



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC
THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 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
Jenny Chan (Alt.), Riverside County Transportation Commission
Adriann Cardoso, Orange County Transportation Authority
Jason Farin, Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Steve Hillman, City of Los Angeles
Linda Johnson, 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
Sean O'Connor, Cities of San Bernardino
Andy Silva, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Cliff Thorne (Alt.), Orange County Transportation Authority
Vicki White, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jason Lewis, SoCalGas
Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas

SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison
Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor-Contractor
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel
John Kampa, Financial Analyst
Megan Lorenz, Principal Deputy District Counsel
Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant
Jennifer Nordbak, Secretary
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator
Paul Wright, SCAQMD Staff

CALL TO ORDER

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

OPENING COMMENTS

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York introduced Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel who will be replacing Megan Lorenz while she is on maternity leave.

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 5)

Receive and Approve

Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the August 2 and September 6, 2018, MSRC-TAC Meetings

The Minutes for the August 2 and September 6, 2018 MSRC-TAC meetings were distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #5, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 2 AND SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 MSRC-TAC MEETINGS. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON ABSTAINED.

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

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

Five final reports were submitted for MSRC-TAC review and approval during January:

- Grand Central Recycling & Transfer Station, MS14082 (\$150,000 – Construct New Public Access CNG Station)
- Burrtec Waste & Recycling Services, LLC, MS16087 (\$100,000 – Construct New Limited-Access CNG Station))

- Orange County Transportation Authority, MS16093 (\$1,553,657– Implement a Mobile Ticketing System)
- Huntington Beach Union High School District, MS16105 (\$175,000 – Expansion of Existing CNG Infrastructure)
- Orange County Transportation Authority, MS18004 (\$503,272 – Provide Special Rail Service to Angel Stadium)

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #5, 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.

Agenda Item #3 – Consider Adoption of 2019 Meeting Schedule

Annually, the MSRC considers a proposed meeting schedule for the upcoming year. The schedule continues with meetings on the first and third Thursdays, respectively for the MSRC-TAC and MSRC, with two exceptions. Staff recommends the MSRC-TAC meetings in January, July and December be held on the second Thursday of the month to avoid holiday conflicts.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #5, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR.

ACTION: The 2019 Meeting Schedules will be included on the MSRC’s next agenda for consideration.

Information Only – Receive and File

Agenda Item #4 – MSRC Contracts Administrator’s Report

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for December 6, 2018 through January 3, 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #5, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR DECEMBER 6, 2018 THROUGH JANUARY 3, 2019.

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

Agenda Item #5 – Financial Report on AB 2766 Discretionary Fund

The Financial report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for December 2018.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #5, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF DECEMBER 2018.

ACTION: No further action is required.

ACTION CALENDAR (Items 6 through 14)

Agenda Item #6 – Consider Seven-Month Term Extension for Waste Resources, Inc., Contract #MS14079 (\$100,000 – Install New Limited Access CNG Station)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from Waste Resources, Inc. They were awarded \$100,000 as part of the FYs 12-14 Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Program to install a new limited access CNG station. Waste Resources stated that it took longer than anticipated to secure contractors to complete the project. However, now they have done so and expect that the station will be operational in January 2019. In order to fulfill the MSRC's five-year operational requirement, Waste Resources requested a seven-month term extension. Their letter actually asked for an extension until February 2023, but that is earlier than the current termination date of August 2023. MSRC staff has confirmed with Waste Resources that the letter should ask for an extension to February 2024.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR WASTE RESOURCES, INC., CONTRACT #MS14079, A SEVEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

[MSRC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso arrived at 1:50 p.m., during the discussion of item #7]

Agenda Item #7 – Consider Term Extension to June 25, 2023, for the Rialto Unified School District (RUSD), Contract #MS14076 (\$225,000 – Install Public Access CNG Station)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from Rialto Unified School District (RUSD). They were awarded \$225,000 as part of the FYs 2012-14 Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Program to install a publicly accessible CNG station. Rialto USD indicated that they were offered the opportunity to participate in a Department of Energy electric bus vehicle to grid demonstration. To meet the increased electrical needs, RUSD needed to enhance their electrical infrastructure, so the CNG station project was delayed while this was done. RUSD then proceeded to complete the work under the contract. In order to fulfill the MSRC's operational requirements, RUSD has requested that the contract's term be extended to June 25, 2023, approximately a sixteen-month extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE CLIFF THORNE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CONTRACT #MS14076, A SIXTEEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #8 – Consider Eighteen-Month Term Extension for the City of Pomona, Contract #ML16008 (\$60,000 – Purchase Three Medium-Duty and One Heavy-Duty CNG Vehicles)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Pomona. They were originally awarded \$310,000 as part of the FYs 14-16 Local Government Match Program to purchase four medium-duty and nine heavy-duty CNG vehicles. Previously, the City indicated that the need for vehicles to have flexibility to use regular gasoline during emergency services had reduced their need for dedicated CNG vehicles. The City requested to reduce their obligations under the contract to the purchase of three medium-duty and one heavy-duty vehicle, with a corresponding contract value reduction from \$310,000 to \$60,000. This modification was processed administratively. The City stated that due to the delay in ARB certification for the first three vehicles, they delayed procurement of the remaining vehicle. The City requested a one-year term extension to allow time to obtain the final vehicle and fulfill the MSRC's operational requirements. In a subsequent conversation with MSRC staff, the City modified their request to eighteen-months.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White asked, has the City already purchased the heavy-duty CNG vehicle and now is only asking for a delay for the medium-duty vehicles? Ms. Ravenstein replied they purchased the one heavy-duty and two of the medium-duty, they're requesting the extension for the remaining vehicle.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O'CONNOR, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE

CITY OF POMONA, CONTRACT #ML16008, AN EIGHTEEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #9 – Consider One-Year Term Extension for the City of Monterey Park, Contract #ML16013 (\$90,000 – Purchase Three Heavy-Duty CNG Vehicles)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Monterey Park. They were awarded \$90,000 as part of the FYs 14-16 Local Government Match Program to purchase three heavy-duty CNG vehicles. The City states that the delay in ARB certification has delayed delivery of the buses even longer than anticipated. Delivery is now anticipated in January 2019, with the vehicles entering service in April. In order to fulfill the MSRC's five-year operational requirement, the City requests a one-year term extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF MONTEREY PARK, CONTRACT #ML16013, A ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #10 – Consider Eighteen-Month Term Extension by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), Contract #ML16022 (\$360,000 – Purchase Twelve Heavy-Duty CNG Vehicles)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). They were awarded \$360,000 as part of the FYs 14-16 Local Government Match Program to purchase 12 heavy-duty CNG vehicles. LADWP's attempts to procure the vehicles have been delayed multiple times due to vendor protests. LADWP had written a new specification and anticipated the contract would be awarded in the next couple of months. Once awarded, the selected vendor will have one year to deliver all 12 units. In order to fulfill the MSRC's five-year operational requirement, LADWP requested an eighteen-month extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER, CONTRACT #ML16022, AN EIGHTEEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION. MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN ABSTAINED.

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

Agenda Item #11 – Consider Contract Replacement for City of Palm Springs, Contract #ML16005 (\$40,000 – Install Bike Racks & Implement Bicycle Outreach)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Palm Springs. They were awarded \$40,000 to install bike racks and implement a bicycle outreach and education program. The City completed a Bicycle Friendly Business District Plan and was working with downtown merchants on implementation. In an extension request submitted in August 2017, the City indicated that the downtown merchants would prefer a different mix of bike rack types, which had delayed the project. MSRC staff followed up with the City in an attempt to learn the necessary specifics, but the contract lapsed on October 3, 2017. After extensive follow-up, it was learned that the City's consultant who was working on the project had died. On October 29, 2018, the City submitted a request to complete the project. SCAQMD recommended that a new contract be executed to complete the project, should the MSRC wish to grant the City's request. Nothing has been paid to date on the previous contract; the new contract value would be \$40,000.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER JASON FARIN, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE JENNY CHAN, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE A CONTRACT REPLACEMENT FOR THE CITY OF PALM SPRINGS.

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

Agenda Item #12 – Consider Contract Replacement for San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), Contract #MS16091 (\$1,000,000 –Signal Synchronization Upgrades)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from San Bernardino County Transportation Authority. They were awarded \$1,000,000 to update the San Bernardino Valley Coordinated Traffic Signal System. On September 21, 2018, SBCTA requested a 14-month term extension due to a longer than expected time necessary for data collection, corridor re-timing efforts, and coordination with sixteen local jurisdictions. Additionally, in December 2016 San Bernardino Associated Governments informed the MSRC of the creation of the SBCTA. While the existing agreement remained valid, it was deemed appropriate to change the contractor name as part of the modification. At their October 23, 2018 meeting, the MSRC approved SBCTA's request. However, the contract lapsed on November 6, 2018, prior to modification documents being mailed out for signature. SCAQMD has expressed concerns regarding executing extensions of lapsed contracts so the modification could not be executed. Staff recommends that a new \$1,000,000 contract be executed to complete the project.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE JENNY CHAN, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE A CONTRACT REPLACEMENT FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY.

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

2018-20 WORK PROGRAM

Agenda Item #13 – Review Lessons Learned from FYs 2016-18 Local Government Partnership Program

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported that a couple of things have happened since the last meeting in December. There was an agreement by the MSRC-TAC that it would be in the best interest of the MSRC's overall program to have another edition of a Local Government Partnership Program. The action at that time was to send out a request for volunteers who would like to serve on a subcommittee to help draft a 2019-2020 edition of the program. Over the next week or two, you're going to be receiving some correspondence wanting to set up a more formal subcommittee teleconference and or in-person meeting to flesh out the details of what the next program should look like. We thought it would probably be good to take a look at the most recent program. It was the first Local Government Partnership Program that the MSRC had ever done, but it was a follow-on to the Local Government Match Program which the MSRC had done for 18-19 years. It was in the same theme of working with our local cities and counties to help leverage everyone's money to do cleaner projects, but the last edition had some unique features relative to trying to match the Subvention funds on a more programmatic basis. Staff worked very closely with the cities and counties over the last year as they were putting together their applications and we received a lot of feedback.

There are 162 eligible jurisdictions within the South Coast Air Quality Management District. There are actually more than 162 cities and counties, but those like Bradbury and Avalon do not participate in the Subvention Fund program. The MSRC allocated a total of \$21,180,650, which was the amount of Subvention Funds which were available to local cities and counties in 2016. The Program was set up to match the amount of Subvention Funds that each jurisdiction got on a dollar-for-dollar basis, with the exception of small cities, which received a minimum of \$50,000 each, and Los Angeles, which was capped at a maximum of \$3 million. We received a total of 121 applications from 109 jurisdictions which participated in the program. The amount of funding was \$15.3 million out of the available \$21.2 million. Interestingly about 80% of the funding went to electric vehicles and electric vehicle charging equipment. That's not super surprising because there was a real emphasis within the program to fund electric vehicles or emission technologies as well as near-zero emission technologies. The reason this program was put in place originally was to help jump-start the 2016 South Coast AQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP identifies what they believe the key strategies are for improving air quality in the region. Moving towards zero emissions for transportation as well as near-zero emissions for those cases in which there isn't currently a fully zero-emission solution available, that would be primarily the heavy-duty sector, are right at the top.

