



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2018 MEETING MINUTES  
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765 - Room CC8**

**MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jason Lewis, SoCalGas  
David Czamanske, Consultant to Board Member (Cacciotti)

**SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS**

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant  
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison  
Naveen Berry, Asst. DEO/Science and Technology Advancement  
Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor-Contractor  
John Kampa, Financial Analyst  
Megan Lorenz, Principal Deputy District Counsel  
Matt Mackenzie, MSRC Contracts Assistant  
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

**CALL TO ORDER**

- Call to Order  
MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

**OPENING COMMENTS**

No opening comments.

**STATUS REPORT**

- Clean Transportation Policy Update –

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York commented several bills relating to clean energy were passed and were signed by the Governor. There was a discussion about the federal standards roll back and what that means to our program. Electric scooters are growing at an unprecedented pace. If you get the app you can pick up these electric scooters anywhere in a metropolitan area. 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](http://www.cleantransportationfunding.org).

**CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 2)**

**Receive and File**

**Agenda Item #1 – MSRC Contracts Administrator’s Report**

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for August 30, 2018 through September 26, 2018 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #2, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR AUGUST 30, 2018 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 26, 2018.

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 August 2018 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #2, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2018.

ACTION: No further action is required.

**ACTION CALENDAR (Items 3 through 9)**

**Agenda Item #3 – Consider Reduced Scope and Value and 18-Month Term Extension by City of Cathedral City, Contract #ML14072 (\$136,000 – Purchase Vehicles, Install Electric Vehicle Charging & Bike Racks, and Conduct Bicycle Education Campaign)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Cathedral City. The City was awarded \$136,000 under the FYs 2012-14 Local Government Match Program. There were specific allocations for the different portions of the project. The bulk of it was for vehicles: there's \$10,000 per vehicle for medium-duty, \$30,000 per vehicle for heavy-duty. The City has determined that they're cutting back the size of the Public Works Department, and therefore, are not planning to purchase as many vehicles. The City is requesting the tasks and funding associated with those vehicles be removed from the contract. The rest of the funding was for other project elements, \$20,000 for bicycle racks, \$21,000 for bicycle education, and \$25,000 for EV charging stations. While it is in one contract, each of those line items has a separate amount of money for it. Even if they give back the \$70,000 for the vehicles, that doesn't become available for the charging stations. With respect to the EV charging, they probably underestimated what the costs were going to be when they put in their original proposal. The City does have a fix for that because a lot of the cost of putting in many of these EV Chargers has to do with upgrading the electrical systems to be able to handle them. Now they've identified that they can put them into a new parking lot that they're constructing, which is already going to have the electrical upgraded to the standard needed. The cost for installing there is going to be lower and they'll be able to do that within this budget. The City is requesting additional time to complete that.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER JASON FARIN, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE A REDUCED SCOPE AND VALUE AND 18-MONTH TERM EXTENSION FOR CITY OF CATHEDRAL CITY.

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

**Agenda Item #4 – Consider Modified Statement of Work and Contract Term Extension to November 30, 2026 for Long Beach Transit (LBT), Contract #MS16121 (\$600,000 – Purchase 40 Near-Zero CNG Vehicles)**

MSRC-TAC Chair, Dan York, reported this is for a modified scope and extension for Long Beach Transit and there is a question in the staff report as to whether they addressed the five-year operational requirement. Staff’s modification is to 2026.

MSRC Contracts Administrator, Cynthia Ravenstein, added there is confusion involving the term of their contract and what is expected to be concluded within that term. They’re looking at a deadline for getting the vehicles into service and they asked for an extension of that date, but the actual contract termination date needs to be five years after that. There’s really no difference in the amount of time the contract would be extended. Long Beach Transit requests to modify the contract to repower 39 vehicles and purchase 1 vehicle, rather than purchase 40, because they were able to utilize another funding source for the other purchases.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE MODIFIED  
STATEMENT OF WORK AND CONTRACT TERM EXTENSION TO  
NOVEMBER 30, 2026 FOR LONG BEACH TRANSIT (LBT).

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

**Agenda Item #5 – Consider 14-Month Term Extension and Change of Contractor Name for the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), Contract #MS16091 (\$1,000,000 – Signal Synchronization Upgrades)**

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) requests a 14-month term extension due to longer than expected time necessary for data collection, corridor re-timing efforts and coordination with sixteen local jurisdictions. Additionally, in December 2016, San Bernardino Associated Governments informed the MSRC of the creation of the SBCTA. While the existing agreement remains valid, it is appropriate to change the contractor name as part of the modification.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER MARTIN BUFORD, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER LORELLE MOE-LUNA, THE  
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE A  
14-MONTH TERM EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF CONTRACTOR NAME  
FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
(SBCTA).

