



**MOBILE SOURCE AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION REVIEW COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020 MEETING MINUTES
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond, Bar, CA 91765 - Conference Room CC-8**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

(Chair) Larry McCallon, representing SBCTA
Ben Benoit, representing SCAQMD
Michael Carter (Alt.), representing California Air Resources Board
Dolores Roybal Saltarelli (Alt.), representing Regional Rideshare Agency (via v/c)
Meghan Sahli-Wells (Alt.), representing SCAG (via v/c)
Tim Shaw (Alt.), representing OCTA
Steve Veres, representing Los Angeles County MTA (via v/c)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

(Vice-Chair) Greg Winterbottom, representing OCTA
Brian Berkson, representing RCTC
Jack Kitowski, representing California Air Resources Board
Rex Richardson, representing SCAG

MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kelly Lynn, representing SBCTA
Rongsheng Luo, representing SCAG

OTHERS PRESENT:

J.R. Deshazo, UCLA Luskin Center
Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas
Andrés Narvaéz, LA Public Works
Miguel Ramirez-Corrye, City of Eastvale
Ric Teano, OCTA

SOUTH COAST AQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS

Leah Alfaro, MSRC Contracts Assistant
Maria Allen, Secretary
Naveen Berry, Asst. Deputy Executive Officer
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Administrative Liaison
Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor-Contractor
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel
John Kampa, Financial Analyst
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator
Paul Wright, Information Technology Specialist

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll call was taken at the start of the meeting. The following members and alternates were present: BEN BENOIT, MICHAEL CARTER, LARRY MCCALLON, DOLORES ROYBAL SALTARELLI, TIM SHAW, MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MARK YAMARONE.

- STATUS REPORT

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator reported there are highlights from the Governor's Draft State Budget. The first public hearing was held on CARB's Advanced Clean Trucks Rule in December. In February, CARB's going to hold their ZEV Workshop, that is going to be used to set actual vehicle target numbers for the fleets. There is going to be a second hearing on the rule in May. The comment period is open on SCAG's Connect SoCal Plan, this is for more than 4,000 transportation projects. Comments are due by January 24th.

MSRC Alternate Dolores Roybal Saltarelli stated that she does not have any financial interest in Item #8 but is required to identify that she is employed by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which is involved in this item.

MSRC Alternate Tim Shaw stated that he does not have any financial interest in Item #1 but is required to identify that he is a member of the Board of Directors of the Orange County Transportation Authority, which is involved in this item.

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 9)

Receive and Approve Items

Agenda Item #1 – Summary of Final Reports by MSRC Contractors

The MSRC received and approved three final report summaries this month, as follows:

- Rialto Unified School District, Contract #MS14076, to construct a new public access CNG station
- Orange County Transportation Authority, Contract #MS16029, for TCM Partnership Program – OC Bikeways
- Orange County Transportation Authority, Contract #MS18005, for Clean Fuel Bus Service to the OC Fair

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND
SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, UNDER
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #9,
THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE FINAL REPORTS
LISTED ABOVE.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI,
SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC staff will file the final reports and release any retention on the contracts.

Agenda Item #3 – Financial Report on AB 2766 Discretionary Fund

A financial report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for December 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED
BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, UNDER APPROVAL OF
CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #9, THE MSRC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL
REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING DECEMBER 2019.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI,
SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: No further action is required.

For Approval – As Recommended

Agenda Item #4 – Consider Two-Month Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14030 (\$425,000 – Bicycle Racks, Outreach and Education)

The County requests a two-month contract term extension to procure and install supplemental lighting at 47 of the bicycle racks sites. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A TWO-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT # ML14030.
AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.
NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #5 – Consider Modified Statement of Work for the City of Bellflower, Contract #ML12091 (\$100,000 – Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

The City requests to increase the number of stations to be installed from five to eleven and to install all stations at the new City parking lot, with no change to the project cost. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A MODIFIED STATEMENT OF WORK FOR THE CITY OF BELLFLOWER, CONTRACT #ML12091.
AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.
NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #6 – Consider Modified Statement of Work and Nine-Month Term Extension for the City of Covina, Contract #ML18156 (\$63,800 – Purchase Four Light-Duty Zero-emission Vehicles and Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

The City requests to substitute one dual-port charging station for the two charging stations specified in the contract. Additionally, the City requests a nine-month contract term extension due to unforeseen delays in the delivery of the vehicles. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A MODIFIED STATEMENT OF WORK AND A NINE-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR THE CITY OF COVINA, CONTRACT #ML18156.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #7 – Consider Eighteen-Month Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14027 (\$500,000 – Install New CNG Stations in Canyon Country and La Puente)

The County requests an eighteen-month contract term extension due to equipment order and construction delays by the vendor. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE AN EIGHTEEN-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14027.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #8 – Consider Three-Year Term Extension for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), Contract #MS14057 (\$1,250,000 – Implement Various Signal Synchronization Projects)

Metro requests a three-year term extension. Contracting issues with the consultant for the San Gabriel Valley Corridor Project delayed the start date for design. Additionally, subsequent to the original award, it became necessary for the individual cities in the project areas to contribute a share of the project costs. This in turn required increased coordination which has delayed the design processes. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A THREE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO), CONTRACT #MS14057.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #9 – Consider Decreased Scope of Work and Value for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14096 (\$150,000 – San Gabriel Bike Trail Underpass Improvements)

The County has determined that the tunnel lighting component of the project requires them to secure an Army Corps of Engineers permit for the installation of the solar panel poles on top of the San Gabriel River Levee. Due to the time necessary to obtain such a permit, and other alternatives investigated taking just as long or longer, the County requests to remove the tunnel lighting from the project and reduce the contract value by up to \$75,814. THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A DECREASED SCOPE OF WORK AND VALUE FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14096.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW, SAHLI-WELLS.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

ACTION CALENDAR (Item 10 through 13)

FYs 2014-16 WORK PROGRAM

[MSRC Member Steve Veres arrived at 2:07 p.m., during the discussion of item #10.]

Agenda Item #10 – Consider Modified Statement of Work for the City of Eastvale, Contract #ML16040 (\$110,000 – Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Eastvale. They were awarded \$110,000 under MSRC's FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program to install 20 Level II charging stations. The City indicates that their residents have expressed a strong desire to have those be Level III charging stations rather than Level II charging stations. The City would like to substitute the installation of 12 Level III stations for the 20 Level II stations, with no change in the contract value. The City has not decided yet what specific type of stations it is that they want to install but one of the options that is under consideration is the installation of Tesla Superchargers. Tesla chargers are only usable by Tesla vehicles. There are two other types of DC fast charging that are in use in North America, CHAdeMO and CCS. All the major DC fast charging manufacturers do offer multi-standard units that provide the ability to charge both CHAdeMO and CCS from the same unit. Tesla vehicles are

capable of using CHAdeMO via an adapter. The TAC considered this request at their January 9th meeting and several of the TAC members expressed concerns about using public funding for a proprietary system that wouldn't be available to the owners of the vehicles that don't have Teslas. But consideration was also given to the City's knowledge of the distinctive needs of their residents and the potential that there could be a significant project investment opportunity lost. The TAC recommended to approve the substitution of the 12 Level III chargers for the 20 Level II chargers, and that the MSRC funds could only be used for non-proprietary EVSE project components. The City could either choose to install a non-proprietary charger technology, or they could install the Tesla chargers but use the MSRC funding on other elements of the project than the charging equipment itself. This could include site work, permitting or other things surrounding the project.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon asked, what is driving them to want to install Tesla supercharger stations? Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor responded, this was based on prior conversations and may not be current. We know that the City has at least made representations of some earlier discussions with Tesla and we are able to convey that Tesla might be willing to bring a substantial amount of money to the table on this project. The MSRC's investment is \$110,000 and the 12 Level III chargers are going to have an investment in excess of \$1,000,000. Mr. McCallon commented, we just put in three Level III chargers at City Hall and I had to get the CHAdeMO adapter for my Tesla and it works fine.

MSRC Alternate Tim Shaw commented, for clarification, in the Eastvale letter, the 20 Level II charging stations were to be at four different locations. Can I assume that the Level III chargers would all go to the Gateway Plaza and the other three locations, they may install them but they won't use MSRC money. MS. Ravenstein replied, that is right.

MSRC Alternate Meghan Sahli-Wells commented, I like the idea of Level III chargers because it is more likely that people will use them. The proprietary idea of it does trouble me, especially because in Culver City, Tesla has installed their own chargers because they sell cars. I am a bit surprised that the City would be involved at all when this private company could not make a private deal anywhere.