There was a lot of communication. Some city staff were unaware that the program even existed. Yet more than any other program in the MSRC's history, this program had an unprecedented level of outreach in an effort to ensure that everyone was aware. We had MSRC staff, AQMD staff, TAC members, and the Outreach Coordinator, the Better World Group. We used letters, emails, personal communications, and telephone calls to try to make sure that the cities were

aware that we were putting an amount of money on the table that was equal to or greater than what they got for their Subvention Funds. The lesson learned was maybe we weren't always talking to the right people. Some cities are small and it's easier to get to the people that are decision makers, other cities are large and have all levels of departments. A remedy which Mr. John Kampa, SCAQMD's Financial Analyst, proposed at the end of last month's meeting was instead of taking top-down approach, maybe try to work it from the bottom up. John works directly with all of the entities who oversee the Subvention Funds from a financial perspective and having John coordinate with the staff that actually control the money is going to be an additional, yet effective strategy to raise awareness of the availability of the Local Partnership funds.

There were two deadlines: the original date and the extended date. There was a rush at the approach of the deadlines. The program was open for 11 months and we received proposals five minutes after midnight that were late and did not receive funding. The MSRC, like the SCAQMD, has pretty firm rules relative to procurement policies. If there's a hard deadline that's been established, they can't accept proposals that come in late. So, what's the lesson learned? If you know that someone's going to wait to the last minute to get something in, maybe you don't benefit by having a really long window of opportunity. Maybe there's an opportunity to make it a shorter proposal submittal period. There are also ways that the MSRC may want to consider retaining a little more control and having a more direct relationship with the city and be the driver of the schedule as opposed to the entity which is just subject to the timeline that the city sets.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee commented that folks didn't know that there was going to be a second deadline. If you were to do a shorter window, in theory, you would have missed out. Mr. Gorski continued, so your point is that had we kept the original deadline we would have had very little participation and that's probably true. MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York commented, as one who's intimately involved in every line item budget in our city, and this may ring true for other agencies, we have a two-year budget cycle. We have a fund source where revenues are expected for the AB 2766 Subvention and we have appropriated those funds for various programs. This Local Partnership program came in, and that would have required us either to add a mid-year or add a budget to re-appropriate those funds to participate in this. At that time, there would likely be a decision point to say we have an opportunity to leverage \$50,000. I like John's recommendation to at least get to the Finance Manager or somebody in finance who runs those budgets because they're responsible for those quarterlies. The City Manager is going to send it over the Public Works Director and the Public Works Director may or may not see that as a priority.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented one thing that's helped is holding application assistance workshops. A lot of it is to help with the paperwork. Even though your process is pretty streamlined, hold a workshop and have staff there to help you fill out the application and answer any questions they may have. Mr. Gorski replied that's a good point. There are 162 eligible cities, could we hire someone to do all the applications for them? If you want to drive the process, the only thing we're really asking them to do is make an affirmation that they're going to submit the money and that they're going to abide by this.

MSRC Alternate Rick Teebay commented we should involve the Council of Governments (COG), particularly for the disadvantaged communities. The disadvantaged communities lack

staff. They don't know a lot about what they're doing, but they want to do all these good things and if we could concentrate some of the resources at the COG level, then the whole region will participate. They're already doing this with some of the state grant applications. The second thing is on the six-month program. If I'm going to my board to get on the agenda, if I file a letter today, it would be on the board's agenda in eight weeks. I know different jurisdictions have different timelines. MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn added for San Bernardino; our timeline has become quite extensive. So, in six months, I think we are required to have counsel review it before it can even become an agenda item. It's pretty far out.

MSRC-TAC Adriann Cardoso asked, do we have to have the resolution before they submit the application. Or could they do it after the funding is approved? Mr. Gorski replied that's an excellent point and we can do it a different way. We don't have to have that, we can work with the staff to put together a contract and then take it to your respective community leaders, supervisors or council; there are workarounds. To get your point about the COGs, that's a good point. The MSRC under the previous program did have a relationship with the COGs in which COGs were more or less recipients of funding from the MSRC on behalf of their cities.

Mr. Gorski continued, our thought going in, which was echoed by the leadership of the MSRC, was that a part of this program was really educational. The 2016 AQMP is now on the street. It has been approved by the Air Resources Board. It's the roadmap moving forward and the leadership of all 162 cities needs to be aware of this. They need to understand what the air quality challenges are, that there is a local air quality agency, and this is what they're telling us we need to do. We thought that education was really important to get to the leadership, the decision-makers. The bottom line was that it was probably not practical to have knowledgeable people like the TAC members or staff go out and do all these presentations. It is suggested that the presentations be abandoned as a requirement in a future program. We could have a short video that the MSRC produces which basically has all the information to show them but doesn't require a staff person at the city to actually get up there and do a formal presentation. Mr. York commented, I don't know about removing it because then we don't achieve probably one of the goals of really getting the word out. I don't know how other agencies handle it, but at our agency we have public input and a presentation, and those presentations are limited to a few minutes. And since they're not agendized, that's not something that we're going to have a lot of dialogue back and forth and give direction to staff. One thought might be to create the video brief with a nice one sheet, leave it behind and then you put the request out to the city clerks to get this on a presentation in the upcoming year or months. That way at least we can get our message out. Mr. Gorski commented, that's a good idea and the entity which I have to do the video is the Better World Group. MSRC Alternate Linda Johnson commented, would you suggest separating that from a requirement. Mr. York replied yes, there wouldn't be a requirement but then everybody's participating in the program. The idea was to get the word out, here's another way we can do that. Ms. Johnson commented going back to our city, we can't get anything on to the agenda unless it's pre-approved. Mr. Gorski replied there might be some special cases in which a MSRC staff member could go on just under public comment. We really wanted cities and counties to leverage the MSRC money not only with their Subvention Funds but all the other colors of money which are out there and then motivate them to take advantage of those other funding sources. Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP) is a huge one right now for the Heavy-Duty Vehicle Voucher Incentive Program offered by the state. It gives very generous incremental funding for technologies, including electric as well as near-zero. The question is how do you inform and motivate people to take advantage of other monies which

are out there. First of all, we can prepare more documentation. I've got a nice running matrix now of other funding available. From the last meeting, the Better World Group came and gave a formal presentation on all the other money that is available. We could make sure everyone gets that. MSRC-TAC Member Jason Farin asked to what extent was the outreach linked to similar incentive programs like HVIP, to sort of inform those programs that have an existing network of people. Ms. Ravenstein replied, we did not do that, but that's a great idea. Mr. Farin added, even like the workshops you have to look at carbon transportation. All the folks that are tuning into those are interested entities and jurisdictions. That could be an easy way of taking advantage of existing infrastructure.

Ms. Chan commented, if you wanted to encourage leveraging, you could make it so that any agency that could demonstrate that they were leveraging external funds could get an additional 10% or something like that. There's a financial benefit, too.

Mr. York commented, the other thing to consider is, there are a lot of us out there that are contracted cities. We don't have a fleet. We have no opportunity to come in and change out a fleet or to provide a charging station, unless we're doing it for the public. There's still a lot of interest to have some local funds to do a certain kind of program. That's why we were starting to say, well are there other opportunities to leverage? Even if it's smaller. Does the COG make sense? Maybe have a simple checkbox form that goes to the various folks. There's a lot of ways to spend this money because obviously there's an interest and obviously there's a lot of organizations that are big enough to where value is added. That's the interesting dichotomy of this Local Partnership program that we have been living with for all this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Jason Lewis, SoCalGas commented, this is just my re-creation of public data. Pardon me if it's wrong, it's my mistake. I did what I could from various public records of what you spent the money on for the FYs 2016-18 Local Government Partnership and then the second page is the Carl Moyer Infrastructure Program. I just want to point out that nearly 76% of the monies spent on the Natural Gas Infrastructure Program that closed was spent on municipalities. And conversely for the Carl Moyer Program, slightly less than 16% was actually allotted to municipalities for natural gas infrastructure. Just wanted to point out that there seems to be a high demand for your money. I would humbly propose it to be considered to be included as a part of the Local Government Program moving forward because the data supports that this is a very popular program.

Mr. Gorski replied, first of all, the MSRC has been funding natural gas infrastructure for at least a quarter century. It's one of those things where the MSRC is trying to balance their obligations to achieve air quality benefits through emission reduction. The MSRC strategy for the past few years--and the data bears out that it's been successful--has been to wean entities off of public assistance for mature technologies. There are now companies that have as their business enterprise to go out and sell you a natural gas fueling system, provide fuel, maintenance and do it in a manner that meets your business case obligations, and makes it financially feasible for you. So, the question is, if there are companies that successfully implement alternative fuel natural gas refueling stations as a business, a very successful profit-making business, how much longer do they need public assistance? So, the MSRC for the past few years has been reducing the amount of funding which is available for a given station, with the hope that they negotiate their fuel purchase contract or another kind of business model with someone who does this for a living. This has been done successfully because if you look at the number of applications that the

MSRC has been receiving annually, whether we gave a station \$500,000 or \$200,000, that number has not changed. They're having to take our \$200,000 and then they'll figure out a way to fund their balance of it, working with a business enterprise. So, the question is, at what point do we drop that number again? What we're not seeing is entities not coming to the table. But what we are seeing is the MSRC funding has been reduced to get the same benefit for less investment. We do have technologies coming on board which are a little newer, hydrogen for example, and to a large extent electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) that at this point, maybe need a little more assistance. But the MSRC has a strong track record and I'm not suggesting that the MSRC has abandoned natural gas by any means because everyone realizes that the number one air pollution reduction strategy for the goods movement sector today really still is natural gas. In the future that will change, it will be hydrogen, it will be battery electric, but today it's natural gas. Funding heavy-duty vehicles which operate on near-zero emission engines with their associated enabling infrastructure is still something that most likely MSRC will continue. But again, we want to right-size the investment and make sure that the MSRC isn't overfunding something. And now that there is Carl Moyer funding available, we need to make sure that the MSRC and the Carl Moyer Program aren't stepping on each other's toes and providing an increment of funding which is greater than what they actually need and just making a more profitable business case for the fuel providers. I'm not trying to say anything disparaging about them, they're an essential component of this overall structure. It's a complex equation that you really need to study. The MSRC has been doing this and we need to continue to do this and we need to continue the dialogue with all the stakeholders. We want you to stay in business but want to make sure that the public money isn't being used to an extent in which you might be unjustly enriched or we're simply throwing too much money at the problem. We're going to continue to do the math and figure out what's the right level of investment for the MSRC.

MSRC Member Vicki White commented, for the Carl Moyer Program information that's presented here, it may not be a good comparison just because last year was the first year we offered infrastructure funding under the program. There was actually a legislative change in 2016 that enabled this. Then ARB didn't have the calculation methodology in place in 2017. So, last year was our first year offering it and that's partly why you see the lower percentage here. I don't think it's a good comparison with the MSRC's many years of funding infrastructure projects. I do think we should coordinate closely with the MSRC for the next funding cycle because we're anticipating the demand under Carl Moyer for infrastructure funding will continue to go up as we implement more years of the program.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay commented, if you want to look at a long chart, even 10 years, you would see natural gas has been funded at a much more significant level than it's funded today. And there's a curve and it says other technologies are coming but natural gas as a percentage of funding levels has declined. The county has the second biggest pot of money for AB 2766. This past year we had \$1.367 million of match. There was a proposal for a couple of CNG stations from one of our departments and that would have sucked more than half of the available funding from the rest of the county's diverse needs. Understand, we have 16,000 units in our combined fleets. So, if you took half of that and put it into just a couple of fueling stations, it would have really denied a lot of other departments a smaller piece of something. So, that department went out separately for the MSRC's CNG funding. That way they didn't get as much but they were willing to forego what they could have received, so that everybody else benefited. I think there's never going to be enough money to do all the projects we want to and it's just about working together.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Jason Lewis, SoCalGas, commented, taking everything that Ray said, none of it I disagree with, I just wanted to point out that the reason why I'm focusing mostly on the municipalities. I saw this being hand in glove with some of the comments I have heard in discussions at previous meetings about the Local Government Program. I've included the counties on there and apologies to the AQMD, I'm just using the data to show that Carl Moyer is competitive as opposed to first-come, first-served. So remember a lot of the municipalities we talked about with their limited resources may not be able to apply on a competitive basis. I just wanted to point this out because there seems to be a lot of demand and I included the counties because I know that one of the discussions was this distribution of resources over the whole air district and the handout shows a diverse application process through this program. As I was thinking about these programs, some of the lessons learned from the natural gas program fit very nicely with some of the problems that were perceived in the Local Government Program.

Agenda Item #14 – MSRC-TAC Discussions Regarding the FYs 2018-20 Work Program

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York reported a couple key points, one is incentives and the other one is never having enough. I've heard a lot of discussions today about trying to educate on some of these other programs and incentives. But if you remember as we were wrapping up from our lunch workshop with the MSRC and we came back and said do we have an opportunity to do something different, something synergistic, something that could take the not enough that we have and actually leverage it to something that could incentivize a bigger cooler program? We talked about when electric vehicles first came out and how this group was part of that leading charge to kick us into where we are now, so that people don't need an incentive to buy an electric vehicle anymore. People really don't need an incentive to put solar on their house and people don't need an incentive to change out their streetlights to LED. All of these incentives have a life. So, the challenge to the group is to keep in mind that we have a phenomenal opportunity. We have an opportunity where this group can present to the MSRC, coupled with the support staff, to offer a more robust program, a three-year work plan. A three-year work plan with a bigger pot of money and a big chunk of that money could be set aside. For example, let's say if you did three programs and we did \$21 million last year for a Local Partnership Program, \$21 million multiplied by three is \$63 - \$70 million. There's clearly an interest in local programs and you guys started with a committee and I think there are some good lessons learned as to how we can still meet some of the needs of some of the agencies that have that. But maybe this is our time to say that need is waning but then maybe take a big pot like \$50 million and now go up to the state level and go to all these different programs and say we're ready to stand before you with \$50 million to synergize and we bring our electeds and we bring those folks and those think tanks together. This group has an opportunity, even in a subcommittee, to help work with the MSRC and field information back and forth to be able to provide something like that is just outside of the box and different and bring us to the next level. So, that's a challenge before the group.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, responded, it's a real opportunity. I would advocate for doing a three-year Work Program for a couple reasons. One is practical and that is our program is on a fiscal year basis which ends June 30th. January is done, we have a few more months and knowing how much time it really takes to do things, we're going to be on top of our next year. To amplify, \$50 million may not be all the money but it's a lot of money. I cannot help but think that if we work with our sister agencies, the District, ARB and the CEC, walked in with our

elected officials and said look, we're putting \$50 million on the table, what can you do to help us leverage that money to serve your interests? I would think that, given all the pots of money out there, someone would want to pick that up and say we can help leverage that \$50 million if you can abide by some of our requirements. Go to the MSRC and recommended a Three-Year Work Program, tell them why and that this is an opportunity to do a big splash program and also have money reserved for some of our more stay the course programs. We received feedback from the MSRC leadership that they wanted us to be innovative while still doing some of the things which have been done in the past where need remains. Having a larger pot money, gives you the ability to do both. You could do, on a more limited basis, the stuff that we've been doing for some time, provided that you always do a reassessment to make sure it's still relevant. And also work with established stakeholders, have something which is meaningful and do what I think is the next thing. First of all, secure the commitment from the MSRC to have a three-year Work Program. John Kampa, Financial Analyst can give us the value of that. It's a big number. Secondly, get the MSRC on board that they will do today what they did 20 years ago. And that is, we put them on an airplane to Sacramento, we put them on an airplane to Detroit to sit down with stakeholders and say we will put this much money forward for a program that you're interested in but what are you going to give us in return? And I think if we had our electeds go to Sacramento to work with the sister agencies, I would think that it is feasible that we could secure some kind of funding commitment. If we can't, then that's fine, but I think we wouldn't be doing our job if we didn't try, at least from staff's perspective. The programs that the MSRC is doing are of interest of others. The state agencies are interested in publicly accessible electric vehicle charging, near zero-emission vehicles for goods movement, all those types of programs. This is where air pollution is primarily.

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York commented, that kind of covers this whole public partnership kind of content. It sounds kind of exciting to me. I want to get some feedback and I want to understand if we go this route, what would our role be, how would we help carve that, would there be a subcommittee or would it be this whole group as a whole as we walk through this and dialogue back and forth to the MSRC on this concept. Then a portion of that program will still be able to feed and serve the existing needs of local partnerships. There's enough of an interest to have that as a consideration.

John Kampa, Financial Analyst commented, as of today, with the funds that come in annually, we're already projecting we're at \$47.4 million available for the FYs 2018-20 Work Program. We get about \$16.4 million a year annually. That \$47 million is made up of things over the years, that have come back to our fund balance. So, at that point, we're \$64 million for just MSRC funds. Back in the day, our Work Program was \$14 million in total. We can still fund those other programs and still have a lot of funding available for the Local Government Match.

