovetail with other programs which are currently in the early formation and or deployment phases so that one's going to need people to participate from cradle to grave and plan on greater than six months. And in between there are going to be a couple of other programs, by all means, and we can continue the discussions as to which subcommittees would be most appropriate for those other programs, but I know there are two right now which are in immediate need of having us position ourselves to address the MSRC's desire to have a large-scale regional program with significant impact as well as meeting some of the immediate needs that have been expressed by the TAC and members of the MSRC. The Major Event Center rises to the top of that list.

Mr. York noted, the Major Event Program Committee members are Adriann Cardoso, Jamie Lai, Kelly Lynn, Rick Teebay, Jenny Chan, Steven Lee, Vicki White, and Rongsheng Luo. With

respect to the other committees, we can wait and talk about them at the upcoming meeting. Did I give everybody the opportunity to share what they needed to share? And if not, I want to give you that opportunity right now. Ms. Cardoso commented, there was just one thing on leveraging. Before we look into leveraging and fund sources, we have to know what the program is. Mr. York replied, we'll get that direction after the next MSRC meeting. Then from the staff's perspective, as an accountability check, is there anything that you were hoping to achieve today that we didn't provide you? Mr. Gorski replied, we've made substantial progress and that we will immediately form and convene and move out with the Major Event Centers Program. For the regional program, the MSRC members do have ideas and but I think in all fairness to the MSRC and the TAC, we need to present them not with necessarily just a solution but with a set of options, with each option having some additional details associated with it. So, they have an understanding of the undertaking, meaning, if they do adopt goods movement, it's a very complex program. If they do want to go with the school bus readiness, that's fine too but at least so they understand and it is something that will need to be worked on over the next couple of weeks, to give them a sufficient level of detail such that they can make a decision. We're hoping that they do make a decision at the February meeting on what to move forward. My gut feels, and again I could be wrong, but I feel that you may get an answer from the MSRC that is along the lines of: okay, we want you to do this Regional Program and we also want you to set the stage for this other program. Meaning that if we do goods movement, we want you to set the stage for the school buses. If we do school buses, we want to set the stage for the EV Community Program. I would not be surprised when we reconvene in March, that the marching orders are to go off to make this program happen. And when you're making it happen, also be setting the stage through the outreach, through working with the District for everyone else to prepare ourselves for the next major program.

OTHER BUSINESS

Agenda Item #11 – Other Business

No other business.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING
ADJOURNED AT 2:56 P.M.

NEXT MEETING: Next meeting: Thursday, March 7, 2019, 1:30 p.m., at the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)