



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC
THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 2021 MEETING MINUTES
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765**

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

MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

MSRC-TAC Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez, representing Orange County Board of Supervisors
MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair Jenny Chan, representing Riverside County Transportation Commission
Adriann Cardoso, representing Orange County Transportation Authority
Cliff Thorne (Alt), representing Orange County Transportation Authority
Jason Farin, representing Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Steve Hillman, representing City of Los Angeles
Minh Le, representing Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Steven Lee, representing Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Ron Lindsay (Alt), representing San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Rongsheng Luo, representing Southern California Association of Governments
Kelly Lynn, representing San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Sean O'Connor, representing Cities of San Bernardino County
Tim Olson, Air Pollution Control Expert
Nancy Strickert (Alt), representing Regional Rideshare Agency
Ash Nikravan (Alt), representing South Coast AQMD
Derek Winters, representing California Air Resources Board
Rick Yee, representing Cities of Orange County
Dan York, representing Cities of Riverside County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ruben Aronin, Better World Group
Debbie Thomas
Debra Mendelsohn
Louis Zhao
Ramine Cromartie

SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS PRESENT:

Leah Alfaro, MSRC Contracts Assistant
Maria Allen, MSRC Administrative Liaison
Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor
John Kampa, Financial Services Manager
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel
Matt MacKenzie, MSRC Contracts Assistant
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator
Alejandra Vega, MSRC Administrative Liaison
Donna Vernon, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order
MSRC-TAC Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

STATUS REPORT

- Clean Transportation Policy Update

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

Information Only - Receive and File

Agenda Item #1 – MSRC Contracts Administrator’s Report

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for March 4, 2021 through March 24, 2021 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER TIM OLSON, UNDER APPROVAL
OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE MSRC
CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT LISTED ABOVE.

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

Agenda Item #2 – Financial Report on AB 2766 Discretionary Fund

The Financial Report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for February 2021 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER TIM OLSON, UNDER APPROVAL
OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL
REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY 2021.

ACTION: No further action is required.

Agenda Item #3 – Report on Outreach Activities

The summary of outreach activities, communications and policy activities undertaken by the Better World Group on behalf of the MSRC for Winter 2020/21 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O'CONNOR AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER TIM OLSON, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE SUMMARY OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES FOR WINTER 2020/21.

ACTION: No further action is required.

ACTION CALENDAR

Agenda Item #4 – Consider One-Year No-Cost Term Extension by City of Torrance, Contract #ML16039 (\$32,000 – Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

No comments were made by any MSRC-TAC members or MSRC staff. No public comments were made.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE ITEMS #4, #5 AND #8, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CONTRACT #ML16039, A ONE-YEAR NO-COST TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #5 – Consider 3-Month No-Cost Term Extension by City of Moreno Valley, Contract #ML16041 (\$20,000 – Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

No comments were made by any MSRC-TAC members or MSRC staff. No public comments were made.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE ITEMS #4, #5 AND #8, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CONTRACT #ML16041, A THREE-MONTH NO-COST TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #6 – Consider Increased Project Scope and Cost Reallocations by City of Aliso Viejo, Contract #ML18128 (\$65,460 – Procure Two Light Duty ZEVs and Install EV Charging Infrastructure)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, explained the City of Aliso Viejo was awarded \$65,460 under the MSRC's Local Government Partnership Program to procure light duty zero emission vehicles and to install seven Level II electric vehicle charging stations. Five

stations were to be limited access and two public access. The City has already entered the vehicles and charging stations into service, but they were able to install nine charging stations for the amount of funding that they received from the MSRC, with the match funding requirements that they had. They should have asked first before they installed them. The City is now asking to increase the number of stations from seven to nine. The way that the funding was split up between limited access and public access, they are requesting to reallocate \$12,125 that had been for limited access charging and put that towards public access charging. So there would be no additional cost.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RON LINDSAY, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE
CITY OF ALISO VIEJO, CONTRACT #ML18128, AN INCREASE IN
PROJECT SCOPE AND COST REALLOCATIONS.

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

Agenda Item #7 – Consider Modified Project Scope by City of San Dimas, Contract #ML18148 (proposed) (\$50,000 – Implement Bike Sharing Program)

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, explained the City of San Dimas was awarded \$50,000 as part of the Local Government Partnership Program to participate in a bike sharing program. This was going to be implemented by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; several different cities were participating in this bike sharing program. Due to the pandemic the bike sharing program hasn't really moved forward. They've had concerns about social distancing and disinfecting the bicycles after they've been used. Some of the other cities have stopped communicating with the MSRC and their funding ended up reverting. The City of San Dimas has requested to substitute a different project. Under the Local Government Partnership Program you can't move the money into a totally different category. But they could do something within this category of allowing for active transportation bicycle programs. They're instead proposing to install bicycle detection units at different intersections. They propose to install five bicycle detection units at three different intersections for \$50,000. They would also still meet the required match of \$50,000.

MSRC-TAC Chair AJ Marquez asked what is the function of a bicycle detection unit?

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, explained there is a certain amount of metal in vehicles to trigger a loop detector. A car typically has enough metal to do that. To ensure that a bicycle will in fact trigger the loop detector, they install detectors that are much more sensitive, so they are able to allow bicycles to compete more equitably with motor vehicles when utilizing public roadways.

Ms. Ravenstein added that without the loop detector, cyclists have to push the pedestrian signal to get the light to change. This proposal is more of a public safety upgrade to make it more attractive to use bicycles as a transportation mode.

MSRC-TAC Member Derek Winters asked if it was possible to extend the bike sharing program instead of swapping the funds for this new program?

Ms. Ravenstein explained if this proposal is denied then staff would check with the City if they wanted to wait and see. The bike sharing program was going to be a cooperative amongst several cities and it looks like the rest of them are not going to continue to pursue the bike sharing program. Ms. Ravenstein does not know if the bike sharing program will be an option anymore.

Mr. Winters stated he would like the bike sharing program to happen, but understands if the other cities are not participating. Though the loop detector offers cyclists ease, CARB would like to see a bike sharing program.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Nancy Strickert asked how soon will this project be completed once approved? How soon afterwards will they be able to finish the project?

Ms. Ravenstein stated she does not recall whether the city gave a detailed schedule on that, but she can get back to TAC with that information.

Ms. Strickert stated that she asked because she was concerned that even if the TAC switched the funds, the city won't complete it in a reasonable amount of time.

MSRC-TAC Member Rick Yee asked if the bike loop detectors are eligible under the program guidelines? Is it just that it would be a difference? If the program were starting from scratch, would it be an eligible use under a different program?

Ms. Ravenstein stated the bike loop detectors were eligible under this program. They were specifically listed as one of the eligible uses. This category was only available to the smallest cities under the Local Government Partnership Program. There was funding set aside for each of the cities that receives AB2766 Subvention funds. It was equivalent to what they get in those funds annually, except for those that get such a small amount annually that there was a concern that there might not be enough for them to do a viable project. In those cases, the MSRC guaranteed them a minimum amount of \$50,000. And for the cities that were just going to get the \$50,000, there were some special categories allowed. The active bicycle transportation projects were one of those special categories. Bicycle detection was one of the specific projects that was called out in that category as being eligible. There is not a particular opportunity for it to be funded right now; that was under the original funding.

Mr. Winters asked if there was a way to see how the detection units are utilized? The bike sharing program would have had data points that could have been gathered from the cities based on participants, he wanted to know how this new program would gather data.

Ms. Ravenstein answered by stating that for all of the bicycle-related contracts it is required for them to do counts in the area before and then some time after installations so that we can try to see if there has been impact in the usage level of that mode of transportation.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY
MSRC-TAC MEMBER DEREK WINTERS, THE MSRC-TAC
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY

OF SAN DIMAS, CONTRACT #ML18148, A MODIFIED AWARD
SUBSTITUTING THE INSTALLATION OF BICYCLE DETECTION UNITS
FOR THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED IMPLEMENTATION OF A BIKE
SHARING PROGRAM

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

**Agenda Item #8 – Consider 18-Month No Cost Term Extension by Riverside County
Transportation Commission (RTC), Contract #MS18023 (\$500,000 – Weekend Freeway
Service Patrols)**

No comments were made by any MSRC-TAC members or MSRC staff. No public comments were made.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY
MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE
ITEMS #4, #5 AND #8, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO
RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, CONTRACT #MS18023, AN 18-
MONTH NO-COST TERM EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #9 – Consider Opportunities to Expand the MSRC’s Social Media Impact

[MSRC Member Minh Le was not present during the full discussion of this item and did not vote.]

Ruben Aronin from the Better World Group (BWG) stated that with the \$37 million plus of investments that the MSRC-TAC recommended and the MSRC approved for the Inland Ports, the upcoming SCAG announcement, and other project investment opportunities, BWG would like to provide monthly recommended Tweets, Facebook posts and Instagram posts to both MSRC-TAC and MSRC members. BWG would like to invite the members to repost to optimize the content for their audience. One of the ways they do this with many other clients is connecting directly with the communications leads within the organization. Similarly, they were looking at how the MSRC can grow its followership by promoting some of the complementary initiatives that the members and their agencies are involved in as well. The goal of their efforts is to ensure that more people are aware of the MSRC’s programs, particularly the Goods Movement Program, within the social media space, increase awareness about the role that local and regional transportation air quality and elected officials play in crafting and implementing these programs and increasing the visibility of opportunities offered when funding notices are available. BWG does this productively and organically over time to grow the followers and audiences. They would like for the MSRC to consider including one or more content pieces of their quarterly e-newsletter that highlights facts at a glance, they would like help extending that content on social media. They want engagement in reposting MSRC social media content, including MSRC content on information platforms, such as websites or blogs. Sometimes there’s a need from local electeds or agencies for fresh content and they would love to provide a pipeline from MSRC

projects for that purpose and provide links and sample social media for items that would be appropriate for the MSRC to be promoting as well. They would start by making sure they have an inventory of all of the existing social media handles, if appropriate those would be individual handles of MSRC-TAC and MSRC members, but also agencies, in particular, social media handles within agencies that are relevant to the clean transportation programs that the MSRC provides. They propose frontloading this opportunity by sharing some sample social media on Monday, in conjunction with the press announcement that they plan on doing presuming that the South Coast AQMD approves the MSRC Inland Ports grants. They were looking to begin to expand the network of allies amongst MSRC-TAC and MSRC members to broaden the visibility of MSRC programs and to grow the voice and following of the MSRC on social media. They think the members and agencies, if appropriate, would be great brand ambassadors and information ambassadors to the constituents that the members represent as well. They propose to submit on a regular basis, via email, sample posts that can be copied and pasted or reposted, particularly around program funding opportunities and project award announcements and as news in their space is appropriate, to highlight or percolate share that as well.

MSRC-TAC Member, Derek Winters asked as a representative for CARB, if there would be any type of formal contract or would it be for whatever CARB sees fit to promote?

Mr. Aronin answered Mr. Winters by stating that there would not be a formal contract. This would be an at will opportunistic piece, for example, when CARB is wanting to highlight clean air or clean transportation investments in the South Coast region that are aligning with its mission and vision, it would be great for a CARB representative to share that information for their feed to make it available to Board members. He stated this is a way to notify people through social media of the MSRC's programs. Especially since the current climate doesn't allow for conferences or cocktail parties, this is another way to use influencers to share and grow the constituencies.

Mr. Winters stated that Mr. Aronin answered his questions, but he still needs to check with CARB before disseminating any information, but it shouldn't be a problem.

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson stated that it sounds like a good strategy, but quite often what the MSRC announces tends to be the award of money. Gathering information would take some coordination with Ray and Cynthia and to raise the visibility of some of the milestone points, like when the trucks come into service and when the projects are constructed. He thinks that it is even more important to show the hardware on the ground and that would vary over time. He also recommended for BWG to talk to legislators that represent these districts and get this information into their newsletters. He mentioned that some applicants are putting out their own press releases, he saw MHX put out a press release showing their commitment to their project.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Nancy Strickert asked what social media platforms would BWG be using? She tried finding the MSRC on Instagram but was unable to find it.

Mr. Aronin stated that they have a Facebook page for Clean Transportation Funding-MSRC that they are going to convert into an Instagram page as well. They don't currently have a lot of image content. They mostly have funding announcements, it's often been difficult to get project partners to give them timely information on implementation, which is more visually friendly. They also have a Twitter handle @cleantranspfund.

Ms. Strickert also asked if BWG would be open to disseminating information from other public transportation providers? Is it possible to extend that information when appropriate, especially on topics like ridesharing, bicycles, carpooling and vanpooling?

Mr. Aronin stated that they would be working with Cynthia and Ray, as well as the other MSRC members on where their comfort is in the MSRC amplifying and providing an echo chamber to some of the great programs that their colleagues are administering. He added that it would be fair to trade information, particularly when shining light on efforts to improve air quality and smart transit and transportation programs in our region.

MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn asked when sample posts would be distributed.

Mr. Aronin stated that with the MSRC-TAC's approval they would send sample social media posts on Monday. They will be programming the MSRC social media and providing sample social media to all of the award recipients that will be publicly announced on Monday. That will be made available to the MSRC and MSRC-TAC members in conjunction with Monday's press announcement. If it's too short notice, they can be teed up for the next opportunity for news.

Ms. Lynn stated that either way she would submit the samples to the public affairs department within her agency to approve.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee asked if with the funding received will they be using that to pay for anything like Google ads, Facebook ads or any sort of ads for exposure?

Mr. Aronin stated that a digital advertising budget was not included in their contract; they intend to grow their audience organically.

MSRC-TAC Chair AJ Marquez mentioned that though he agrees that social media engagement opportunities are good for the MSRC, he wanted to offer a word of caution because of potential Brown Act implications. He met with counsel before today's meeting and advised the MSRC-TAC members that they may continue to communicate on social media platforms to answer questions, provide information to the public or to solicit information from the public regarding a matter within their jurisdiction. He asked the board members to refrain from those activities if they involve a majority of the other members and contained discussions regarding official MSRC-TAC business. Discussions could be something as simple as a thumbs up, thumbs down or other emojis. He asked the board members to be mindful of those types of communications and though a single contact between one public official and another would not typically constitute as a prohibited meeting, AB992 now prohibits a member of a legislative body from responding directly to any communication on an internet based social media platform regarding a matter within the jurisdiction of that legislative body. As long as we are posting information that's in the public domain, they should be safe, but they should be careful with any types of interactions between the public or any other members.

Senior Deputy District Counsel Daphne Hsu stated that the key point of the new law that was passed last year is board members are not allowed to respond to any of the other members' posts period. Also there's the general prohibition against serial meetings. Those two things, in terms of

responding to other people's posts, mean something like a happy face emoticon that is prohibited under this law.

Mr. Aronin asked for clarification regarding an item that has passed, in public domain, which means it is no longer a pending item in front of the MSRC, would it still have those same restrictions on it? For example, the approval of the \$37 million for the Inland Ports, would members be able to push that out as a public announcement?

Ms. Hsu stated that members are allowed to put public information out there. But let's say Chair Marquez posts something, another cannot take action such as a "like" on the posts because public officials cannot respond to things in their jurisdiction on social media. They may push out information, provide information, but when they start communicating with each other, there are some concerns that start getting into the serial meeting territory.

Mr. Aronin stated that maybe it would be safer ground to like and repost MSRC social media content, which has been vetted before being made public.

Ms. Hsu agreed with Mr. Aronin stating that since the MSRC is not a member, it is different to "like" that post, whereas to "like" a member's post is prohibited.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND SECONDED BY
MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY
VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE THE BETTER WORLD GROUP'S
OUTREACH STRATEGY TO EXPAND THE MSRC SOCIAL MEDIA
IMPACT

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

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was introduced.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING
ADJOURNED AT 2:19 P.M.

NEXT MEETING: Next meeting: Thursday, May 6, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

(Minutes prepared by Maria M. Allen)