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

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider Modified/Corrected Award to Capistrano Unified School District under the Natural Gas Infrastructure Program**

As an element of the FYs 2016-18 Work Program, the MSRC previously awarded \$116,000 to Capistrano Unified School District as part of the Natural Gas Infrastructure Program. The project was described as the expansion of an existing limited access station, when the description should include both expansion of the station and training technicians. This action would correct the description with no change to the award amount.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE THE  
MODIFIED DESCRIPTION OF THE AWARD TO CAPISTRANO UNIFIED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT TO INCLUDE EXPANSION OF THE STATION AND  
TRAINING TECHNICIANS.

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

**Agenda Item #7 – Consider Novation of Contract #MS16030 with The Better World Group, Inc. to Better World Group Advisors, Inc.**

The Better World Group (BWG) currently provides the MSRC with programmatic outreach assistance under contract #MS16030, which will expire on December 31, 2019. BWG recently informed MSRC staff that their owner and CEO will be retiring at the end of 2018. On or before January 1, 2019, BWG will become a new legal entity named Better World Group Advisors, Inc. (BWGA) and have new co-owners. With the exception of the current owner, the same BWG staff would continue to provide service to the MSRC. In order to minimize any interruption in programmatic outreach, MSRC and SCAQMD Legal staff recommend execution of a novation agreement.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER VICKI WHITE, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE NOVATION OF  
THE CONTRACT WITH THE BETTER WORLD GROUP, INC. TO BETTER  
WORLD GROUP ADVISORS, INC.

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

**2016-18 WORK PROGRAM**

**Agenda Item #8 – Consider Funding for Applications Received under the Local Government Partnership Program**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported that over the past several months the TAC and the MSRC have seen applications coming forward under the Local Government Partnership Program. Last month, there were a very large number of applications that came in

right before the deadline. Two applications were not included for consideration in last month's awards. First, some clarifications were needed from the City of San Bernardino. Secondly, a numbering mix up between staff and SCAQMD Procurement regarding the City of Coachella's application was discovered in the interim. These are the last two applications under that program. The MSRC had allocated \$21,180,650 for this program. The previous awards totaled \$15,240,047, leaving a little over \$6,100,000. The Subcommittee is recommending two awards totaling \$337,108 for the Cities of Coachella and San Bernardino. If the MSRC-TAC recommends that the MSRC approve these awards, there would be approximately \$5,819,295 remaining which would revert back to the MSRC Discretionary Fund and become available as part of the next Work Program.

MSRC-TAC Chair, Dan York, commented that in last year's Local Partnership Program, there was really a big push for zero and near-zero and to be able to focus on infrastructure that would help support those kinds of vehicles. The \$21 million which was presented by the program was to really foster that kind of technology. Of the \$21 million, did it hit the goal that we really had going into it and was it primarily hitting charging stations? Ms. Ravenstein replied that there were some categories that were available to smaller cities only--those that had an allocation of the minimum \$50,000--for signal synchronization, for first mile/last mile, and some bicycle projects. Those categories were not all that popular. The vast majority of the funding went towards more advanced technologies and the infrastructure to support them.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Jason Lewis, Southern California Gas Company, stated for six and a half years, I worked as a State Local Government Energy Efficiency Partnership Program Manager, and I had never heard of this program until I started coming here. I would encourage and could provide contacts for SoCalEdison, SoCalGas and other municipal utilities to reach out and try to partner with them. I've been making them aware of this since I started getting this information, but it was kind of late obviously with it closing a few months ago. In the world of municipalities, these two worlds overlap in a big way with energy efficiency and sustainability.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER KELLY LYNN, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AWARDS TO THE CITIES OF COACHELLA AND SAN BERNARDINO FOR A TOTAL OF \$337,108.

**ACTION:** MSRC staff will include these award modifications on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

**Agenda Item #9 – Discuss Potential Discussion Items and Project Categories for the October 23, 2018 FYs 18-20 Work Program Joint Retreat**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported the MSRC and TAC will have their joint Retreat Tuesday, October 23<sup>rd</sup>, here at South Coast AQMD headquarters in conference room GB. This is the biennial get-together in which the MSRC and TAC begin the process of formulating how they're going to invest their upcoming two-year fiscal allocation. The amount of funding available for investment is \$46 million.

MSRC Chair Larry McCallon wants to focus at least part of the Retreat on a discussion of lessons learned from the recent Work Program and have staff discuss the emission reductions which have been captured through MSRC's investments, what the cost-effectiveness was on a per category, per project basis, how does it compare to prior years, are we doing worse or better and be able to show where they're putting their money and what their gains were in return for those investments. The intent would be to apply the lessons learned towards the identification and "refinement" of air quality proven strategies, particularly on the Local Government Partnership Program. There is an interest being expressed by members of the policy Committee to potentially have another iteration of that type of program. However, there's also the desire to have us perform an analysis to have a better understanding of what worked, what didn't and what needs to be modified to balance the achievement of air quality benefits versus having people actually come to the table and participate in program.

Other topics which staff is considering would be having an understanding and a dialogue as to where air quality funding on the state level is being invested. Who has the money and how are they spending it? This would include discussions with member agencies including the South Coast AQMD, California Air Resources Board and California Energy Commission because those are the big three for making air quality investments within the state. There are other colors of money, such as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and California Climate Initiative Investments, which are flowing through those agencies. By having them give us a good picture of how they are planning to make their investments over the next couple of years, it will give the MSRC and TAC the opportunity to see where the MSRC can fit in. It would also be helpful to have an understanding of any regulatory pushes which are being made through their regulatory agencies. One example is the advanced transit bus rule, because given the timeline and the obligation to start replacing transit fleets with zero-emission vehicles, it's going to be natural that you'll see a need for funding in that area. Then another topic is stakeholder perspective. The MSRC held five workshops to help understand the stakeholder perspective prior to beginning the work program development process. We're going to hear an analysis of those results, including how it compares to prior years and what are the trends.

The bulk of the discussion will be on pathways moving forward. This is to identify strategic paths for staff and TAC to do some investigation and outreach. One pathway is to simply continue to do what you've done. It doesn't mean you can't improve it through the lessons learned but to basically stay within these types of projects and do them for the next two years. The MSRC has made a lot of outreach over the last couple of years to form partnerships. Overall they've been very beneficial. However, given that it has \$46 million the MSRC does have the ability to identify its own project areas and implement those without any involvement from other member agencies or outside stakeholders. The question is, is there opportunity for the MSRC to leverage their \$46 million with other larger amounts of money made available through the CARB, the CEC and South Coast AQMD, to have more money available for specific types of programs such that you can have a larger impact?

There are a lot of programs being pursued, however, the majority of the state money is being invested in EV infrastructure technologies. Is that the only air quality strategy out there? No, it's not. There are other things that can be done to improve air quality. That's an opportunity for the MSRC to maybe find an underfunded category and make an investment. And even though there's a lot of money out there, the agencies believe or not are oversubscribed in certain categories. The most notable of these is The Carl Moyer Program, which has a huge funding backlog. There

is a potential to have the MSRC pick up some of those unfunded projects and achieve on behalf of the SCAQMD some very cost-effective air quality benefits. It would be relatively easy to do because the work is done, the projects are known, the only thing they are missing right now is some funding.

MSRC-TAC Member Martin Buford questioned whether we might not consider an expanded view of programs that could have air quality benefits as opposed to some of the stuff out there that's really chartable. I work in Regional Rideshare Shared Mobility Programs, where you design programs in the hopes that they are going to affect transportation congestion, which turns into air quality benefits. So you build it in the hopes that they will come. It's not guaranteed, but if you build it well enough, you have the opportunity of affecting it, like the Employee Commute Reduction Program (ECRP). When we are designing programs, usually around software designs to help match people up, we have some new ideas that we're going to start doing and I want to share them at some point. Right now we look at employers, and who works here and how can we find the people that live closest to each other, but instead my idea is to look at community based trips and then find people that can do a partial ride share, like first mile last mile to a rail station and then go opposite directions on the rail. That's going to take software development but the success of something like that could have positive air quality benefits. Sometimes with many of our agencies, our hands are tied because of funding, so we might consider an idea on how to obtain some of that money, especially if we were to do something regionally.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented there's \$46 million over the two-year period. Are you expecting those funds to be allocated to projects through contracts and completed? Do you have any guidelines or requirements to have 80% up front in the first year and the rest in the second year? Also do you have a liquidation deadline? Mr. Gorski replied the MSRC has full discretion as to how the money is managed. By the time we actually get going, we are going to have to invest \$46 million in one-year. The clock started July 1st for our two-year Work Program. It's going to take time for everyone to get Work Program ideas and then actually write programs and then run them through the public process, which requires going through subcommittees, the TAC, the MSRC and then SCAQMD Governing Board. When you look at the public process it's about 3 months. Ms. White questioned is there any way we can get in early into the planning process before the projects are approved to be filled? That kind of fits in to a little bit of the outreach plan that may go along with this funding cycle. A lot of these facilities, whether they're schools or warehouses, get sited right next to these residential areas. In the case put forth at a community meeting in San Bernardino, they're just siting warehouse facility after warehouse facility. These trucks are coming in and out of those facilities day and night and it's starting to impose a very heavy impact on those communities. Are there any strategies or something unique with the MSRC that maybe can get a little bit ahead of that process before the impact occurs? I was thinking of rethinking our outreach. Mr. Gorski replied that's an excellent point. We have a retained outreach coordinator. Part of this is let's do some additional target outreach, try to set the dominoes before the money pushes the first one over, that certainly can be done. That is a contract which is in place and the money's there and the only thing Cynthia needs to do is write a task order for them to go off and do something specific. So if that's the goal by all means you absolutely have the ability to make that happen. Using AQMD and MSRC resources together, we're trying that right now. The most recent instance is the hydrogen station that's going to be done in Irvine and there are other things we have been doing over the last decades. We've done taxicabs, residential EV charging, and Showcase. Twice as much money, can do twice as much good or more.

Assistant DEO of Science and Technology Advancement, Naveen Berry, questioned whether there are any limitations in terms of leveraging or partnering with federal, state or local funds? Mr. Gorski replied there used to be a provision in some other funding sources that you couldn't use them with AB 2766. Most of those have been stricken from the updated Health and Safety Code and the other areas in which those other programs are defined. Mr. Berry questioned how do you plan on showing cost-effectiveness? Mr. Gorski replied that's through the guidance of the California Resources Board. A long time ago, it was pretty much decided that infrastructure is an enabling investment to allow another air quality strategy to be viable. So you can't have hydrogen fuel trucks unless there's a hydrogen fuel station. So making investment there by definition is allowable. It's not quantified from a cost-effectiveness standpoint. Mr. Berry commented in the contracts are we putting in utilization rates or are we getting data back? Mr. Gorski replied unfortunately we put in utilization rates right before the great recession struck.

MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo commented the MSRC's mandate is really to target the criteria pollutants, but a lot of the efforts' funding right now is really targeted to GHG reduction. So it's like there are dual purposes, one to help achieve the quality standards and on the other hand to reduce greenhouse gases. So I'm wondering whether they may be some kind of discussion about the role of the MSRC and how maybe we can maximize the co-benefits. Mr. Gorski replied we actually started a couple years ago looking for those greenhouse gas reduction co-benefits. The mandate of the MSRC is to reduce air pollution consistent with the California Clean Air Act and the AQMP. If the AQMP has a real focus on reducing GHGs, then the MSRC by definition has more ability to focus investments on greenhouse gas reduction, even though it's not the traditional NOx or PM. I think we can do it and I think we are doing it because we're always trying to identify what the co-benefits are. Usually the reality is if you're doing a strategy that in fact that reduces criteria air pollutants, most of the time there's a corresponding greenhouse gas reduction. But again, I think your point's well-taken that we should maybe get some defined guidance as to how greenhouse gases fit into your investment plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Jason Lewis, SoCalGas, commented thank you for your previous support of CNG infrastructure. I want to remind you, if you hadn't seen it, fully 80% of all the people that got funding from the MSRC's Natural Gas Infrastructure Program were municipalities and school districts. I think that it's important that you recognize that the previous CNG Infrastructure Program was mostly about municipalities which is something that obviously you are all interested in supporting. I'd also like to say that there is one fuel--one infrastructure--that can provide you with electricity, compressed natural gas and hydrogen and that is CNG and the natural gas infrastructure. Through the utilization of fuel cells, you can produce electricity for battery electric vehicles, you can obviously produce CNG for CNG trucks, and you can also produce hydrogen for hydrogen fuel cells, or as some folks are calling it the other zero emission vehicle. I'm here to appeal to you all as a part of this process to consider reopening a version of the CNG Infrastructure Program. You have the hydrogen infrastructure program and maybe it would be a way to add on CNG as a part of that. It's important that we continue the efforts to reduce mobile air source pollution from the dirtiest pollution contributors which are heavy-duty trucks. There is really only one technology that can do a one-for-one replacement of a diesel truck on the road and that is a CNG heavy-duty truck. With the 0.02 g/bhp-hr optional low NOx truck, a truck that is 90% cleaner than the 2010 diesel, using renewable natural gas, you can reduce carbon by up to 80%. You're taking carbon out of the atmosphere and it's really starting to rise as a new fuel in California. We have a new pilot that was authorized by the CPUC. I'm really

here to ask if that could be considered on the agenda. I'm very proud to be able to announce now that SoCalGas has received an approval from the CPUC to go out and actually procure RNG in our own stations now. SoCalGas is doing our part and we also encourage that the overall CNG infrastructure in the market be supported as you have done in the past and I would encourage you to consider doing that in the future.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Agenda Item #10 – Receive Presentation on Transportation Systems in Singapore, Bangkok, and Seoul**

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee gave a presentation of the transportation systems in Singapore, Bangkok, and Seoul, with emphasis on station design, safety, equity, etiquette, and congestion pricing.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No public comment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING  
ADJOURNED AT 2:57 P.M.

**NEXT MEETING:** Next meeting: Joint Retreat, October 23, 2018, 10:00 a.m., Conference Room GB, at South Coast Air Quality Management District.

.  
(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)