MSRC Member Ben Benoit commented, I have similar concerns only because my belief is you can still go to the Tesla website, if you're a private entity owner or private shopping center owner, and put in your address and if Tesla wants a supercharger in your area, they will come to you and be happy to take your 12 or 24 parking spots and do that. I have never heard of a City entity having to interject some money into that process. I think it is fine if they want to do Level III chargers, but CHAdeMO type chargers that are more compatible. From what I am seeing on the American market, that is most likely the standard that we will be seeing coming forward. That is what is on the Kona that I drive from South Coast AQMD and a lot of the other non-Tesla cars for Level III charging. I would be supportive of that, but I would have trouble spending money for Tesla. Mr.

McCallon commented, in this particular case, it sounds like the City and the developer of this shopping center are going to have a substantial investment by Tesla, probably an outlet or something like that. I would hate to deprive the City of that private investment, if we do not allow them to put in whatever they want to put in, as long as they do not use our money for the private chargers.

Mr. Shaw commented, just to be clear, the money from MSRC would fund what exactly? Mr. Gorski responded, the MSRC would mostly be doing civil work, any type of enabling technology for the site, but not actual proprietary equipment.

Ms. Sahli-Wells commented, are all of the chargers going to be for Tesla or will there be other kind as well? Mr. McCallon responded, If I understand it correctly the City has not really made the decision yet on what they are going to do. I would assume that there would be a mixture.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Miguel Ramirez-Corrye, City of Eastvale commented, there has not been a determination whether it will be Tesla. Tesla was one of the companies that is interested in coming in with it. We are working with Lewis, the developer on this and the chargers would be at Eastvale Gateway. As far as we know, they would be installing Level III only at that shopping center, but they are developing another center where they will have Level II stations because there is going to be a hotel at that center.

ON MOTION BY MSRC ALTERNATE MICHAEL CARTER, AND
SECONDED BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, MSRC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE WITH CONTINGENCIES: 1)
APPROVAL OF THE SUBSTITUTION OF 12 LEVEL III CHARGERS
FOR 20 LEVEL II CHARGERS AND 2) THAT MSRC FUNDS ONLY
BE USED FOR NONPROPRIETARY EVSE PROJECT COMPONENTS.
AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW,
SAHLI-WELLS, VERES.
NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

FYs 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM

Agenda Item #11 – Consider \$15,079 Contract Value Increase for the Better World Group Advisors, Contract #MS21002 (\$250,000 – Programmatic Outreach Services to the MSRC)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported that at the June 2019 meeting the MSRC approved a proposal from the Better World Group to perform

additional research and outreach in support of development of the FYs 2018-21 Work Program. The MSRC authorized the work at a cost not to exceed \$25,165. That was going to be met through a combination of existing funds and the allocation of an additional \$15,000. A task order was issued to authorize the work. It has not proceeded as rapidly as anticipated. This is partially because they have been working under staff's direction, and partially because some of the potential project partners' schedules have not allowed the Better World Group to move that quickly. The Better World Group's contract that the work was authorized under expired December 31, 2019. Of that original \$25,165 in the task order, \$15,079 was not expended. The Better World Group is requesting that the funding which is going to revert back to the MSRC fund be added to their new contract so that they can complete the work that they had originally been authorized to do.

John Kampa, Financial Analyst commented, this would have no fiscal impact because the encumbrance is still open and reflected on the financial statement.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon asked, the new contract allows for this type of activity to go on? Ms. Ravenstein responded, basically, most of the funding in the new contract is for specific activities, this would be for an extra activity. That is why the MSRC had authorized it in the first place. Some portions of this work would fall under the tasks in the existing contract, other portions would not. Also, even if this funding is authorized to be added to the new contract, there's still going to be a substantial balance from the old contract that would not be spent and would revert. Mr. McCallon asked, the new contract does not allow for this work to be done? Ms. Ravenstein responded, no, it does not.

ON MOTION BY MSRC ALTERNATE MICHAEL CARTER, AND
SECONDED BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, MSRC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT VALUE
INCREASE BY \$15,079 FOR THE BETTER WORLD GROUP
ADVISORS, CONTRACT #MS21002.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, MCCALLON, ROYBAL SALTARELLI, SHAW,
SAHLI-WELLS, VERES.

NOES: NONE.

ACTION: MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

Agenda Item #12 – Update on Development of UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation (Luskin Center) Report on Planning for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Investments

J.R. Deshazo, UCLA Luskin Center reported where they are in the development of two tools for electric vehicle charging infrastructure: (1) the first that's focused on multifamily housing, also known as MUDs, and (2) the other that is supporting targeting infrastructure at workplaces. The broad purpose here is that for both of these sectors, we need to be able to better target our staffing resources and our outreach and communicate that we have incentives to provide technical assistance to specific units and structures. The question is, can we identify in a more targeted way, the promising MUDs and workplaces that are either in need of infrastructure or whose users are likely to purchase plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) in the near future? We are really focused on providing a set of tools that would help regional planners. Both of these tools will be available in a couple of weeks.

As many of you are aware, we have experienced really rapid growth in PEV adoption over the last 10 years. About 10% of all new vehicles sold are PEVs. 95% of those are currently being sold to residents who live in single family detached homes. One of the challenges is getting this infrastructure into multi-unit dwellings. One of the things that we would like to be able to do is use our scarce staffing resources to provide outreach to the MUDs where there are future prospective PEV residents. What we have done is develop a tool that helps us target those MUDs with residents that who would be likely to purchase PEVs in the future if they had charging on site. The way that we forecast this, is we now have 10 years of data on the types of people who live in single-family homes that purchase PEVs, and we can predict with a lot of accuracy where PEVs are going to be bought now.

There is not a lot of mystery in terms of which communities and even which census tracts are going to have rapid rates of growth of PEVs. We have taken that information and we have basically distilled it into it a tool that predicts, at the building level, where people are more likely to purchase PEVs. We have this propensity to purchase variable that we can apply to every single MUD structure in all five counties. We have normed it for counties because a big predictor is income and home value, or rental price in the case of renters.

Basically, this tool will let you zero in on any community that you want within a five-county area. We have done this calculation for each of them. It should enable us to target property owners and residents of these structures. And then it also can be used by prospective developers if they want to understand what the likely PEV demand is going to be as they develop new MUD properties.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon asked, is the tool being made available to people or is it going to be just UCLA? Mr. Deshazo replied the tool is going to be hosted on SCAG's existing website, so that will give everyone access to it. We have already made arrangements for them to host it and they have agreed to maintain it. This analysis will be

good for about five to six years before residential patterns change enough that you might have to redo it.

Mr. Deshazo continued, one of the areas of relative success has been getting chargers into workplaces, but we still have many drivers who cannot charge at work who would like to. The second tool will identify the workplace areas. We have been able to calculate how many chargers a workplace community has. We are also able to know the number of electric vehicles, and the make and model of each electric vehicle, that drives to that workplace area. We can actually estimate the state of charge of their batteries and then can compare how much electricity they need either to complete that trip or to return home for every vehicle in that area. Then we can compare that to the number of chargers that are currently in that area and we can identify the gap between the two. The bigger the gap, the more electric vehicle miles traveled which could be accomplish if additional chargers were placed in that space. The nice thing about this is it is based on actual travel behavior today. Essentially we're accounting for two types of trips: (1) you can go from your home to your work, but you run out of electricity on the way home and you have to travel the rest of the way on gasoline, and (2) you actually run out of electricity and have to travel on gas even before you get to your workplace. So, both of these tools are all about how to use your staffing resources to support MUD installations and workplace installations.

We are going to be done with this in March. We are actually done with the analysis now, but we are still trying to get it into a form that could be usable and posted online.

Mr. McCallon asked if a City can go on the SCAG website and do some planning? Mr. Deshazo responded, they could identify their top MUD structures within their jurisdictions, and they could identify workplaces that would benefit from the investment.

MSRC Alternate Michael Carter asked, did you say this would need to be updated in five years? Because I imagine in five years things are going to change quite a bit. Not sooner than five-years? Mr. Deshazo responded, the question is what's going to change between now and five-years that would affect this. There might be some additional workplaces or workplaces that are lost. There could be some movement of MUD residents and neighborhoods were changed slowly. There are certain neighborhoods, like Highland Park, which five-years from now is going to look quite different than it does today. It is gentrifying very quickly. Right now, our tool would probably identify it in terms of MUDs as promising but not super promising. Whereas in five-years, there are going to be a lot of electric vehicles in Highland Park. So, it's that kind of quick neighborhood transition that we're taking a snapshot of and for which you could do planning over the next couple of years but that's the type of change that it would need to be updated for.

Ray Gorski commented, you mentioned that SCAG was going to be maintaining it. Is there going to be as part of the maintenance on a regular basis, doing an assessment of

what the state of the technology is? For example, five years from now, it may not be uncommon to have a 600-mile range EV, in which people would not necessarily need to charge every day. Mr. Deshazo responded, not that I know of. SCAG has been super supportive of making these tools available broadly and providing PEV planning broadly. The resources needed to make these annual updates have been something that we have not really nailed down with them. Mr. Gorski asked, how difficult would it be to upgrade the technology component of this model? Mr. Deshazo responded; it would not be difficult at all. Mr. Gorski commented, maybe it can be done using another entity to do that. Mr. Deshazo replied depending on what you wanted to do, rethinking this for light-duty fleets, where 60% of them are going to have 250 miles of range, which is probably what we're looking at in the next design cycle, would be a fairly easy thing to do. And in this context, it would make MUD support even more important and would probably make workplace slightly less important. Vehicle technologies are going to change where we want to put charging stations.

MSRC Alternate Meghan Sahli-Wells commented, I want to make sure that I am understanding the basis of the analysis for MUDs. Is it economic, in other words are you saying these are the likely areas where multi-family dwellers would be able to buy these vehicles? Mr. Deshazo responded, the question that we are answering is where in the MUD space is resident demand the highest for PEVs. We are trying to avoid stranding assets. And so, what buildings could you put charging stations in where the probability that they are going to get used is the highest, that is the question we are answering. Your question is a little bit different, which is, what does it cost to put them in and are the benefits going to outweigh those costs. Ms. Sahli-Wells commented, I am wondering if you are determining that these areas are most likely to use EV's based on the economics of the people who live there. Mr. Deshazo responded, we do a breakout for MUDs; we do this a separate breakout for disadvantaged communities. If you wanted to be able to identify within disadvantaged communities where the highest demand for PEVs would be, you can do that using this tool. Your question might be getting at this fact, which is that among new EV purchasers, income and housing value are the greatest predictors of who's going to purchase a new PEV. However, we are now at a moment where the used EV market is taking off like crazy, and we are now having to go back and predict who is buying used EVs. There is a program that is actually administered by the South Coast AQMD, the EFMP Plus Up Program, which targets those moderate- and low-income drivers in disadvantaged communities. This tool could help complement outreach to them. Ms. Sahli-Wells commented, I am just wondering how we can use the tool with an equity lens? Mr. Deshazo responded, there are a couple of ways to do it. One is to break it out by disadvantaged communities, which is what I just suggested. Just look at disadvantaged communities and say okay we are going to make an investment in disadvantaged communities, and we want to make sure we are putting chargers where they are most likely to be used within them. This tool will let you do that for MUDs. You can adapt this tool and do it for single family homes too for disadvantaged communities. The other thing that you could use this tool to do, is for the workplaces. You could look

at workplaces that needed greater investment that were just in disadvantaged communities.

ACTION: No further action is required.

Agenda Item #13 – Update on MSRC’s Regional Goods Movement Program

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, presented that back in November the MSRC launched the Market Acceleration Program, which is to target near zero, natural gas 0.02-gram trucks. This is a partnership program with the South Coast AQMD and Clean Energy. There are more opportunities to deploy near zero-emission technology and staff and the MSRC-TAC are currently putting together options which will be brought forward for your consideration over the next couple months. Specifically, there is a program that we are working on with the South Coast AQMD. It is not 100% designed yet, but we are excited about it. At the very onset of this Work Program, the MSRC gave staff some specific direction as to how the MSRC thought the near zero trucks could be deployed to support, for example, some of the independent owner-operators. We have taken all the guidance from the MSRC and tried to put that into a program structure that would target specifically those areas which the MSRC felt were most important. There are a lot of targets of opportunity for the near term deployment of zero-emission natural gas trucks. These will get quantifiable air pollution reductions in a very timely manner.

We do also understand that there is a large stakeholder contingent that wants to help move the bar towards full zero-emission technology. What we are trying to do is come up with an investment balance for the MSRC to consider. We have recently received several letters of support from regional stakeholders that are advocating that the MSRC, under the current Work Program, help implement a zero-emission truck technology demonstration. The letters have come from City of Los Angeles through the Mayor's office, the Maritime Ports, Los Angeles Metro, plus we have several from utilities, manufacturers, other technology companies, etc. There is a desire to put together a coalition/partnership and people believe that the MSRC can be a strong member of that. We're really trying to strike a balance, to bring to MSRC the ability to make immediate decisions for rapid deployment of commercially existing technology, as well as continue to work with other stakeholders on crafting a potential future project which would demonstrate zero-emissions drayage truck technology. We would like to convene a second meeting of the Zero/Near-zero Truck Working Group, probably in the mid- to late part of February. However, this would only be focused on the zero-emission component. The reason is we think we have sufficient targets of opportunity on the near-zero side that we can make that happen without having to have additional stakeholder input. We are recommending that we bring all the stakeholders together, review the individual status of some of those entities which have suggested they would like to partner with the MSRC, and see if we can find common ground. It is really to lay the groundwork for a zero-emission program that can be launched within a reasonable time frame.

For the Inland Ports category, also in November the MSRC authorized the release of a Program Opportunity Notice (PON) that was put on the street as of early December. This has had very wide scale distribution that was completed in mid-December. We sent out 3700 hard copies to warehouse distribution centers within the Inland Empire, specifically Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. This was using South Coast AQMD's database that they use in the development of their indirect source rule. In addition, there have been over 500 targeted electronic copies sent via email, and outreach to greater than 100 local governments. Your member agencies are also having their internal staff go out and try to beat the drum. They are sending this out using their own mailing lists. We are trying as hard as we can to make sure that everyone who has a potential role is aware that this program exists. Traffic over the last month has been low to moderate. We have had some contacts which are very encouraging and feel optimistic that at the end of the day this program will yield projects which are going to be highly beneficial to the Inland Empire.

The Last Mile category was the final component of the Goods Movement Program. This is the package delivery trucks and other entities which take the goods from the distribution centers to your doorstep. We are currently working very closely with SCAG and their internal goods movement staff to brainstorm options for moving forward. We selected SCAG because of their broad role within the region. Additionally, they have internal staff which have been working on this topic for quite some time. So, we are trying to utilize them as a resource. However, that is not to say there are no other stakeholders that will participate, and we are trying to seek them out and make sure that everyone is aware of that the MSRC is working towards Last Mile Program opportunities.

As far as the immediate next steps, we could put out a PON or we could put out a Request for Proposals. We could convene a Last Mile Technical Working Group, bring them to the table, see if we can brainstorm some good ideas--or we could do all the above. At this point, based upon the conversation we had yesterday, the recommendation is to wait approximately one month because SCAG is in the process of compiling, for your consideration, some potential program opportunities and we would like to take a look at those first. SCAG is continuing to engage some of the other entities. They have been working with the big package delivery companies for example, continuing to shake the trees to see if there are other companies that may want to do business. The good news is that more zero-emission product is becoming available in the Class 4 to 6 trucks. We're still always looking at this from two vantage points: (1) the technology, that is the truck/car that's delivering goods to your doorstep, and (2) looking for operational efficiency improvements to reduce VMT and emissions from less goods movement overall. It usually has an acronym called FATIS which is the Freight Advanced Technology Information System. The truth is a lot of the big companies do that already and maybe there is something that can be made available to some of the smaller entities.

A lot of these companies are doing everything they can to lower their operations cost. At this point we just do not have all the answers yet.

MSRC Alternate Michael Carter asked, given that the Ports already have their incentive type programs to get cleaner trucks and this is reflected in gate fees, for example, how does the MSRC funding coincide with that? Is the money stackable? Mr. Gorski responded, it is an interesting question because in our conversations with the Ports, they are suggesting they really do not have money to do any advanced technology trucks, or at least not yet. Now, of course, there is the hope that under some of the upcoming programs which would be made available through the state, such as the California Climate Investment Program or other types of funding which the regulatory agencies could make available, they would be potentially able to bid to secure funding. But right now, in the frequent conversations we've had with the Ports, they are very interested in partnering with the MSRC because they would very much like to have a demonstration program put on the street very quickly. Because, for all intents and purposes, despite the representations that the mayors of both Los Angeles and Long Beach have made that a program would be put together in the short term to demonstrate zero-emissions drayage trucks, I have not seen a funding plan, per se, on how that is going to be accomplished.

Mr. McCallon commented, South Coast AQMD has made significant investments in the Port in terms of demonstrating zero-emission technology. Mr. Gorski commented, there are several demonstration programs on going now. This includes the hydrogen trucks working with Toyota. We have the equipment which is being used on terminal, that includes the cargo handling equipment. What the Ports have stated they want to do, and what they are going to seek money for, is to do a large-scale demonstration. We are talking probably over 100 zero-emission trucks. That is probably their next step and their number one priority right now.

ACTION: No further action is required.

Agenda Item #14 – Other Business

No other business was introduced.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comments were allowed during the discussion of each agenda item. No comments were made on non-agenda items.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the MSRC meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, February 20, 2020, at 2:00 p.m., Room CC8.

[Prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo]