



**MOBILE SOURCE AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION REVIEW COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2020 MEETING MINUTES**  
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond, Bar, CA 91765 - Conference Room CC-8

All participants attended the meeting remotely pursuant to Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

(Chair) Larry McCallon, representing San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA)  
Ben Benoit, representing South Coast AQMD  
Michael Carter (Alt.), representing California Air Resources Board (CARB)  
John Dutrey, representing Regional Rideshare Agency  
Ray Marquez (Alt.), representing Regional Rideshare Agency  
Meghan Sahli-Wells (Alt.), representing Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)  
Tim Shaw, representing Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)  
Steve Veres, representing Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)  
Mark Yamarone (Alt.), representing Metro

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

(Vice Chair) Brian Berkson, representing Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)  
Jack Kitowski, representing CARB

**MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Steven Lee, representing Metro  
Rongsheng Luo, representing SCAG  
Kelly Lynn, representing SBCTA  
(MSRC-TAC Chair) AJ Marquez, representing Orange County Board of Supervisors  
Nicole Soto, representing Regional Rideshare Agency  
Scott Strelecki, representing SCAG  
Derek Winters, representing CARB

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Tricia Almiron  
Rubin Aronin, Better World Group Advisors  
Debra Ashby, South Coast AQMD  
Michael Bolin  
Harvey Eder  
Lauren Dunlap  
Lane Garcia, South Coast AQMD  
Doe Girling  
Carl Hansen  
Frances Keeler  
Jack Symington  
Angela Thomas

**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 2:02 p.m.

Roll call was taken at the start of the meeting. The following members and alternates were present: MICHAEL CARTER, JOHN DUTREY, LARRY MCCALLON, MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, TIM SHAW, STEVE VERES.

- Opening comments

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon introduced John Dutrey, Mayor of the City of Montclair, as a new member of the MSRC representing Regional Rideshare Agency. MSRC Member John Dutrey commented, I was a part of the MSRC back in the mid-90s, when I represented Council Member Leonard Paulitz who was a Governing Board Member and also on the MSRC. The MSRC was about 4 or 5 years old. I learned a lot from the group when I was attending both the Committee Board meetings and the MSRC-TAC meetings and am looking forward to representing Regional Rideshare as part of SBCTA. The MSRC does a lot of great things to assist in the reduction of mobile emissions and obviously we are playing a real big important part these days.

MSRC Alternate Meghan Sahli-Wells stated for the record that for Agenda Item #12, she does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that she is a Regional Council Member for SCAG, which is involved in that item.

MSRC Member Tim Shaw stated for the record that for Agenda Items #11 and #12, he does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that he is a City Council Member in the City of La Habra and an Alternate Regional Council Member for SCAG, which are involved in those items.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon stated for the record that for Agenda Items #12 and #13, he does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that he is a Governing Board Member for South Coast AQMD and Regional Council Member for SCAG, which are involved in those items.

MSRC Member John Dutrey stated for the record that for Agenda Item #12, he does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that he is a member of the Transportation Committee for SCAG, which is involved in that item.

[MSRC Member Ben Benoit arrived at 2:08 p.m.]

MSRC Member Ben Benoit stated for the record that for Agenda Item #13, he does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that he is a Governing Board Member for South Coast AQMD, which is involved in that item and that for Agenda Item #12, he does not have any financial interest, but is required to identify that he is on the SCAG Board, which is involved in that item.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 10)**

### **Receive and Approve Items**

#### **Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the January 16, 2020 MSRC Meeting**

The minutes of the January 16, 2020 MSRC meeting were distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #10, THE MSRC APPROVED THE JANUARY 16, 2020 MSRC MEETING MINUTES.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, DUTREY, MCCALLON, SAHLI-WELLS, SHAW, VERES. MSRC MEMBER JOHN DUTREY ABSTAINED.  
NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** Staff will include the January 16, 2020 MSRC meeting minutes in the MSRC Committee Report for the September 4, 2020 South Coast AQMD Board meeting and will place a copy on the MSRC's website.

#### **Agenda Item #2 – MSRC Contracts Administrator's Report**

The MSRC AB 2766 Contracts Administrator's Report for May 28 through July 29, 2020 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #10, THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT FOR MAY 28 THROUGH JULY 29, 2020.

AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, DUTREY, MCCALLON, SAHLI-WELLS, SHAW, VERES.  
NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** Staff will include the MSRC Contracts Administrator's Report in the MSRC Committee Report for the September 4, 2020 South Coast AQMD Board meeting.

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

A financial report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for July 2020 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #10, THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JULY 2020.  
AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, DUTREY, MCCALLON, SAHLI-WELLS, SHAW, VERES.  
NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** No further action is required.

