



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 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
Jenny Chan, Riverside County Transportation Commission
Jason Farin, Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Steve Hillman, City of Los Angeles
Linda Johnson, Cities of Orange County
Nicholas Nairn-Birch, California Air Resources Board
Rongsheng Luo, Southern California Association of Governments
Scott Page, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Nicole Soto, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Sean O'Connor, Cities of San Bernardino
Andy Silva, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Vicki White, South Coast Air Quality Management District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas

SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison
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 1:30 p.m.

OPENING COMMENTS

No opening comments.

STATUS REPORT

- Clean Transportation Policy Update –

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

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 3)

Receive and Approve

Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the June 7 and August 2, 2018 MSRC-TAC Meetings

The Minutes for the June 7 and August 2, 2018 MSRC-TAC meetings were distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7 AND AUGUST, 2018 MSRC-TAC MEETINGS. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON ABSTAINED FROM ITEM #1.

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

Information Only – Receive and File

Agenda Item #2 – MSRC Contracts Administrator’s Report

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for September 27 through October 31, 2018 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 27 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2018.

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

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

The Financial Report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for September 2018 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE-CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, 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.

[MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo arrived at the meeting at approximately 1:45 p.m.]

ACTION CALENDAR

FYs2018-20 WORK PROGRAM

Agenda Item #4 – MSRC-TAC Discussions Regarding the FYs 2018-20 Work Program

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York highlighted some of the key takeaways from the Joint MSRC/MSRC-TAC Retreat. MSRC Chair Larry McCallon stated the need to focus on the criteria pollutants of concern right away. SCAQMD Deputy Executive Officer Matt Miyasato gave good highlights and focused on NOx reduction. The SCAQMD has a program focusing heavily on heavy-duty diesel trucks as a top contributor to NOx. We talked about a lot of technology related to the port trucks and some of the things that they're doing in that area. That's something that this group could choose to participate in or acknowledge that the SCAQMD already has a good viable program. MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson shared the Governor's Executive Orders. He felt the key driver was EV chargers and there was discussion on hydrogen stations. He also highlighted the advancement of fleet technology, low carbon fuels, and biofuels, and how there will still be a good opportunity to expand those. MSRC Member Jack Kitowski shared what CARB is doing including upcoming regulations and multi-agency partnerships. CARB's goal is zero-emission where feasible, otherwise near-zero. MSRC Member Michele Martinez was interested in general plans and zoning for local agencies and to get industrial operations out of our backyard. MSRC Member Jack Kitowski said on the industrial side, there may be some technology that can help address that. MSRC Member Martinez also talked about better use of data technology. Ray Gorski provided highlights of the Major Event Center Transportation Program. It's not the biggest chunk of money spent over the last few years; the most recent iteration utilized about \$4.5 million. It's had some success, however, there are

still things that need to be tightened up. There are some challenges with the program. If we choose to say status quo, is this the best use of our money? Has this program been in place long enough that if we weren't subsidizing them, would riders still use the services now if they had to pay?

Mr. York continued infrastructure has been the biggest slice of the pie. Why is that? We're a Technical Advisory Committee, meaning that we can focus on technical aspects-- the numbers. I want to challenge this group to consider what really is going to resonate technically. Then we can decide whether we continue with the Infrastructure Program. Do we continue to dole out little pieces of money to as many little cities as we can? Is that the most effective use of our money? It's the same with Local Partnership. At the end of the day, should we maintain the status quo? I just want to highlight that almost any project can yield cost-effective air quality benefits. There's no criticism as to what we've done over the last few years because we definitely have recommended projects to the MSRC that have had positive air quality benefits. In the past we have created Work Program Subcommittees which help identify how we're going to carve up the funds available to us. Historically after the Retreat three or four subcommittees have been formed based on subject matter. They consider potential project categories, make recommendations, and identify what they think would be a minimum funding amount. Each Subcommittee Chair makes their recommendations and then that goes to the MSRC, and thus we have a Work Program. After that, most of what we do for the rest of the Work Program is review what comes forward to us.

In the previous couple of Work Programs, the Infrastructure Program had about \$2.4 million awarded out of \$5 million budgeted. Then last year we had budgeted \$4 million, and awarded \$5.03 million. The Local Match Program historically awarded \$14 to \$15 million. We really bumped up the allocation last year. Our goal--and the direction of the MSRC Chair at that time--was to get more cities involved, and we did that. Even though the full \$21 million was not awarded, we awarded \$15.3 million. The Major Event Center Program was in the \$4.5 to \$5 million range. In the prior year, we were really focusing on incentives for near-zero and we budgeted \$10 million, but we only awarded 60% of that. Why was that? Was it because it wasn't a popular program? Was it because of our parameters? Over the last six years we've invested the biggest chunk in Local Government Match and sole-source awards to the CTCs and SCAG. I want to challenge the group to talk about what parameters we give the CTC's and SCAG. How do we want them to spend those monies to move forward the kind of programs that we think are going to provide the greatest impact? The FYs 2012-14 Work Program had \$23 million. This year it's \$45 million. We're seeing an increase in dollars available, however, when this program first started that money was able to go a lot further than it can go today. Inflation and population growth needs have hit us. So even though it looks like it's a bigger number, our buying power is probably less than what it was when we first started the program.

Over the last 10 years or so, of the various programs, is there something that this group has done that was really revolutionary--that did something very significant for air quality? MSRC Technical Advisor Ray Gorski replied let me preface this by talking about history. I've been associated with the program for just over 25 years and it has not always been done the way we've done it the last few Work Programs. A lot in the recent Work Programs has been based on lessons learned from those earliest years. But things do change over time, and it's always good to go back and reevaluate what you're doing and whether or not there's a better way. The MSRC did take some different approaches in the past. They worked with other agencies, identified a

specific need, and invested almost their entire pot into jump-starting a program which they viewed as having long-term benefits for the region. As one example, back in the late 1990s and early 2000s the MSRC was the leading entity for the introduction of the electric car into Southern California. That was a very significant undertaking. It involved the MSRC members going back to Detroit and working directly with the auto manufacturers and doing some pretty high-level negotiations relative to what the vehicle would cost. It was agreed that the MSRC would only invest their money if the auto manufacturers introduced their initial cars at a price point that was below the trigger for luxury tax, because the MSRC didn't want it to appear that they were only funding cars that rich people could afford. That was a negotiated agreement. But it took members physically going back to Detroit, sitting down at the table and saying look if you want our money, and all the support that we can get, this is what you have to do because we're not going to give you public money if it appears that you're just subsidizing rich people. Looking at it from a broader perspective, the MSRC understood that no way would electric vehicles become even remotely viable if there wasn't publicly accessible charging, so the MSRC made a decision to implement two large-scale programs: Quick Charge and EV Charge. The objective was to install as many publicly accessible level II chargers as possible to support the introduction of those electric cars. It was done region-wide and it was managed by the MSRC. Hundreds of chargers were put in and all the publicly accessible infrastructure was funded initially by the MSRC. The last thing we had to do, was help people find where the chargers were, so the MSRC negotiated with Caltrans to come up with a standard for EV signage. They also went out and hired a signage company to develop the actual signs and work with us to identify where the signs had to be located in proximity to a charger. Then we put a requirement back on the site, that if you are taking MSRC money, you have to provide adequate signage at your site.

Mr. Gorski continued that the MSRC has extraordinary flexibility and has the ability to do a project if they deem it important, hiring the expertise as necessary. When you start a Work Program, it's always a clean sheet of paper. We understand that certain things do become somewhat institutionalized. There are needs out there, and entities are looking forward to maybe getting that MSRC contribution. The reality of the consumer price index is that the monies we have today have the effective buying power of 50% of what they did when the legislation was first written, so that does to a certain degree hurt us. By doing a two-year Work Program it puts us back to the full strength of what we used to have for one year. But the one thing that we can always rely upon if we need to, is the potential to leverage other monies, and there's a lot of money out there. Back then the MSRC was the only game in town in all honesty. Today, the MSRC in their capacity as primarily elected officials, can work with their counterparts in the legislature or in the agencies. We can again put ourselves in the position where we have a meaningful amount of money to go off and do the great things that you're going to talk about today. The bottom line is it is a clean sheet of paper. There's a lot that still needs to be done. The MSRC has more flexibility than any other entity that funds projects, and the MSRC relies heavily on the input from their TAC to help them make these hard decisions. They could not have invented the EV programs had the concept not percolated up from members of the TAC who were proactive, saw the need, and came up with some really good ideas. Mr. York replied you actually touched on one thing that I was going to bring to the group as well. Instead of being deemed the agency that people are coming to looking for money, how can we take our money, go to somebody else, and say: we've got funding and here's our vision, what do we have to do and how does it fit in your program? How can we start using other people's money and make it a much bigger program?