MSRC-TAC Member Andy Silva commented, the Strategic Growth Council administers a lot of the GHG money. A few years ago, they created the Transformative Climate Communities Program, which is a significant pot of money. They wanted to go big, \$70 million went to the City of LA, \$35 million went to Fresno, and the third player to be named later. Strategically, our county got together and said let's not have all the jurisdictions fighting over a small amount, we got our electeds including, senator, assemblywoman, and the other electeds to look into putting all our efforts into one proposal not competing. As a result, Ontario scored the other \$35 million dollars. Regional cooperation is a big part of that. If you're looking for something transformative, Sacramento is receptive to that and would probably embrace that.

Mr. Gorski added, maybe we need to sit down with Mr. Nastri and see if this something that the AQMD is interested in partnering with the MSRC on. If we're bringing \$70 million dollars to the table, I think that District probably will be interested in that.

MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo commented, I am excited about the three-year Work Program; it's a good thing to do something big. I'm wondering whether or not we should come up with some kind of an initial idea that we want to focus on.

Mr. York commented, if we had \$64 million and \$50 million went to a Match Program that still leaves \$14 million. If you look at what we allocated last year--\$21.1 million--and we spent \$15 million, having \$14 million is almost like we're able to do the last two-year Work Program except it's going to be over three years. So, it would be a little bit of a weaning but it's not as harsh and then we still have this opportunity to a pretty big splash. So I think those are kind of the numbers that are on the table.

Ms. Cardoso commented, what programs are we talking about continuing and what exactly is the new program that we're talking about? Mr. Gorski replied the programs that we're continuing are to be determined. As far as what the new program could be, well, there are a lot of opportunities there. Basically, 2020 would be the year where this actually happens. 2019 is almost gone. It takes a long time to pull these programs together and secure the funding. For example, for the South Coast region, there could be a really broad-based EV Readiness Program, if you wanted. This would be looking at a lot of infrastructure, \$100 million worth of infrastructure and vehicles including near-zero for goods movement. You could really do a program which is getting the area ready for what the state keeps telling us is our future. For a big splash program, it's the program to get this area ready for EVs, putting together the mix of infrastructure and vehicles to do that. Mr. York commented it kind of does match up to where we spent our money in the last program, 80+ percent went to EV charging. We've been hearing at every one of these retreats for years about the importance of infrastructure, we're hearing it at the state level and at all these incentive programs. Even if the monies were maybe not as available to the locals, that's okay because what we would now be providing is a bigger, more robust, steadier program. It'll be easier for the locals working within their local land use control to provide them the connections to this bigger system. Ms. Cardoso commented, I like this structure a little better where we're not just taking all of the funding and putting it into a brand-new program. This is a nice compromise, where we're able to continue some or most of the existing programs and then come up with this big picture contribution.

Mr. Teebay commented, one issue that I have is what's the endgame? What's the target? Recently the state allocated \$200 million over a period of years for charging and in this region, they allocated \$29.4 million, but it's all for DC fast charging hubs that are available 24/7. Mr. York replied a few meetings ago we talked about what would this plan be, what would this infrastructure look like? Is some of this actually developing a plan, so we really see something truly in the ground not just throwing money away at the air? What about a regional plan in the South Coast Air Quality Management District, so that when we're done, we can say: you see that, that's what we did. I hope that's the end game. That's probably what this group would want to feel comfortable. Mr. Teebay continued, for EV charging, you also need to know where you have constraints in the system, and where there's available power grid. And you need to manage that load because if everybody plugs in at the same time, the rest of the block will go down. Mr.

Silva commented, if you talk about infrastructure, you need to talk about upstream infrastructure because we got killed on EV charging stations because our transformers are 80 years old. It will blow out the whole block if you plug in a Volt. Depending on what direction we decide to go, we need to look at the upstream infrastructure and get the utilities involved. We also need to have a discussion as to whether we are paying contractors to do cement work or are we looking at something bigger and broader, more strategic planning?

Ms. Chan commented, I really like the idea of doing something transformative, but I like the Major Event Program. I realize the air quality benefits aren't there, but I also think it's a great incentive for people to try Metrolink for the first time, especially in our region where the ridership isn't as high. But these events could be a great incentive for people to try it for the first time and then maybe adopt that kind of behavior for other trips in the future. Those kinds of benefits aren't really reflected in the air quality analysis. Mr. York replied of this Local Partnership Program; this may actually play into this. It could be an eligible project that the Local Partnership Program comes up with. I'm sure that's a possible discussion to have and that could be a competitive project amongst some of the other categories. Is that feasible without having to create all these other subcommittees? Mr. Gorski replied, it's possible but there needs to be a more in-depth discussion relative to the Event Center Program, especially as it pertains to rail. Mr. York added if its ridership has been low, and this is maybe a short-term incentive because there's a unique type of opportunity. That's something that I think could be discussed in that program. As we've been talking in the past, maybe we're not getting the benefit from it and maybe the incentive needs to be something where we get a better benefit.

Mr. Luo commented, for the Vision 2020, how will that work? Do we need to bring in a consultant? Mr. Gorski replied, this is something that's going to take time to really flesh out. We need to know what we want, how we are going to pay for it, and how you're going to do it. That's going to be the course of the discussion, where we're going to say what resources do we need, do we need to bring in experts from the outside, the answer is probably going to be yes. I'm not suggesting it has to be this broad based EV readiness, it could be something else that they've come up with but the process is going to have to be the same: get the MSRC on board to do something a little bolder. Let's use three years of money and let's go and try to leverage this money through all the other available resources, know what we want and then try to put together the process for getting to that endpoint.

Mr. York proposed a motion that the TAC would recommend that the MSRC consider a three-year Work Program with a large incentive program that we would save for in about the \$50 million range. They'll have to work through the details, but a big chunk of that three-year Work Program would be identified for an incentivized leadership or leverage type program with the balance working on local programs and some of the existing programs that we currently have. They're similar to the services that we provided in the last year. If we can make that as a motion and then it gets to the MSRC, if they agree to it great. Then we'll roll up our sleeves and we'll start figuring this out. If the answer is no, then they'll direct us to come back.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC CHAIR DAN YORK, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO ADOPT A THREE-YEAR FYS 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM.

Ms. Cardoso commented, I'm still very confused by this. The \$14 million that we're talking about was that the Work Program for just the Local Program Partnership? What was the funding level? I'm supportive of what MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chen mentioned. We definitely want to see the Event Program considered. I'm comfortable with the funding levels. I would like to see where we were and what's being proposed for each of the funding programs and then the other thing is the large incentive Program. Maybe this isn't part of the motion, but whenever you start a new funding program, you have to start with the goal. The subcommittee is going to have to identify what the specific goals are. Mr. Gorski replied, there are programmatic goals and technical goals. Right now, we're really speaking on the programmatic side. We know that where we are temporally, that we're almost in February, and we have a two-year Work Program of which one year is almost gone. We have real benefits to be derived from having a three-year Work Program--having more money. So, from a programmatic perspective, our goals right now are to secure the three-year commitment from the MSRC and then secondly to leverage that money. That in and of itself is a goal. Instead of having a \$60 million program, to have a \$100,000,000 program. To do that, we're going to have to know in parallel from a technical side, what we want to spend that money on. But we know where the money is, and we know what that money is targeting. There are some big categories that would logically be the element of a big program, infrastructure being one of them. Ms. Cardoso commented, if everything is channeled through the Local Program or the Local Partnership Program, I don't believe that all of the same entities can apply through that program, that could apply through the other program, so that that would be a challenge. Mr. Gorski replied, we may come up with something totally different at the end of the day. It may be an MSRC program that has a lot of participation for local governments and other stakeholders. This is a clean sheet of paper to a large extent. There are a few things we do know about; we know that there is advocacy to reprise some programs which the MSRC has done in the past. We need to revisit those, just to make sure that at the end of the day, the MSRC can demonstrate that there was an effectiveness, but secondly given the magnitude of the funding we have, I think it'd be just a natural to want to do things which are mutual interest of both the state, the local agencies and the District. We have to recognize that there's not going to be instant gratification here. This is going to be important.

Mr. Luo commented, realistically to come up with this, roughly how much time are we talking about? I share the concern about any existing programs. So, if it would take like one year to come up with that idea, it would be 2020. Maybe, while we explore the ideas, we can still maintain the current two-year Work Program and then for future transition to a three-year Work Program. You can address existing programs' concerns because all of a sudden you cut all those off. I can see there is a real concern with that. This may be an approach you want to consider.

Ms. White commented there are a lot of opportunities, although it's complex to leverage funds from existing programs. There's a lot to that, it's like a whole separate analysis with the funds you have, what's current. There are a lot of timing issues and requirements associated with those programs. Maybe a consultant can do that best. As manager over South Coast AQMD Incentive Programs, I'm happy to help in that regard. It may be that MSRC identifies maybe one of these programs to have a successful leveraging. Is there a potential to actually revisit the MSRC legislation to see if there can be some increased funding within that process? Mr. Gorski replied, we're not necessarily looking for the match legislatively, but we are looking for the agencies which have control of their money to agree to partner with us in bringing some of their money to the table. But to answer your question, it certainly has been considered and discussed and to a certain extent analyzed--it's complex. Ms. White replied, we had done that under the Carl Moyer

Program, and it was successful. Part of that is talking about the benefits of the program over time and also some of those arguments are very true today. To get to the zero-, near-zero technologies or even cleaner technologies in the off-road sector, the costs are much higher. I don't know if those arguments have been made recently in these contexts with the existing and new technologies we're looking at. Mr. Gorski replied, we have. It was put on the table last year. It's complex and some of the complexity is that the AQMD is embarking upon gaining legislative authority with a ballot initiative and there's some concern of having too many tax/fee increases at the same time. The question is, would it not make sense--given that the mission is even becoming more important because of the deadlines which have been placed upon this region through federal and state requirements--wouldn't it be smart to bring everyone back to full strength simply by increasing the MSRC's funding such that it had an amount which had the same effectiveness as it did a quarter century ago? From a logical perspective, that seems to make a lot of sense. The only thing you're asking is to have the same air quality improvement effectiveness as was originally intended by the legislature. The problem of course is that anytime you open a piece of legislation, you are putting yourself in a position of risk to lose it all. You never know how it can backfire, because people don't like taxes and fees. And it's complicated this time because of the legislative maneuvering that the South Coast AQMD is currently doing relative to their "Vision 2020 Program", which is to have a sales tax to generate money to implement the South Coast's 2016 AQMP. If we have two initiatives at the same time, would it create a situation where one's success may lead to another's demise, or vice versa? It's still all being discussed, it's still on the table. Ms. White added maybe increased funding for MSRC can somehow be negotiated if we're successful in getting the sales tax. This all is in the context of us not looking very good this year with meeting our attainment in 2020-23.

Ms. Cardoso commented I looked at the existing funding programs and I know we were just given the information on the local program. It looks like \$15.3 million was awarded in the last two-year cycle. And then for the Major Event Centers \$4.7 million was awarded in the previous cycle. And then the Infrastructure, I think this is the kind of program that would naturally roll into this new program was about \$5 million. There were the near-zero engine incentives, which I also think roll into the new program, and that was \$5.8 million, but that two-year cycle we had \$20 million between the Major Event Centers and the Local Partnership. I would probably be more supportive of a motion that put more funding towards that and then if you wanted to have some kind of leveraging incorporated into those programs naturally as part of what the subcommittee does, matching with other funding sources. But \$14 million and \$50 million, it seems like it's not a good balance based on the past two-year funding needs. I would like to see closer to \$30 million/\$34 million.

Mr. York commented, we have a motion and a second and we've got good feedback. I'm going to propose a modified recommendation and if it takes a second we'll go to vote. I understand what you're asking is for is dollars and cents. I still believe that I want to get out of this status quo. So, we spent \$20 million on Local Programs and Major Event Centers in the past, and I understand that there's interest for those major events and we're going to have folks who are going to vote for that. I'm going to modify my motion firstly to recommend to the MSRC that they consider a three-year Work Program. Secondly, the recommendation would be that they direct the MSRC-TAC to spend 2019 to develop a programmatic identified incentive program that will mirror some of the priorities that have been included in past Work Programs. So I'm not asking for a dollar amount at this point, Ms. Cardoso commented that the last one includes the Major Event Center. Mr. York replied all the current things that we have, that they will give

us some directions. We're telling them that we think we have a phenomenal opportunity and staff will present them.

Mr. Gorski added, if there's interest for a Major Event Program, I would suggest that the action include forming the subcommittee to discuss it. That one is going to take some time.

Mr. York commented, I want to do what's good for the group and I am not real hot on the Major Event Center Program. So what I'd like to do is complete this vote. And then if somebody in the group wants to come back and make a motion for a Major Event Center Program, I think that would be fine and we can do that as part of still being consistent with our discussion over programmatic issues. Ms. Cardoso commented, I'm supportive, I just want to clarify number three because you did specify Local Partnership Program, which is one of the four existing programs under that third recommendation, that you are not just referencing a Local Partnership Program, that you mean all of the original four. Mr. York replied what I'm recommending is not bringing forward programs as usual. That's what I really need you to clearly understand and I know there's passion for each one of those four programs and there may be elements of each one of those four programs as we carve this out. That's what I'm recommending. MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee asked, do you actually have a vision for how this money will be spent, if we are to go to Sacramento. Mr. Gorski said, we've kind of briefly been talking about it today. Mr. York resumed Item 2 of my recommendation is that this committee spends 2019 to develop the program so we'll all be part of it. Mr. Lee commented let me clarify my question a little better, meaning if we even put forth a motion to get rid of some of these programs or to lump sum of these programs, we should have some type of idea. So instead of putting that motion in front, let's take a step back to think about what type of vision that we might have for the future. And then make a motion on that and if we were to eliminate some of the programs or so forth. Mr. York replied that's fair and out of realness, MSRC is looking for us to give some kind of direction. We're wanting to see if they're even interested in a large scale program. We do need to develop that vision further. We've given you some ideas, we've talked about a bigger infrastructure, we've talked about planning programmatic things that are going to deliver something at the end game and that's what I think we get to flesh out. If they're not interested in this, then this is all moot. Instead of us spending our whole year trying to get past this potential that we're throwing out there. If this potential doesn't get through this TAC, it will never even get to MSRC. If we get it up to the MSRC and they say that's all great, but we have different ideas, they're going to direct back down to us to meet. It could be we're comfortable with the existing four programs and that's what you want us to bring back to you. But see what I'm trying to force now is to get something up to them to get clear direction, so we don't spend all of 2019 without doing any work. I want us to get to work and I want us to work on something that we're proud of and that's going to really make something significant. The motion that was seconded is that we're going to recommend to the MSRC that: (1) consider a three-year Program; (2) that they direct the TAC to spend 2019 to develop this programmatic incentive program; and (3) this is one that we're going to share with the MSRC, that this TAC still has interest in elements of the four prior years' programs.

Mr. Gorski added, you have three years' big pot of money. Do you want us to take some of that money to see if we can leverage it? In parallel, we could look at doing some prior programs or potentially new programs. Mr. York commented, that's three. I've taken the liberty to use your last three meetings to try to sell this pitch. If it doesn't go today, I'm done. I won't pitch it again. If it's something that you want to do, we will bring it to the MSRC. If they don't want to do it,

then I'm done on that one too, and we'll get back to business as usual. Ms. Cardoso added just for purposes of the minutes and the record when you first said it you said elements of prior years' programs and Ray just said potentially new programs for item #3. I want to make sure everyone is voting on the same thing. Mr. York replied, so to clarify item #3, I'll change my motion to be elements of the prior programs or any other new items.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC CHAIR DAN YORK, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND: (1) CONSIDER A THREE-YEAR PROGRAM; (2) DIRECT THE TAC TO DEVELOP PROGRAMMATIC INCENTIVE PROGRAM; AND (3) CONTINUE EVALUATING ELEMENTS OF THE PRIOR YEARS' PROGRAMS OR POTENTIAL NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS.

ACTION: These recommendations will be included on the next MSRC agenda for consideration.

OTHER BUSINESS

MSRC-TAC Andy Silva shared breaking news regarding the tax measures that SCAQMD is pitching. They are looking for an author. Dr. Burke said they have been talking to some legislators about that. Yesterday at the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, they didn't vote because it wasn't on the agenda, but they will vote next month to oppose that. This morning at the SCAQMD Legislative Committee, RCTC showed up and based on their platform, their concern was they want to make sure that if this does go forward, it won't pass without two-thirds vote within Riverside County. One of the concerns was that if we have one sales tax measure, it will compete against our potential transportation tax.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING
ADJOURNED AT 3:33 P.M.

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