**For Approval – As Recommended**

**Agenda Item #4 – Consider Modified Alignment and Four-Year Term Extension for the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District, Contract #ML14021 (\$250,000 – Bicycle Trail Improvements)**

The Park and Open Space District requests approval to return the bikeway to its originally proposed alignment because the alignment currently specified in the contract has been determined to have insurmountable conflicts in users and ownership. The County further requests a four-year term extension to allow for completion of Southern California Edison's Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP). Power lines are planned in the immediate vicinity of the trail, meaning that the trail would be subject to damage/removal should it be constructed prior to completion of the RTRP.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A MODIFIED ALIGNMENT AND FOUR-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT, CONTRACT #ML14021.  
AYES: BENOIT, CARTER, DUTREY, MCCALLON, SAHLI-WELLS, SHAW, VERES.  
NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #5 – Consider Six-Month Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14023 (\$230,000 – Maintenance Facility Modifications in Westchester)**

The County requests a six-month contract term extension to allow them to carry out their public outreach plan.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A SIX-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14023.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider One-Year Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14024 (\$230,000 – Maintenance Facility Modifications in Baldwin Park)**

The County requests a one-year contract term extension due to delays with the contractor over fee negotiations, acquisition/delivery of materials due to the COVID- 19 situation, and travel restrictions to California that prevented the contractor from conducting the system start-up, testing, and training.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML1402.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #7 – Consider One-Year Term Extension for the County of Los Angeles, Contract #ML14097 (\$104,400 – Install Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure)**

The County requests a one-year contract term extension due to delays associated with the COVID-19 situation.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CONTRACT #ML14097.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #8 – Consider Six-Month Term Extension for the City of Rancho Cucamonga, Contract #ML16052 (\$315,576 – Install Two Class I Bikeways)**

The City requests a six-month contract term extension due to delays associated with limited staff resources.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A SIX-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CONTRACT #ML16052.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #9 – Consider Modified Statement of Work and Three-Year Term Extension for the City of Rialto, Contract #ML16077 (\$463,216 – Implement Pedestrian Improvements and Bike Sharing)**

The City of Rialto requests to modify some of the terms of the contract to reflect advances in the market and technology now used to provide bike sharing services. The

City also requests a three-year term extension to allow them to pursue additional funding through the Clean Mobility Options Voucher Pilot Program. If successful in securing this funding, they also propose to extend the minimum operational period for the bike sharing element to five years.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A MODIFIED STATEMENT OF WORK AND THREE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE CITY OF RIALTO, CONTRACT #ML16077.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #10 – Consider Station Relocation and One-Year Term Extension for the Regents of the University of California (UCI), Contract #MS18175 (\$1,000,000 – Expansion of Existing Hydrogen Station)**

UCI requests to relocate the hydrogen station because the current location has been selected for a hospital. Their administration has identified a site in the vicinity with enhanced accessibility and visibility. UCI would cover the relocation costs. Due to the time necessary for relocation, UCI requests a one-year term extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A STATION RELOCATION AND ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION FOR THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (UCI), CONTRACT #MS18175.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** The station relocation will be placed on the September 4, 2020 South Coast AQMD Governing Board agenda for approval.



**ACTION CALENDAR (Item 11 through 17)****FYs 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM****Agenda Item #11 – Consider Substitution of One Dual-Port Level II and One Level III Charging Station for Two Dual-Port Level II Charging Stations for the City of La Habra, Contract #ML18143 (\$80,700 – Install Two EV Charging Stations)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of La Habra. They were awarded funding from the MSRC in the amount of \$80,700 to install two publicly accessible, dual-port, Level II EV charging stations. The City is proposing instead of two Level II charging stations, each of which would have had two ports, to install one Level II station and one Level III charging station. This would actually provide one fewer charging ports, but the Level III charging station charges vehicles a lot more quickly. So, there is a strong argument that it would be equal to or better than the two Level II charging stations. The MSRC-TAC recommends approval of the request. There was some discussion that since the MSRC has seen some other requests recently which involved substituting Level III for Level II that involved proprietary technology that might not be usable by all vehicles, the MSRC-TAC wanted to be sure that there was consistency in what the MSRC was approving. The MSRC-TAC recommended that there be a contingency on this approval that the Level III charging station be of a non-proprietary technology. Basically that would mean that it would be a kind of technology that the vast majority of vehicles would either be able to use, or be able to buy a converter to use, as opposed to something like a Tesla Supercharger, which is only usable by Teslas. That is the MSRC-TAC's recommendation. This contingency was communicated to the City. They did not express any concerns with it.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon commented, in our City we put in three Level IIIs and I have a Tesla, so I had to go buy the adapter so I could use them. Ms. Ravenstein commented, it is possible for you to get an adapter, whereas the other way around, it is not possible.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC MEMBER JOHN DUTREY, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE WITH THE CONTINGENCY THAT MSRC FUNDS ONLY BE USED FOR NON-PROPRIETARY EVSE PROJECT COMPONENTS.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract accordingly.

**Agenda Item #12 – Consider Proposed Contract with Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to Implement Last Mile Component of MSRC Goods Movement Program**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request is following up from a proposal that came forward back in May. SCAG had proposed that they could implement the Last Mile component of the MSRC's Regional Goods Movement Program and the MSRC authorized SCAG to submit a sole source proposal to do that. But the MSRC wanted to have a more detailed scope of how the SCAG would implement that. An initial response was brought to the MSRC-TAC in June, but they still needed more definition. That went through several iterations with MSRC-TAC's Last Mile Subcommittee. The MSRC-TAC feels that it is now ready to be brought forward to you for your approval. Mr. Scott Stelecki from SCAG will present more detail.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Scott Strelecki reported, just to reiterate, we are proposing to serve as a lead for the Last Mile component. This has established a two-phased approach. Phase One is looking to implement a call for projects focusing on the purchase and commercial deployment of zero and near-zero emission heavy- or medium-duty on-road trucks as well as considering the equipment and / or infrastructure that supports those vehicles. Phase Two is looking to further expand upon this Phase One project commercial deployment and coordinate with public and private sector stakeholders to deploy broader innovative technologies which are currently being demonstrated by leading last mile delivery companies, especially as these things relate to e-commerce.

As part of the Last Mile Subcommittee we thought it would be prudent to get a sense of what we are doing to create a program approach. We focused on three core areas. We have an investment thesis, the investment impacts and investment targets. So, within the thesis we laid it out in a few different areas. One area is: the right problem at the right time. Everyone is aware there has been a rapid increase in expectations for commercial vehicle production. That goes from Class 8 trucks, delivery vans and lower level commercial, all the way down to a construction pickup truck. In the 2022, 2023, and 2024 timeframe companies are going to really look to start ramping up production. We are right at the cusp of the right time for these types of commercial deployments. With respect to the critical barriers, there is a public-private aspect here where we really want to focus on the benefits, the challenges, and the impacts from the return on investment perspective for the private players. But at the same time there are a lot of public impacts and relationships as we look at interrelationships between how you scale near-zero or zero emission vehicles, equipment, and infrastructure in relation to that. Measuring success, we are interested in how we can get further emission reductions. But at the same time, we really want to better understand how these vehicles operate in the transportation environment and all the connections between vehicles, equipment, infrastructure, etc. For investment impacts, we laid out some questions related to what we could expect for long-term potential benefits for air quality, as well as the economy, as both are important to consider. Looking at the Last Mile industry, how could cost reductions for the private

sector be achieved long-term? We are really trying to get at some of those issues for public/private and at the same time from a more transformative perspective. This program could be a leader for our region and even on a state or national level. Could we set the tone for what the future could begin to look like? Lastly, on the investment targets, these were specific things that we felt we needed to have some clear guidance on. The program approach was really meant to set the tone of what we were looking to achieve, how would we achieve that, and how could this directly feed into the statement of work. The structure of the statement of work is broken down into four tasks with the first task being the development of the program guidelines and the issuance of a call for projects, followed by screening and selection process for the projects, then getting to project implementation, and then ultimately evaluation, monitoring and reporting.

We really tried to enhance the details which were requested at the prior MRSC meeting. We have the overarching expectations where the contractor shall work directly with the MSRC's Last Mile Subcommittee, MSRC-TAC and Board, discussed developing the Program Guidelines, and ensuring there is a recommendation from the MSRC-TAC on the Guidelines before they ultimately will be approved by the MSRC Board. That all has to occur before a Call for Projects will be issued. We have laid out how we have organized the information that we have discussed to date through the Last Mile Subcommittee, adding a substantial amount of detail to better inform the decision to approve this item. We had further dialogue on how we begin to frame these program guidelines, what the important things are to consider and that need to be a part of the discussion before a recommendation. That led to the focus of geographic funding minimums within the four-county area of the South Coast Air Quality Management District, an investment match of one-to-one, as well as funding minimums and maximums. The funding minimum for small to medium-sized businesses was primarily focused on the consideration that while we have a high expectation we will receive interest from some of the larger last mile delivery companies that are operating, at the same time we wanted to ensure that there was an opportunity for small to medium-sized businesses as part of that process. At the same time, we recognize that there could be a company that could potentially meet the overall coverage of the four-county area. So, we put in a maximum per project as well. The geographic funding minimum amounts were \$1.25 million per county. The minimum funding for small and midsize business was \$3 million and the maximum per project was set at \$5 million. And again, this is out of a \$10 million total amount.

For the fleet and infrastructure components, we felt it was very important to add specification regarding the number of zero emission or near-zero vehicles that would be procured. The potential to convert additional vehicles, as well as considerations for regional fueling or charging hub depots, grid integration of that technology, etc. were also important. We also need to consider how the load could affect the peak times of the system. Other areas in that section were focused on data considerations, this ranged from the actual vehicles and infrastructure, vehicle miles traveled, emissions information, origin/destination, etc. A couple other items considered were potentially to require