Mr. York continued that if we decide to continue with status quo and stay with the current programs, I'm going to challenge this group to find more efficient ways. In other words, instead of those dollars being dissipated administratively, find ways that actually use the maximum amount of those dollars to put something in the ground--something that's going to be more positive. Are we going to recommend the status quo? Or are we going to take a new revolutionary approach? So when Tim Olson was talking about the California Energy Commission at the MSRC Retreat, he said our biggest charge for the next several years is going to be focusing on putting in EV charging stations. He said our biggest shortfall's going to be in providing the infrastructure for EV. That could be a program. For example, in Riverside County, we decided as a county that we wanted to change our carbon footprint. We wanted to take control of our street lights and swap out on the region wide basis to LEDs. Instead of going to each one of the 25 member agencies, we went to our Council of Governments. The COG can coordinate, they have the expertise and one or two staff members that will be 100% committed to this program and bring us all along. We're now delivering to all the agencies streetlights with LED technology that we're going to be swapping out before for this time next year. That's pretty earth-shattering. Models are out there and resources are there that can help us deliver a lot more in a lot faster time.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White asked whether there are any geographical commitments to meet per certain regions? Mr. Gorski replied no. Specifically, there's a policy that was adopted when the MSRC was formed, that there is no return to source requirement. However, the MSRC realized that because the legislation took into account for the four-county region that there should be broad-based participation, the MSRC has endeavored to have as many of the areas of the region participating in the program as practical. There's no firm requirement, but there's a desire for inclusion. Ms. White added there's a lot of opportunities to develop programs that are considering other funding sources to help leverage the MSRC money. I can already see opportunities in the coming year to do that. That's something that we should really explore, maybe set up a subcommittee, if there isn't one already going to focus just on that. It's a good idea. It takes a lot of time and effort. The Local Partnership was a great idea. It was a great model for what we could be doing with some other program.

MSRC-TAC Member Andy Silva commented there's boatloads of money out there right now. I'm going to go to the first AB 617 Steering Committee meeting tonight for San Bernardino. We have rail yards and we have trucks. There's going to be money coming in through AB 617 that we can maybe do something with. There's the Energy Commission. We can talk about how they spent Cap and Trade dollars but there's a bunch of Cap and Trade dollars out there. There's opportunities. I agree with Mayor McCallon, we should be looking at cutting NOx now because we've got four years to reach attainment. We've got 400 tons of NOx to go. Mr. Gorski added the MSRC has a lot of authority to do a lot of things, but it's not a legal entity per se. Because the MSRC doesn't have legal standing, we need another agency to step up and be the entity which seeks that money on behalf of the MSRC. When we went after some Energy Commission money, SCAQMD more or less put in the proposal on behalf of the MSRC. Because we can't do it ourselves, the establishment of partnerships with entities that can do it with us is going to be critical. Historically the District's been a logical one, but it doesn't have to be them.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay commented CARB just approved a funding plan for \$483 million, primarily from the Cap and Trade funds, and they've got it spread across a variety of programs including ports. And the Energy Commission has approved \$29+ million dollars for

DC fast charging in the region. That program will fund 70-75 % of the cost of a DC fast charger. So the idea of leveraging, filling that gap, would be doing what the AQMD has done with school buses. For example, there's a program with funding for electric school buses and the AQMD has stitched together funding from multiple sources so that the school districts are going to get these buses for virtually no cost. If we can figure out a way to leverage our funding that way I think it will have a lot of impact. There's another \$130 million that CARB is going to release from the VW penalty. That will come after January 1. There's an incredible need for infrastructure. A lot of people believe, at least the people who are distributing funds in Sacramento that DC fast Chargers are going to solve that issue. Most cars sit 95% of the time. If we can charge someone where they park, it's easier on the grid. It's going to have a lot more impact. And the Governor's given the Executive Order. He wants 250,000 chargers by 2025. We have fewer than 20,000 today. Yesterday there was a second workshop at CARB. There are going to be new regulations for EVSE for Level II and DC Fast Chargers. The regulations are going to require credit card readers. Basically in the past, when regulations would come down for EVSE, everything existing was grandfathered. This won't be. It's going to be a requirement to rip and replace in five years. That's going to have a real impact and I'm afraid that some agencies are going to just pull them out because they aren't going to have the funding to replace them. I'm actually working with Electrify America trying to get some of their DC Fast Chargers. There are a couple of issues that are really significant when you're putting in DC fast Chargers, while some issues are for any infrastructure. You have to provide for ADA. One of the things that requires is the first space has to be 12 feet wide. And so you end up losing a space and that gets you to a point where now you don't meet the minimum number of parking spots for occupancy. So we need to change that not only at the local level but also at the state level and so it's written in building code. Some agencies sees this as a change of use. I can put a Starbucks in a grocery store; that's not a change of use. I can put an ATM in the middle of a parking lot; that's not a change of use. But if I put in a level II charger in a parking lot, that's a change of use. You have to go through the seven-month process that has costs and delays projects. So that's going to be a huge issue and that's jurisdiction by jurisdiction county law. There's a ton of funding for disadvantaged communities, but it gets to your point about not having the resources; not having the expertise. Most of them are just trying to keep the lights on, they don't have the staff, the time, or the wherewithal even if they want to. So what I suggest, we fund resources at the COG level and that we make that available to communities within the COG, so that you get that level of expertise.

Mr. Teebay continued that the City of Boston got routing software for school buses. They were able to reduce the number of bus routes to service the same number of kids from like 662 to 590. That means the number of buses and the number of bus drivers, but it also means reducing emissions and reducing the cost at the fuel pump. I would suggest we find some kind of routing software that focuses on school buses and waste haulers, particularly municipal waste holders. UPS is already doing this. As far as disadvantaged communities, more than half of the disadvantaged communities statewide are in LA County. If you take the region as a whole, you're talking two-thirds of the disadvantaged communities. That means we ought to get two-thirds of the funding for disadvantaged communities. We ought to be there to step up and match them.

Mr. Silva commented speaking of the infrastructure issue, San Bernardino is an old city, and we've wanted to do the chargers. The chargers aren't that expensive but putting in a new transformer that can handle that load is expensive. Mr. Gorski commented I'm doing a bunch of charger installations right now, both Level II as well as DC Fast Charging; it's not a quick

process and it takes a lot more engineering than people think it does. You're cutting concrete, running conduit, and going back to the panel. Before you know it, you have this major design, which is costing you six figures for a \$5,000 box and it's taking a year. There are ways to do a few things, get legislation to give a "get-out-of-jail-free card" to entities which may violate their minimum parking requirements with the loss of a spot for ADA compliance--that shouldn't happen. There are examples of recent legislation which show it's possible to do that. For example, the exemption we were giving the alternative fuel vehicles. The MSRC has weighed in on other big issues like this in the past and has written advocacy papers to the authorities. That was done most recently when they were trying to hijack some bandwidth that was currently being used by signal synchronization projects that the MSRC had helped fund. We had to work to retain that, so all our investment wasn't for naught. Eventually, unfortunately, it was taken by the cellular telephone companies but the ability is there to advocate for something which is common sense and would be beneficial to the region and in keeping with the MSRC's mission.

MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo commented we need to do a combination of both old and new. With regards to the existing programs, we know quite a few are very popular. I'm wondering whether we can get a list of programs, and then we try to figure out which programs would have least resistance, if we want to either reduce the funding or get rid of the program. In the last two years' Work Program there's been a focus on the implementation of the AQMP. I think it still should be the focus. As you may be aware, the AQMP has a list of strategies with the associated NOx reductions. It would be nice if we could get some kind of reference list of which measures that the MSRC's money can fund. Some of those measures fall into regulation and my understanding is we cannot spend money for reductions required by regulation. Mr. Gorski replied when we launched the Local Government Partnership Program, going back to 2016, it was called the AQMP Jumpstart Program. The rationale was that the AQMD had just published the roadmap for reaching attainment. When you read the beginning of the AQMP, it talks about how much money they need to get--a billion dollars a year--so the MSRC made the first \$20 million investment and helped jump-start the key strategies which are heavy-duty vehicle emission reductions. If you look through the AQMP, it is focused extraordinarily heavily on reducing emissions from the heavy-duty sector, both on-road and off-road. If you look at the source categories, in order of which are the ones that are creating the most air pollution, the first one is heavy-duty trucks. The third one is ocean-going vessels, which we can't do. But the first couple we certainly can because they are on-road heavy duty trucks and off road construction equipment. Now that is where you get the most emission reductions and you get them primarily in the most cost-effective manner. However, that's not the total picture because there are other forms of money which are being used to implement those programs. The question is, is the money sufficient or is additional money needed? The Moyer backup list substantiates that. But if you want to look at what are the most cost-effective categories, off-road heavy-duty vehicle repowering is definitely number one. You get the biggest bang for the buck because the increment between the old and the new is so great. The near-zero heavy-duty natural gas engines are also cost-effective because it doesn't take a lot of money to get that 10% reduction in NOx when you're talking about that technology. It's not the huge zero-emission incremental cost, it's only a fraction of that.

Mr. Gorski continued that infrastructure is related, only because most of the infrastructure that the MSRC invests in, and especially the natural gas, is being used to help a fleet which is operating heavy-duty vehicles, whether they be natural gas trash trucks, buses, etc. So again, it's directly allowing that cost-effective technology to become viable. There's only so much more

time where anyone is going to be worried about reducing emissions from light-duty vehicles. The reason is that every year the standards change, and every year the fleet is turned over more. There's so much penetration now by vehicles which are, from the Air Resources Board perspective, near-zero. I mean so many cars have a partial zero-emission vehicle certification, or they're hybrids, or now people are starting to move towards the adoption of true electric vehicles. Every time we go to implement a project which is targeting reduction of VMT from light-duty vehicles, we need to remember that some of those people you're targeting are driving a Prius and they are not the problem. The light-duty fleet is only going to become cleaner over time. It takes more and more and more vehicles to be removed from the road to get that one pound of NOx reduction compared to if you repower a bulldozer.

Mr. Gorski said that the bottom line here, is no one is suggesting that you should abandon those programs that target VMT and trip reductions. But we just need to do it with the understanding that we need to get a broad swath of cars off the road. Stephen Lee made a presentation of his world travels and there was a lot of really good information there. The first one was that they have strong public-private partnerships, through advertising within their transit sector, to get more money into it. And the second thing is that there are a lot of nations which really are not that shy about imposing some pretty rigid requirements on drivers. He also talked about how in Asia where he was traveling, you don't necessarily get to just buy a car without paying a hefty tax. You don't simply get to drive it every day, without having restrictions on which days you cannot take that vehicle. If you go to London, you just don't drive into Central London. If you go to Japan, everyone is on a bicycle because it's so costly operate a car. The types of strategies which are really effective at VMT and trip production and cost effective are those that have broad impact. Congestion pricing make it so expensive that you don't want to park that car in downtown LA.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chen questioned what opportunities are there, if there are any, where we could reevaluate the Major Events Program and propose new guidelines or new restrictions. Mr. Gorski replied the nice thing about the Major Events program is that we've looked at that through a magnifying glass. The MSRC was presented with some projects which ultimately they denied. But as staff, we're obligated to have a good reason why a project is not recommended for funding from the MSRC. We're going through these analyses. We start to get a pretty good handle on which elements of a project are fatal. We've compiled a list of lessons learned that I believe can be applied to program categories like your Major Event Center Program. Let's look at the program design and make sure that the design is for an air quality improvement as opposed to solely for the convenience of the riders. For those types of projects, you have to do remember they are quality improvement projects as opposed to simply an alternative method to get to Dodger Stadium. It can be done. It takes a partnership with the proposing entity, and we've suggested to the MSRC that even before the application is submitted, we should sit down and look at the design and then work with the applicant to see if design modifications can be made.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Scott Page added a comment about the Major Event Funding. There's two things happening here. I've been working with the City of Inglewood. They got themselves into a real problem because they allowed the stadium to be built with no Environmental Impact Report, and with only adding 20,000 parking spaces for 90,000 seats. They're really in a panic. They've hired this guy who specializes in stadium parking shuttles, etc. I've advised them to work with Transit Systems who does the Hollywood Bowl and use the same methodology, the same kind of

parking places because they don't have a place for these people to park. You mention whether it is a matter of convenience for the person so they don't have to drive. Or is it a matter of if you don't have it they're going to drive and then we're going to have more NOx emissions and then the traffic is going to be so much worse. MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay replied a decade ago I used to be involved with the Hollywood Bowl project and the reason is they have 4,000 spaces at the Hollywood Bowl. It's exactly the same situation. So not only would you have gridlock but you don't have adequate parking for a 20,000-seat stadium. Mr. Page questioned who's responsible on the private side? Mr. Gorski replied those projects, from an air quality perspective, would fail. The reason is this: the vendor does not use the cleanest technology vehicles available. One of the lessons learned is the minimum standard needs to be near-zero for the shuttles; they would need to clean up their fleet. Mr. Teebay added in defense of Transit Systems, the buses they have meet the 2010 standard which is not adequate, but that's part of the problem. We're saying that the operator has to operate new buses. We're not saying almost new buses, but new buses. Mr. Gorski added we're saying that they need to hit a minimum emission standard. The MSRC, being the entity it is, could have a portion of its Work Program to help to buy down the cost of the cleanest technology for entities which want to do access to venues, whether it be under the Major Event Program or not. I look at it from an air quality perspective and if you have to sit in traffic for two hours in your Prius, I don't care because you're not the emissions problem. If you look at the ARB standards for light-duty vehicles, the average car is now very clean. And because cars roll over, the technology now in vehicles--even of the average age--in California is to the point where they are almost all what we classify as almost near-zero vehicles. Light-duty is not the problem anymore. And everyone has recognized that. Because if you look at where the money goes, there's no programs out there with the exception of the Clean Vehicle Rebate Program which actually incentivize light-duty vehicles. Everything else is heavy-duty vehicles.

Mr. Page commented getting back to the buses, it used to be that Hollywood Bowl used Metro. We never had enough drivers to fill the run and by the FTA rules we couldn't spend federal money on point-to-point service. If you were going to buy down the cost for a private operator who's only going to use those buses when the Hollywood Bowl is in session, it's not good business sense for these people. You have to determine where the 2010 standard is and where the business standard is; there has to be some happy medium somewhere for the good of the county. Mr. Gorski replied it's not the MSRC's issue because we have to get cost-effective emission reductions. The venue, the Hollywood Bowl, they're the ones that are obligated to figure out how to have people conveniently access their venue. That project didn't deliver. The MSRC tried it twice. The better way to do it, which will actually get you emission reductions, is if they run zero-emission buses and that's the best way to do it. If they can't run zero, then near-zero at the maximum because anything above that doesn't break even.

MSRC-TAC Member Martin Buford asked would the MSRC be in a position, or should they be in a position, with this situation in Inglewood to get them out of a pickle because of their poor planning? Is that the best way to spend money or do they just figure it out themselves? Mr. York replied I think those are good points. The challenge that we have today is simple. The MSRC has \$46.5 million. We've identified the MSRC-TAC's job is to recommend what will provide the most reduction in NOx. If these programs are still a high priority for us, then I think we would continue to work through these points in subcommittee. You may want to join that subcommittee. Early on we talked about having a subcommittee to focus on other monies to match the program. How do we leverage? And Rick did a great job of identifying some

significant pots of money. Mr. Teebay added with Edison Charge Ready Program, they're going to have funding for infrastructure.

Mr. York asked is there a feeling amongst the group that we want to spend some time and effort towards a bigger program, something that like the first EV car? The kind where in 10 years, you look back at our legacy and say this Work Program made a significant impact on where we are today. Is that our charge? Or are you all still feeling like there's still so much to do with the current programs, and we'd like to look again at those existing subcommittees, and these existing kind of pots of money, and then work in those subcommittees to start addressing some of these other concerns? Who has an appetite for maybe something that is revolutionary--that might really leverage these dollars and achieve a more significant reduction in air pollution by going to different, revolutionary approach? Understand that we're not a political body; the political body's going to have some weigh in. So I'm hearing from you that there may already be a desire of the existing political body to maintain some level of consistency. We still as a technical advisory group could make a dual presentation. In the first presentation, we could really highlight the opportunities and the goal. We could have a discussion about here are some opportunities, here's where we would like to spend the first part of our program to do some additional investigation to engage some of the other groups who have technical data. We could probably do that, and maybe be a little bit slower in carving up all the pie, to present to them a pretty significant program. And then the other part of that could still be distributed out towards whatever those programs are.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee commented the Local Match Program seems like it was a fairly new program. It seems like a lot of thought went into designing that program. Mr. Gorski replied the newest version of the Local Match Program started little over a year ago. It was a reincarnation of the original Local Government Match Program which ran for about 18-20 years. Mr. Lee commented in less than a year \$15 million was spent. That seems to be a guaranteed way of successfully spending a good chunk of the money. It's a new program you put a lot of thought into, and it's proven. If you're doing a split between status quo and new ideas, I would vote for that as a way of guaranteeing that you're getting very good value for a good chunk of the money. You could think of new ideas with the remainder, or some sort of hybrid approach.

MSRC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso commented we should definitely pursue those, but there's something to be said for having a program that comes back year after year. Agencies are used to it; maybe they start planning for it. They structure some of their air quality activities around an expectation that some of those programs are going to keep coming back. If we are going to walk away from some of those, maybe we do it in a tapered approach. Maybe you start increasing the local match requirement for those programs, so it's not just a clean break. In the agency I come from, we always try and push for more of a formula approach. In terms of the goals, at the state level there are so many funding programs that have these multiple layers of goals. The simpler we can make the goals here, the more successful we will be. I'm a little concerned about focusing on disadvantaged communities when you're talking about transportation and transportation infrastructure. It's not like we're building a park or a bikeway or something. We're talking about regional transportation. And in order for regional transportation to be successful, it needs to be deployed throughout the region not just in specific localized communities. That's another area that I would be really hesitant to consider. OCTA really likes the Local Partnership Program, the Major Event Program and we definitely like the County Transportation Commission Program.

Mr. Gorski commented that we have presented to the MSRC on two occasions. We have knowledge of areas that need improvement, if it is going to be relaunched. There are lessons learned that we really want to incorporate because it's why we did an evaluation of the program, and talked to the stakeholders and got their feedback. We're thinking of having another survey of those that didn't participate to find out why not. We get we have some more knowledge. We have a pretty long list of things that need to be evaluated.

Mr. York commented that at our next meeting we can talk about those subcommittees. This would not be agreeing to a dollar amount, but talking about those programs that we think we would like to embark on. And we can talk about this new bigger revolutionary program, where we do something. We look for money match sources, identify where the best expenditure of our dollar is; we look at where we have leverage and we have a subcommittee that focuses on that. That could be a new subcommittee; it could be somewhat exciting. We can have a discussion of the Local Match and infrastructure. I would have loved it if today we would have walked away and said let's put \$46.5 million down, we're going big. I also understand that's not realistic. But I will tell you that what we are doing today could be setting ourselves up to do that maybe in the second Work Program after this or the third Work Program. And if this Work Program includes some pilot programs to collect data, using some of the other resources that we have through our CTCs and our COGs, in order to revisit supporting the AQMP maybe there's still involvement for us there. The detailed work needs to be done at the subcommittee level and reported back. I appreciate you allowing me to go a little rogue and off script today. We don't have a perfect answer and that's an okay thing. We're not really voting on anything and that's an okay thing. The next meeting we will need to start drilling it down and I think maybe that is a good solution. As individuals, please send to staff what you think your priorities are and then they will they will accumulate those for our next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING
ADJOURNED AT 3:00 P.M.

NEXT MEETING: Next meeting: December 13, 2018, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room CC8, at South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)