procurement and purchase orders within a set time frame to ensure timeliness once projects were selected. We could move forward in a manner towards implementation and monitoring that would be beneficial for the program, as well as looking at other lead times as things could be impacted by the CEQA process, building permits etc., on the infrastructure side. For project expectations, we discussed different considerations obviously from a holistic perspective of the project, clearly designating what type of technologies would be used, what's being provided as part of the application and for the program funds, which would be supported between vehicles and equipment versus infrastructure. We would want to see any relationships between utility companies that would require letters of intent, as well as looking at further delineating project screening and selection criteria. That is something that we would have further dialogue on and develop as part of the Program Guidelines. Looking at other areas such as anticipated drive cycles of operators, routes, those are examples of more detailed things that would need to be clear as part of the proposals. As part of that development of the Program Guidelines and ultimately putting out a Call for Projects, coordination would be sought with the MSRC Last Mile Subcommittee and MSRC-TAC to review, discuss and screen the project proposals. A recommendation from the MSRC-TAC would be provided for consideration to the MSRC Board and the Board would have final approval of the selection of projects.

For project implementation, this would be where SCAG, as implementer, would enter into memorandum of understanding (MOU) agreements to establish the implementation process including targets and expectations as a direct outcome from the program guidelines. That process would involve the proposed MOU template language being provided and discussed through the Last Mile Subcommittee prior to the issuance of those MOUs to ensure consistency of expectations. Afterward, SCAG would be responsible for ensuring all project elements are implemented in accordance with MOUs, including oversight and coordination with all project stakeholders. For evaluation and reporting, we would have regular progress reports summarizing the results to date including tasks completed, any issues or challenges encountered, resolutions implemented and other progress items. We will perform an evaluation of the project implementation and as part of that both an interim and final report would be provided. As part of the interim and final reports, we would summarize actions taken to implement the plan, identify any obstacles and how solutions were generated and discuss success of each project implementation and the overall plan. We would be focusing on the emission reduction results, any replication potential across the region, opportunities for further refinement, etc. As part of that we feel it would be very valuable to have recommendations of strategies for wide-scale adoption.

Our initial draft schedule is based on the tasks as they have been laid out. We are at the August 20th MSRC Board meeting. We would expect after that for the contract to be awarded; that would occur for the South Coast AQMD in September. We could quickly after action today, continue the process of working with the Last Mile Subcommittee to get to a point of drafting the Program Guidelines and have an opportunity to bring that

back through the MSRC process in October. Then we could have a Call for Projects issued as early as November. We would later in the year look towards the screening and selection of projects with approval occurring early next year. Following on, we would be walking through the MOU process and getting towards project implementation in the spring and having that run through the summer of the following year, with all of the progress updates and interim and final reporting occurring over the course of that time towards the end of next year. I will say that we do recognize that as we get closer to some of the holiday times there could be some impacts. So we do recognize that there could be some adjustments that need to be made and we also feel this is a fairly aggressive approach right now, but we're fully well prepared to deal with any need to make adjustments.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon commented, is it realistic to project that South Coast AQMD would issue a contract in September? Ms. Ravenstein replied, he might be referring to the award. I do not think that they would actually be able to enter into the contract in September. Mr. McCallon commented, the award of the contract to SCAG? Ms. Ravenstein replied, if the MSRC were to approve it today.

MSRC Alternate Meghan Sahli-Wells commented, as you can see SCAG has worked really closely with the MSRC Last Mile Subcommittee and the MSRC-TAC because there had been some questions and details to fill in. From the presentation you can see how much they have developed over the last couple of months. This is just a great opportunity for us to partner together to leverage our resources to really move on what all of our goals are to reduce the pollutants that are choking us in this region and that we're tasked with addressing. This is really an exciting opportunity for us to be a leader. SCAG is really eager to work with you. We wanted to especially thank the hard work of the Last Mile Subcommittee, the MSRC-TAC and MSRC staff, especially Ray and Cynthia for their feedback and collaboration on this proposal. We want to thank all of you for considering this refined and very detailed proposal and hope to get your approval today.

MSRC Member John Dutrey commented, just to clarify, the MOU with the vendors who submit proposals, that is approved by MSRC not SCAG? Final approval is the MSRC Board? Ms. Ravenstein replied, the MSRC has to approve the contract with SCAG. Then the MSRC is going to approve what the projects are. But the actual MOUs for those projects will be between SCAG and the project proponents. The individual MOUs will not be brought to the MSRC under this proposal.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor commented, this was a very good process. We listen to the initial comments from the MSRC. We brought it back through the committee process. There was a lot of collaborative effort over several meetings to ensure that all the stakeholders had their voices heard, but more importantly bring something to you today, which we feel has been fully vetted and has sufficient detail to hit the ground running upon your consideration and approval. It took a little longer than we had initially thought but it is one of those situations where we wanted it right as opposed to right away.

Mr. McCallon commented, I would like to echo Meghan's comments about thanking everyone involved in this process. I know it has been arduous to put together and I thank SCAG for bringing it forward. It looks to be an exciting program and I am looking forward to it. This is one area where we need a solution. The Last Mile area is something that needs to be worked on very quickly.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT, AND SECONDED BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE A PROPOSED CONTRACT WITH SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000,000 TO IMPLEMENT THE LAST MILE COMPONENT OF MSRC GOODS MOVEMENT PROGRAM.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** This item will be considered by the South Coast AQMD Board at its meeting on September 4, 2020.

**Agenda Item #13 – Consider Reallocation of \$3,000,000 from Implementation of South Coast AQMD Market Acceleration Program to South Coast AQMD Trade Down Program**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported back in November the MSRC allocated \$4 million to partner with South Coast AQMD to implement a Market Acceleration Program. The focus of this program is to target trucks, trying to get early deployment of near zero emission natural gas trucks. This program had two kinds of transactions that it was trying to go after: (1) a more simple transaction where you're having somebody that's going to purchase a new near zero truck and they're going to scrap an old truck, and (2) then there is a little bit more complicated approach sometimes called a trade down approach. That would involve two different parties and three trucks. After the MSRC allocated the funding, South Coast AQMD has decided that they want to split the two parts of this program. The simpler incentive part, as coordinated by Clean Energy, would be handled by them. And then South Coast AQMD wants to handle the trade down approach and focus on the two-party transactions. They are asking, of the \$4 million that the MSRC originally allocated, to take \$3 million and reallocate it to this Trade Down Program.

Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, commented that the Trade Down Program is really focusing on having a vehicle available to the independent owner operator. What we are trying to do is set up a system similar to what we have been doing under the Voucher Incentive Program (VIP) that is focused on the small independent

owner/operators. A large fleet can afford to get a truck for \$175,000, or actually on average with the sales tax and the excise tax it's about \$180,000 per truck, and they would be incentivized up to \$100,000. We would utilize some of those funds from the South Coast AQMD grant, as well as from the MSRC cost-share, and then buy down for the small independent owner/operator the truck that they can get from the larger fleet. What we have learned is a larger fleet typically has 2014 or newer trucks in their fleet. This way an independent owner/operator can scrap a pre-2010 truck, get a 2014 truck for about \$10,000 out of pocket cost, and continue providing that independent drayage service that they have been doing for a long time. One of the reasons why the South Coast AQMD is very interested in this is that the Truck and Bus regulation is coming in and pre-2010 trucks will be completely phased out by 2023. Our goal is to try to help the independent owner/operator continue to have those trucks be available. The other aspect we are setting up is the dealers that we have been working with under VIP will actually help us coordinate between a larger fleet, that can acquire a new truck, and then have that newer used truck be available to the independent owner/operator. They are going to help us initially set up the system. Our goal is to grow that approach, not just for this trade down pilot concept but also work with CARB possibly to see if that can be incorporated into the Carl Moyer Program or to work with the Ports when their rate program is implemented to see how we can use this to accelerate that truck turnover, especially for independent owner/operators.

MSRC Alternate Michael Carter commented, how was the \$3 million versus \$1 million split determined? Mr. Berry replied, that was based on MSRC staff discussing it with our staff. But what we are doing is a million dollars for the Market Acceleration Program, which was an award that was made to Clean Energy from the South Coast AQMD a couple of years ago. That will be focusing on turning over trucks with larger fleets. But in that approach that larger fleet will actually acquire an older truck from the independent owner/operator. Then the larger fleet would have the brand-new truck, the truck with an engine certified at .02 g/bhp-hr NO<sub>x</sub> or below, as well as the 2014 truck for example. They would acquire a pre-2010 truck from an independent owner/operator. South Coast AQMD believes that a million-dollar cost share from the MSRC will help us implement that program fairly rapidly. But we also are requesting that the \$3 million dollars allocation for the Trade Down Program be available so that independent owner/operators can continue to have that benefit. So that is how that split was made.

MSRC Member John Dutrey asked, how many trucks? Mr. Berry replied that it depends on the cumulative funding. Initially we were looking at leveraging funds from the state's HVIP Program as well. Unfortunately, that is oversubscribed. We are looking at about \$135,000 total per truck that will be incentivized as a result of South Coast AQMD funds and MSRC funds.

**ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER JOHN DUTREY, AND SECONDED  
BY MSRC MEMBER TIM SHAW, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED  
TO REALLOCATE \$3,000,000 FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF SOUTH**

COAST AQMD MARKET ACCELERATION PROGRAM TO SOUTH  
COAST AQMD TRADE DOWN PROGRAM.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** This item will be considered by the South Coast AQMD Board at its  
September 4, 2020 meeting.

**Agenda Item #14 – Consider RFP for MSRC Website Hosting and Maintenance  
Services**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported the contract for maintaining and hosting the MSRC website is due to terminate in February. In June, the MSRC authorized the development of a RFP to solicit a firm to continue hosting and maintenance of the MSRC website. This has been prepared and is recommended for approval. It has also been reviewed by South Coast AQMD's Information Management staff. It is seeking somebody to continue hosting and maintenance and do minor modifications to the website, not looking for a major revamp at this time. There is not a set funding amount for the work but the cost that is proposed is one of the major elements of the evaluation.

MSRC Alternate Meghan Sahli-Wells commented regarding keeping the minutes updated on the website, which is kind of a parallel issue, but I wanted to make sure that we were able to do that. Especially when we have new members come on, it is always good to familiarize yourself with the votes. So just another plug for making sure that happens especially as we have this opportunity of updating.

ON MOTION BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS,  
AND SECONDED BY MSRC MEMBER JOHN DUTREY, MSRC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE RFP FOR MSRC WEBSITE  
HOSTING AND MAINTENANCE SERVICES.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** This item will be considered by the South Coast AQMD Board at its meeting  
on September 4, 2020.



**Agenda Item #15 – Consider Proposed Outreach Strategy Developed as Part of Programmatic Outreach Services under Contract #MS21002**

[This item was deferred until the September Meeting].

**Agenda Item #16 – Consider Reallocation of Dodger Stadium Express Funding to Future Baseball Seasons and Modification of Major Event Center Work Program by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), Contract #MS21004 (proposed) (\$2,188,899 – Clean Fuel Bus Service to Dodger Stadium)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported that as part of the Major Event Center Work Program the MSRC awarded Metro \$2,188,899 to provide special bus service to Dodger Stadium for the 2020 and 2021 baseball seasons. A proposed contract was prepared to effectuate that award. The contract was being circulated through internal reviews. Then at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a freeze in Major League Baseball games and it finally happened that they decided to have a truncated 2020 season but to not have any fans in attendance. Without having any fans coming to the baseball stadium, it was evident that there was not any need to have bus service provided to the stadium. Preparations were underway to modify the proposed contract and have it cover only the 2021 baseball season. This information was communicated to Metro, but the contract had not yet been sent to them. As the result of receiving this information, Metro requested that any unused funds from modified baseball seasons be reallocated to future baseball seasons. They also requested that the MSRC modify the Major Event Center Program as necessary to allow that to happen. There is a provision in the Major Event Center Transportation Program Announcement that says that all the events that receive funding under that Program Announcement have to be held no later than December 31, 2021. This provision created an issue with being able to reallocate funding beyond 2021. Staff sought guidance from counsel concerning whether it would be possible for the MSRC to authorize a modification which didn't comply with that provision. It was confirmed that would not be possible for the MSRC to do that, without having some kind of a change in the program itself. Metro's request was brought before the MSRC-TAC. The MSRC-TAC is recommending that the Program Announcement be modified to extend the end date by which events could occur to December 31, 2022, to give one more year for those events to happen. This Program Announcement is still open at this time, and still accepting applications through March 30, 2021. It would be a modification of the open Program Announcement. The MSRC-TAC further recommended that the MSRC reallocate the funding for Metro from 2020 and 2021 to 2021 and 2022, in order to address the fact that this 2020 season was not something that required transportation services, and no one could have envisioned it. Those are the recommendations coming forward from the MSRC-TAC. It does not change the date by which people would submit applications, only the date that events could occur. And then specific to Metro, it would reallocate the funding so that they could use it in 2021 and 2022 instead of 2020 and 2021.

MSRC Member Tim Shaw commented, am I correct that the Dodgers were going to do quite a bit of work in the parking lot, the flow of traffic in and around the stadium? What does that possibly portend for the ridership of on this service? MSRC Member Steve Veres replied, the improvements this year were for the stadium, they actually invested quite a bit in the fan experience, including where fans would be dropped off, so they can enter directly into the stadium from the buses that that Metro had set up with MSRC. That experience was supposed to be substantially improved and they do have a proposal that is moving through Metro to do a gondola service from Union Station to the stadium. One of the concerns was that the buses were not moving fast enough through the process and they would close down the street, as the interest has grown, the fan attendance is pretty steady at about 50,000 or so game. So, they are trying all kinds of ideas to move it along. So those are interesting sort of modifications that are coming but we still have a gap from the Union Station pickup point all the way up into the into the Chavez Arena area. There is some movement and there is a future to look beyond just the buses to get folks up to the stadium using clean transportation options.

MSRC Member John Dutrey commented, I heard also the Boring Company is looking at a study to go underground from Union Station to Dodger Stadium. We are doing that at SBCTA at the Ontario Airport. Mr. Veres replied, that one has not been announced too publicly as opposed to the gondola option.

MSRC Alternate Mark Yamarone commented, we wanted to thank the staff and the MSRC-TAC for considering this. Just to clarify, we are not asking for any additional funds and all of the local match continues to be in place. From MSRC's own analysis you know how successful this program is. Both the programs that Mr. Veres mentioned are very far off in the future. This would be to get us through two successful seasons once fans are allowed back in the stadium. This is just an extension, no additional funds, and no change in our commitment to the program.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER STEVE VERES, AND SECONDED BY MSRC ALTERNATE MEGHAN SAHLI-WELLS, MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE MODIFICATION OF THE MAJOR EVENT CENTER PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT TO EXTEND THE ALLOWABLE DATE FOR EVENTS TO DECEMBER 31, 2022, AND TO APPROVE REALLOCATION OF FUNDS AWARDED TO METRO TO THE 2021 AND 2022 BASEBALL SEASONS.

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

NOES: NONE.

**ACTION:** MSRC Staff will amend the above contract and Program Announcement accordingly.

**Agenda Item #17 – Status Update on an Unsolicited Proposal Submitted to the MSRC by the Los Angeles CleanTech Incubator (LACI)**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported that this was presented to you at your June meeting. However, it was not presented as an actionable item. MSRC staff received an unsolicited proposal from the Los Angeles CleanTech Incubator (LACI) on June 15th. We were requested, if possible, to have that proposal considered at your June 20th meeting a few days later. Due to the public noticing requirements of the Brown Act, staff was not able to agendaize that item as an action item, but we did have a brief discussion under Other Business. LACI is offering to support the MSRC's goals by providing heavy-duty electric charging infrastructure along strategic routes throughout the region, specifically looking at the critical I-710 route. This helps make feasible the use of zero-emission electric trucks which would come from the maritime Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and go out to distribution centers both within Los Angeles County as well as the Inland Empire. The proposal from LACI was a request for \$15 million. That would allow them to implement, on a task order basis, various infrastructure projects to support the deployment of zero emission drayage trucks. The initial task order that was included in their proposal was seeking \$2.65 million out of the total \$15 million funding request to construct 16 DC fast chargers. This would be split amongst two locations of a fleet that they had identified who was willing to partner with LACI and the MSRC in implementing the project. The fleet's name is Total Transportation Services Incorporated (TTSI). Under LACI's proposal, they offer to have these DC fast chargers installed at locations both at the Port of Los Angeles and another TTSI facility in the City of Carson.

The MSRC asked staff to take a couple of actions: (1) work directly with LACI to more fully refine the conceptual paper and proposal that they submitted for MSRC consideration, and (2) work with the technical working group and other regional stakeholders to provide guidance to both LACI and the MSRC relative to further refinement of this conceptual proposal. On July 16th, the MSRC convened a public meeting of a standing group that the MSRC has to look at these types of projects. The meeting had broad-based participation including not only members of your MSRC-TAC but also several regional stakeholders. This included the South Coast AQMD, Los Angeles County Metro because of their interest in electrification along the I-710 Corridor, SCAG because of their regional interest as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and both maritime Ports -- Long Beach and Los Angeles, and finally we had participation by representatives from the state air regulatory and energy agencies, CARB and the California Energy Commission (CEC). Over 40 individuals participated. There was a very dynamic discussion looking at some of the details that were included in LACI's proposal. From a technical standpoint, there were no showstoppers identified. There were of course issues that based upon the deliberations would need to be addressed, but nothing that would present itself as a technical issue that would prevent those charging stations from being implemented.

During the discussions and subsequent discussions with the members of the South Coast AQMD legal team, there was a process issue identified. The MSRC works under the Procurement Policy of the South Coast AQMD because the South Coast AQMD enters into contracts on behalf of the MSRC. The Procurement Department that regulates unsolicited proposals made a determination that the proposal as submitted did not conform to the sole source justification requirements. Because of that it is recommended to not take action on the LACI proposal as it was presented. This can be contrasted to some other programs which the MSRC has authorized on a sole source basis, including one today with SCAG. Under SCAG's proposal an MSRC-approved solicitation is going to be developed. Projects that are submitted in response to that solicitation will be brought back to the MSRC for your review and subsequent approval. There is a competitive component to the work that the MSRC will be undertaking with SCAG. With the LACI proposal, it was brought to us differently in that LACI had identified at least the first fleet to participate under the \$15 million program. Within the terms of their conceptual proposal, LACI would go off and bring other potential fleets to the MSRC. That is the primary reason that there is a differentiation between the SCAG and the LACI efforts, and why due to the sole source justification requirement it is recommended that action not be taken on the LACI proposal.

That does not mean that pathways do not exist for the MSRC, LACI and other regional stakeholders to work together. There has been an awful lot of interaction, probably an unprecedented amount of interaction going on over the last couple of months between the stakeholders who are looking at electrification within the South Coast region. In September, your MSRC-TAC is going to consider a program related to a competitive opportunity in which LACI would be able to participate. But even beyond that, LACI and the MSRC have been asked to participate in a South Coast AQMD-led Regional Collaborative. Under that Regional Collaborative, money is being sought from state agencies to bolster the resources on a regional basis that can be used to move electrification forward. There are going to be opportunities for the MSRC to work with LACI. Those will conform to the procurement policies that we are subject to, both those which are sponsored by the South Coast AQMD through the Regional Collaborative as well as MSRC-sponsored potential projects that are going to be brought to your attention as soon as September. There is going to be funding available from the state in the very near term. We expect to see solicitations from CARB and CEC as soon as September offering a total of \$40 million which this region will want to go after. The South Coast AQMD-led regional team will have LACI and the MSRC as partners. Because of some of the issues where we have been confronted with given COVID-19 and its impact on the state budget, the MSRC dollars are now more important than ever in achieving these regional objectives. As was just mentioned in the preceding agenda item, some of the other funding is going away, at least in the short term. There is now greater need for the MSRC to participate as a potential funding source should this Committee make the decision to invest in these areas. We will bring those details to you beginning next month. We had a very good working relationship with LACI. As staff in refining the proposal, LACI was very amenable to making suggested modifications. We had a very strong

deliberative discussion with the regional stakeholders in a public meeting. I think a lot of important information came out of that, which further refined the proposal.

MSRC Member Steve Veres asked, you listed the two check boxes that were talking about developing a solicitation and then to be part of a regionally led effort, those are examples of next steps? I may be getting ahead of myself in terms of what you have in mind for the September presentation, but just curious because it seems to me that those could both be developed complementary to each other and along with any of the other things that you're talking about for next steps. Mr. Gorski replied, you are 100% correct. These are going to be worked in parallel. They are independent but not mutually exclusive, in that all these individual efforts--whether it be LACI's proposal to do heavy-duty electric vehicle charging infrastructure, whether it be the effort from the CARB and the CEC to do a large-scale deployment of zero emission drayage trucks, whether it be the MSRC looking to do Last Mile or Inland Ports--they are all related. All these efforts are simply components of the overall larger picture. What we are doing is bringing forth to the MSRC multiple programs that while they are themselves independent, are all interrelated and are all working toward the established regional goal, which is a zero-emission future. We are not ignoring the air quality concerns we have in the present, that is why the MSRC is also working on near-zero truck deployment. But as part of a regional effort, this is focused specifically on the future of zero-emission goods movement within the South Coast region. In September what we hope to see, if they get through the MSRC-TAC, are specific solicitation documents that we would recommend that the MSRC consider, as well as a request to have a more definitized and structured role in the collaborative effort led by the South Coast AQMD. We have to ensure that in doing one project it supports the regional effort and can potentially leverage other projects. That is what the MSRC-TAC has been fully engaged on for the last couple months including stakeholders such as Metro, Port of Los Angeles, SCAG, Port of Long Beach, LACI, and others.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon commented, the project LACI has put forward is intriguing and obviously I hope something comes forward that we can all benefit from in the region.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Brendan O'Donnell, Charge Point, commented since there were no written materials available, is there any information on the LACI proposal itself specifically with regard to the infrastructure that was selected for the 150-kilowatt chargers? Mr. Gorski replied, the answer is yes, and with the concurrence of the MSRC we can make the written materials that we have received from LACI available to the public. Mr. McCallon commented, there is no reason that they should not be made available to the public.

MSRC Member Ben Benoit commented, the proposal has two locations, are they both publicly accessible? Or would they be accessible to the other fleets that operate in that area, so there is not just one operator that is getting use to this but multiple operators? Mr. Gorski replied, during the deliberations and discussions with LACI, we did address the

potential for future public accessibility. While initially the access would probably be only for the anchor fleet, there was definitely an offer to allow other fleets to utilize that infrastructure in the near future. I think it is one of those situations in which once it was installed, they would want to allow their own fleet to use it for a while and then based upon the results of their charging duty cycle, they would allow other fleets to utilize it when it was available. There is also the potential to have additional chargers installed at those locations, which would further the public accessibility element of the project. So, absolutely in all of our discussions we include the question as to how we can make this publicly accessible.

**ACTION:** No further action is required.

### **Agenda Item #18 – Other Business**

MSRC Member Tim Shaw commented, this is my first meeting, I have now officially been appointed by Orange County Transportation Authority to MSRC. I was an alternate for many years to Greg Winterbottom, who you all knew very well, who unfortunately passed away. I am excited to join the MSRC. I am very sad it was under this situation. MSRC Chair Larry McCallon commented, we are excited to have you and we do miss Greg.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Harvey Eder commented, this whole process sucks. It is an illegal violation of the Brown Act. There is a lot of stuff going on. I wanted to put into Governor's contact on reviewing the Brown Act and all public process removing what is threatening our democracy in a depression. This vector, this virus is climate, and it is hitting us right in the face and you are ignoring it. It is melting of the Arctic a year ago and in National Geographic, your Board will not hear it. It is 19 of the last 20 warmest years on record. And what does Burke say, I was up there 30 years ago it was 98 degrees. It is 100 degrees now plus everything's melting, it is going to natural gas. You are doing what we voted out. We voted out Pickens and his garbage 12 years ago when you bring it up through private deals and this and that. It will not work and it should not work and it is going to be challenged. It is garbage, everything you are doing is garbage. You have to change it. You are not listening Biden. The plans, the Democrat needs to be changed. No methane, that is what is happening with nitrous oxide 300 times. Out of the Arctic, 12 times increase in the last 10 years, that is 144 times in 20 years. This is a crisis. You are not listening. You are depreciating this earth for some fairytale that does not exist. And you are taking away from everybody including me and mine and it will not stand.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the MSRC meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, September 17, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

[Prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo]