



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC  
THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES  
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765 - Room CC8**

**MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez, Orange County Board of Supervisors  
Adriann Cardoso, Orange County Transportation Authority  
Jenny Chan (Alt.), Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Steven Hillman, City of Los Angeles  
Linda Johnson (Alt.), 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  
Sean O'Connor, Cities of San Bernardino County  
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Vicki White, South Coast Air Quality Management District

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Lauren Dunlap, Southern California Gas  
Cathy Rosas, LA Metro  
Sandra Solis, LA Metro  
Patricia Whelan, Dodgers

**SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS**

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant  
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison  
John Kampa, Financial Analyst  
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel  
Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant  
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

## CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order  
MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair AJ Marquez called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.
- Opening Comments  
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel announced there is a requirement for ethics training. She said, if you have completed the training, please turn in your certificate to me or Cindy Bustillos.

MSRC-TAC Vice Chair AJ Marquez announced we're going to rearrange the agenda. Item #4 will be moved to the end of the agenda. We're going to consider items #10 and #11 in order, these both have to do with the Major Event Center Program.

## **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](http://www.cleantransportationfunding.org).

## **CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 3)**

### **Receive and Approve**

### **Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the Minutes for the November 8 and December 13, 2018 MSRC-TAC Meetings**

The minutes of the November 8 and December 13, 2018 MSRC-TAC meetings were included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN HILLMAN, UNDER  
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-  
TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND APPROVED THE MINUTES  
OF THE NOVEMBER 8 AND DECEMBER 13, 2018 MSRC-TAC  
MEETINGS.

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 January 31, 2019 through February 27, 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN HILLMAN, UNDER  
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-  
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE  
CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR JANUARY 31, 2019  
THROUGH FEBRUARY 27, 2019.

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 February 2019 was distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN HILLMAN, 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 2019.

ACTION: No further action is required.

**ACTION CALENDAR (Items 10 through 11)**

[MSRC-TAC Members Adriann Cardoso and Kelly Lynn arrived during the discussion of item #10.]

**Agenda Item #10 – Consider Program Announcement for Major Event Center Transportation Program**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported this is the draft Program Announcement for the 2018-21 iteration of the MSRC’s Major Event Transportation Program. Some modifications have been made based on the Event Center Subcommittee’s work to continue the program for this current Work Program cycle, taking into account the lessons learned and direction that was given by the MSRC at their Retreat in October.

The Program Announcement to a large extent follows the same basic format which was previously implemented by the MSRC, however, there are a few notable changes. The Subcommittee has recommended a targeted funding amount of \$6.5 million that would cover the three-year period for 2019 through 2021. There would be a geographic funding minimum for each county in an amount of \$450,000. It's been recommended that no single entity be able to secure more than 50% of the total funding available, which would be \$3.25 million. The program will run from the date that the South Coast AQMD's Governing Board approves the solicitation, tentatively the first Friday in April. Applications will be accepted beginning at that time, with the exception of one today that we'll talk about in item #11. The last day to turn in an application will be March 30, 2021. The other pertinent elements of this solicitation are changes that focus primarily on zero and near-zero transportation. There's a requirement that near-zero or zero-emission vehicles be used exclusively for implementing service. There have been some recommended changes in the proposal evaluation and scoring. This would become a two-step process, in which the first step is simply a reasonable certainty that the project will in fact yield a net air quality benefit. The second step would be scoring, which will also look at the other attributes of the project. Based upon the points which are awarded, the scoring would make a determination as to whether or not the project meets the minimum threshold for funding consideration. This will probably be a much better way of doing evaluation because we're not comparing proposals against each other. We're comparing them against the requirements as set forth by the MSRC and TAC. So, this will allow a fair evaluation but also ensure that the program is going to yield the benefits which the MSRC expects given the investment that they're going to be asked to make.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee asked where the distribution of points came from. Mr. Gorski replied that when we took the Subcommittee comments when we all participated on those teleconferences, it became pretty obvious to staff that the current evaluation design was not going to continue to work. It actually was designed more for having proposals competing against each other and that's really not the case in this process. The proposals can be submitted at any time within the application submittal window and they're evaluated on a case-by-case basis. What we need to determine is if the proposal will have a reasonable probability of achieving cost effective air quality benefits. That's how we designed the scoring, having a gatekeeper, if it will not result in an air quality benefit then it probably is not in the interest of the MSRC to consider it. And then secondly, we're trying to ensure that the investments that the MSRC makes are cost-effective, meaning that the air quality benefit which will result from the project is something which is commensurate with the amount of funding that the MSRC is asked to invest in that project. That's why the cost-effectiveness is in there. The nexus to existing public transit, that was based upon commentary that was provided at the Subcommittee level. That's to ensure that projects, to the extent feasible, do have connectivity with other existing public transit. A lesson learned from the nine years of implementing the program is that those that are successful utilize other sources of public transportation in addition to that feeder service to access the event center. It's requested that the proposers provide information relative to how they integrate their event center service with other

existing public transit. The program continuation plan is a carryover from every previous Major Event Center Program. It's the MSRC's attempt to design this funding to be used to launch projects and help them reach a sustainable operational level. It's hoped that in the future, projects will be able to continue their operations without the need for additional funding from the MSRC. This is to explain the process in which they will achieve self-sustaining status.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented, this is proposed as \$6.5 million allocated over the three years. Do you anticipate getting enough applications in to subscribe \$6.5 million or do you anticipate being undersubscribed and having to release another solicitation, maybe a year or two from now? Mr. Gorski replied, we do not anticipate releasing another solicitation. We make the best judgment based on what has happened in the past and try to use that as the point for targeting a funding value for the program. Based upon past experience and the number of proposals we typically see, we believe \$6.5 million is probably a reasonable amount that I doubt would be oversubscribed, but I do not expect it to be significantly undersubscribed either. Ms. White asked, how are you going to rank these projects in the event that you are oversubscribed? Mr. Gorski replied, we're not because these are going to be reviewed in order of receipt. Ms. White commented, there was a defined application period right. Mr. Gorski replied, it ends in March 30, 2021. Ms. White asked, if your undersubscribed are you going to extend that or reallocate the funds? Mr. Gorski replied, that is going to be pretty much commensurate with the end of the MSRC's Work Program. So, any funds that were left in this category, would simply revert to the Discretionary Fund.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee noted that some of the scoring criteria were part of the scoring process from previous programs. The program continuation plan previously was worth 10 or 15 points, and now it's proposed as 50. He would propose 50 for cost effectiveness, 25 for nexus to transit, and 25 for program continuation.

MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo commented, in the previous Program Announcement, we had cost-effectiveness, co-funding and we also had continuation, but I don't think we had the nexus. Mr. Gorski replied, co-funding is no longer an element for the evaluation. Co-funding is minimum, that's set forth within the Program Announcement. Mr. Gorski replied, we are trying to depart from our previous ways of doing it because it is our belief that it did not work that well. So, based on the lessons learned, this is a much more doable evaluation method for the subcommittee members. The 50 points for the program continuation plan is intended to send a message that this program will be coming to an end and that people who are participating really should endeavor to put effort into determining how they will continue this program, once the MSRC money is no longer available.

MSRC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso commented, we said a match as part of the subcommittee, but I guess I missed the part where we said we wouldn't provide points for additional match. Did we discuss that? Mr. Gorski replied, it's kind of a moot point when

you're only evaluating one single proposal. It's not competing against anyone else, so to give them points for having a higher match, it really doesn't have any impact on whether or not they ultimately get their funding. What does have impact, is if we set a minimum threshold and say if the program doesn't have the air quality benefits and can't deliver those in a cost-effective manner. In my opinion, that is where the bar needs to be. A line needs to be drawn and you need to fall on either side of it to be considered for funding. Ms. Cardoso commented, you're going to set a minimum point threshold that everyone has to score. Mr. Gorski replied, yes, every proposal will have to meet the minimum 70.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay asked, how cost-effective have these projects been in the past? Mr. Gorski replied, not very cost-effective. Mr. Lee commented, Ray had a presentation during the Retreat, that showed the cost-effectiveness. The top three Event Center projects were the Angels, the OC Fair and the Dodgers Express. Mr. Gorski replied, the problem is when I go and rerun the numbers using the new automobile emission factors, which are much cleaner than the ones that were originally used, the cost-effectiveness of the most cost-effective project is going to jump down a tier or so. The ones that came in at the mid-level are going to drop down to the lower level and based upon what I'm hearing, for example, the OC Fair would probably not get funded. You build in some benefit if you use zero-emission buses, for example, because they're going to get higher cost-effectiveness. Mr. Lee commented, I thought was a pass or fail kind of approach, if it didn't have an air quality benefit then we would not accept the application. If it does have some type of air quality benefits, I believe we would accept the application. There were no talks of a point system at the Subcommittee. Ms. Cardoso added, there was some talk though of caps. There was no talk about cost, but I don't think we approved that option. Mr. Lee added, the points is really new to me and apparently everybody here at the TAC level too. I would actually instead of proposing the points, to make a motion to what we discussed at the Subcommittee level. If in fact a project has an air quality benefit, to take that into consideration and have that for TAC to vote on the project because I can't think of any other projects that have this type of point system. Mr. Gorski replied, I think the MSRC might disagree with that. The problem is that you can have a project with an air quality benefit, but it has to be commensurate with the investment which the MSRC has been asked to make. To spend a million dollars to earn one pound of air quality benefit is not a good investment. The MSRC needs a goal post, something that they can compare projects against and amongst categories. Are you going to invest in a clean transportation system or you going to invest in Event Center? For every dollar you invest, if you get 10 times the pay back in air quality benefits from one versus the other, you probably want to make your investment in that which was cost-effective and that's why I put it in there. Not just to not have any guidance, would mean that you could be potentially funding projects, on which you'd spend a lot of money and have very little to show for it at the end of the day. That's unfortunately somewhat the situation we found ourselves in, so when we're at the MSRC meeting and discussions with the MSRC, it's clear that they want us to be investing in those projects which are in fact cost-effective, for which the return on investment warrants the MSRC investment.

Mr. Marquez commented, your scoring criteria is defensible. Mr. Gorski replied, it's based upon past history, taking into account some changes in emission factors, which have been promulgated by CARB. When I designed it, I looked at the cost-effectiveness of past projects and also what's a reasonable place to draw the line. There's a point at which spending a lot of money and getting nothing too much in return is not in the best interest of public policy. Mr. Luo asked, to put it in perspective, what is the average Carl Moyer cost-effectiveness? Mr. Gorski replied, Carl Moyer comes in at \$1700/ton, these are not even anywhere near that. None of this would qualify under Carl Moyer.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan commented, I personally like the points breakdown for criterion #1 but I'm curious as to how or if we should also do a point breakdown for #2 and #3? Mr. Gorski replied, it's always good to have quantitative evaluation. I wasn't sure how to do it for #2 and 3 in all honesty. I think #3 really is more subjective because it's more of a narrative, but we can assign points to anything. To try to put a definitive range in for #2 and #3, I had difficulty doing that. Those are to a certain degree, a little more subjective. Air quality quantification and cost-effectiveness are objective criteria. There are methodologies which we use to calculate those. And there are measures of effectiveness which the regulatory agencies use in determining the merits of their projects and that only brings the MSRC closer to how other regulatory agencies invest money based upon knowledge of what you're going to get in return.

Ms. Chan continued, for the past submitted applications, did a majority of them have a nexus to a public transit service, such as being directly next to a Union Station or a rail station? Mr. Gorski replied, as we discussed during the Subcommittee deliberations, it's going to be important for project applicants to endeavor to improve their transit connectivity. That's really where the benefits are generated from and looking at past programs, we believe there are opportunities for them to do so. We've had projects recently submitted fail because there was no reasonable connectivity to existing transit. When you only looked at the benefits generated by the shuttle; it really didn't warrant funding consideration by the MSRC. When someone's putting together a proposal, the first thing they should understand how they're going to be scored. I would hope that they look at 1, 2, and 3, take them to heart, and then in designing their project do their best to make it firstly cost-effective from an air quality perspective. But also, to the extent possible, utilize or have a nexus to connectivity with other public transit and then also be thinking about how are they going to continue this program in the event that the MSRC funding is either reduced or eliminated at some point the future.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Linda Johnson asked, for the past projects, how would they have scored on of the proposed points for cost-effectiveness? Mr. Gorski replied, just to give a couple examples, the Dodger Stadium Express, at one time would have scored somewhere between 25 and 20 points. Right now, it's probably going to be in the same ballpark. Something like the OCTA's Fair Express, would have scored probably in the 15-point range. We have other projects that, if they were put forth for consideration today, might score less.

Mr. Lee commented, what were the top three numbers again from your presentation from the Retreat? Mr. Gorski replied, the Dodgers came in at little over \$500/pound. If the Dodgers now utilized their 0.02 gram buses, that would make cost-effectiveness a little better, but you have to factor in the cleanliness of the vehicles because every year cars get cleaner on average. Since now the Dodgers proposal took out the rail element for the crosstown rivalry games, that's going to help the cost-effectiveness again. I'll predict that it's going to come out pretty much between \$500 and \$750/pound. The next two were in the \$1,500 to \$2,499 range. If they utilize the 0.02 gram buses and maybe improve their transit connectivity, they could easily get themselves up to 20 points. It comes down to project design and we'd certainly be willing to work with any potential applicant to help them understand what the implications of project design are and maybe make some suggestions for how to improve it. We tried that quite a bit with one of the applicants and fortunately at the end of the day the answer still came back no. That project didn't make it but under this scoring matrix, that would not have fared very well anyway, and we don't believe it had a net air quality benefit.

Ms. Johnson commented, I just wanted to note as a someone that has seen some of these major event center proposals over the last several years, I kind of like the idea of expanding the emphasis on the program continuation. It needs to send a clear message that things have changed. In the past, it seemed like a lot of folks were just cutting and pasting their continuation plans. There was really never anything that they expanded upon. When you look at an RFP, if it's a real small amount of points, it's like cut and paste, it doesn't really matter. If we're trying to send a message that this program isn't going to continue forever, increasing the points on it sends that message to the proposers. They'll look at that differently, especially folks that have submitted before. I used to work on the private side, I used to look at RFPs and that's one of the first things you look at, is where those points are being broken up.

The MSRC-TAC considered a number of different possible point allocations between the three criteria. Following extensive discussion, a consensus appeared to develop for Cost-Effectiveness at 50 points, Nexus to Other Transit at 25 points, and Program Continuation Plan at 25 points. The MSRC-TAC also discussed several different options for cost-effectiveness ranges in terms of dollars per pound. The consensus was to leave the ranges as originally proposed, but with corresponding point values of 50/40/30/20/10/0.

Mr. Marquez commented, let me recap just to make sure everyone's on the same page, the Major Event Center project cost-effectiveness will be 50 points. The table will start at 50 and go down to 0. The nexus to other public transit services will be 25 points, and program continuation would be 25 points; that would be rated on the narrative.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE JENNY CHAN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE

MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE MAJOR EVENT CENTER PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT WITH THE SCORING WEIGHTED AS 50 POINTS FOR COST-EFFECTIVENESS, 25 POINTS FOR NEXUS TO OTHER TRANSIT, AND 25 POINTS FOR PROGRAM CONTINUATION PLAN. .

ACTION: The proposed Program Announcement will be included on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

**Agenda Item #11 – Consider Sole-Source Funding Award to Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to Implement Dodger Stadium Express Transportation Service for 2019**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported the Dodger and LA Metro partnership is proposing to implement Dodger Stadium Express service between Union Station and Dodger Stadium for the 2019 Baseball season. The total funding request is \$1,163,485. This will be met with co-funding which will be greater than or equal to that amount, for 81 regular season games, a preseason game, two special events which primarily are concerts, and then up to 10 postseason playoff games. It would be very similar to past programs. The major modification which has been made to this proposal is that LA Metro has committed to use their near-zero buses to implement the service. That's going to improve the overall program quantitative emissions benefits, as well as cost-effectiveness. They added a new elements to their outreach plan: three videos which are going to be made. The MSRC is being requested to fund pretty much the same cost elements as in prior Work Program years, specifically the actual direct transportation costs associated with the Dodger Stadium Express, as well as traffic control. This ensures that the buses can get between Dodger Stadium and the Union Station in a less impeded manner. Security, to ensure that there are no incidents on this service that would diminish its attractiveness, would also be funded. Although this has been submitted for consideration prior to the release of the Program Announcement, it would be acceptable under the terms of the new Program Announcement. There may be a requirement for LA Metro and the Dodgers to look at item #3 in the evaluation scoring matrix and a request to provide some additional information. As far as the quantifiable air quality benefits, we have enough experience to say with substantial certainty that it would score high enough that it would be recommended for funding award.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER KELLY LYNN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, THE  
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ALLOW LOS ANGELES  
COUNTY METROPOLITAN AUTHORITY (METRO) TO SUBMIT  
THEIR APPLICATION FOR DODGER STADIUM EXPRESS SERVICE  
FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE MSRC AT THEIR MARCH 2019

MEETING, UNDER THE CONDITION THAT METRO AGREES TO ABIDE BY ALL RECOMMENDATIONS RESULTING FROM THE MSRC-TAC PROCESS AND THEY AGREE TO POTENTIAL NEGOTIATIONS TO REVISE THEIR PROPOSED PROJECT PRIOR TO CONTRACT EXECUTION.

ACTION: This award will be included on the next MSRC agenda for approval.

### **FYs 2016-18 WORK PROGRAM**

#### **Agenda Item #5 – Consider Four-Year Contract Term Extension for the City of Palm Springs, Contract #ML12090 (Install EV Charging Station)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported that MSRC staff usually does not make any recommendations with respect to a contract modification request but if a four-year term extension were approved, that would be precedent setting. The City was originally awarded \$38,000 under the FY 2011-12 Local Government Match Program towards the installation of 6 EV charging stations. The City obtained additional co-funding and was able to complete the station installation specified in the contract without MSRC funding assistance. MSRC staff made many attempts to learn from the City whether they had unreimbursed costs on other station installations and would like to request a substitution. However, City staff changes including the death of the City's consultant delayed their decision on how to proceed. The City would like to take the funding that was originally awarded to install an additional Level III station in a different location. They are requesting a four-year contract term extension in order to allow time to complete the installation and meet the five-year operational requirement.

MSRC-TAC Rongsheng Luo asked this four-term extension is precedent setting but there have been projects that have requested extensions multiple times, if we combine all of the extensions, would this still be precedent setting? Ms. Ravenstein replied no, there have been others that have received multiple extensions, but the cumulative effect is much longer. Mr. Luo added if we acknowledge that would this extension be such a long event. MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee commented that it's just changing, and they haven't taken the money and they're going to change it again in regard to the type. Who knows if in four years they come back and say we have a different project again?

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan asked with the City doing the Level III, would that give more benefits versus a Level II? Ms. Ravenstein replied certainly one could argue that there are more benefits to that, people can charge faster. Then again, for some situations where people are going to be leaving their vehicle parked, then Level II is fine.

MSRC-TAC Chair AJ Marquez commented that if we don't vote on this, we deny it, there's no Local Government Match Program currently for them to reapply to. Ms.

Ravenstein replied, the TAC's recommendation would still go to the MSRC, the City would have the opportunity to come and speak to the MSRC about it.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Linda Johnson commented that it seems that they've really done a lot of work and they're asking for one more. They are not asking for more money, just to use the money. Working at a city hall, there's an increasing number of cars that use these facilities. I would be in favor of giving them the extension.

MSRC-TAC Member Rick Teebay commented that looking at Plug Share, there are three in the area, Cathedral City, Plaza Rio Vista in Cathedral City and at Palm Springs Visitor Center. It doesn't seem unreasonable if they want to do a DC fast charger at that location. What I would question would be the length of time and whether or not we want to set that precedent. I wonder is there any way that they would agree to continue for this for a five-year period, but we gave them a shorter window in order to do the installation.

MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn commented that on other projects we've done check-ins. If that was something we are able to do with them in a year or 18 months, just to see are they progressing or moving along.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor commented that just to clarify because the charger will be operational by October 2020, that's 18 months away or so. The extension to 2025 is administrative, in the sense that it ensures we have a contract in place in the event the South Coast AQMD would need to take action on behalf of the MSRC. So, it's not like the station's not going to be put in until 2025. It's going to be in operation by 2020. We can give a proposed date of October 2020, make sure that they come in and September 2020 or earlier and say yes, they will make or will not make it. And in the event that they're not going to make it, they need to have a good explanation and then have something else built in that would just drop in, if they really are starting to have further delay beyond that.

Ms. Chan commented that I make a motion to approve with asking them to complete the project by September 2020.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE JENNY CHAN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE  
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO  
APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF PALM SPRINGS, CONTRACT  
#ML12090, A FOUR-YEAR CONTRACT TERM EXTENSION WITH  
THE CONDITION THAT WORK MUST BE COMPLETE BY  
SEPTEMBER 2020.

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

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider Two-Year Contract Term Extension by City of Fontana, Contract #ML16047 (Enhance Class I Bikeway)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Fontana and they were awarded funding under the under the MSRC's FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program to help enhance the existing San Sevaine Class I Bikeway by paving an access segment, installing lights and installing fencing. The project was originally expected to proceed through Caltrans' conventional encroachment permit process. It transpired that the project cost within the Caltrans right of way exceeded the encroachment permit threshold and the project now needs to go through a Caltrans oversight process, adding at least one year to the project schedule. Additionally, two of the primary staff for the project left City employ, requiring new staff to be assigned and come up to speed. Finally, during the geotechnical boring work, the crew accidentally hit a private water line. This had to be repaired, and the liability resolved, resulting in additional months of delay. The City now anticipates construction acceptance by June 2021. The City requests a two-year contract term extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER KELLY LYNN, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN HILLMAN, THE  
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO  
APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF FONTANA, CONTRACT #ML16047, A  
TWO-YEAR CONTRACT TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #7 – Consider Increasing Stations from One to Two and Twenty-Nine-Month Contract Term Extension by City of South Pasadena, Contract #ML14068 (Install EV Charging Station)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of South Pasadena. The City was awarded \$10,183 under the FYs 2012-14 Local Government Match Program towards the installation of one or more publicly accessible EV charging stations, providing the capability to charge at least two vehicles. Subsequently, the City clarified that exactly one station would be installed, and the contract was modified. In reality, two stations have now been installed. They're having to resolve easement and franchise agreement requirements with SCE before they can make them operational. The City is requesting a twenty-nine-month contract term extension to enable them to complete the project and the three-year operational requirement.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O'CONNOR, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE SOUTH PASADENA, CONTRACT #ML14068, AN INCREASE IN STATIONS AND A TWENTY-NINE-MONTH CONTRACT TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #8 – Consider Six-Month Contract Term Extension for the City of South Pasadena, Contract #ML16025 (Purchase Heavy-Duty Natural Gas Vehicle and Expand CNG Station)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of South Pasadena. This was a contract to expand their existing CNG station and purchase a heavy-duty vehicle. Previously, the MSRC approved some changes to the way that they were going to do the expansion, reduce the scope and the contract value, along with extending the term. The City states because they changed the design as the MSRC approved earlier, the design changes took longer than expected. They are now anticipating completing the construction by October of this year. To allow them to fulfill the five-year operational requirement they are requesting a six-month extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA, CONTRACT #ML16025, A SIX-MONTH CONTRACT TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #9 – Consider Decreased Scope and Value and One-Year Contract Term Extension for the City of Fullerton, Contract #ML16010 (Expand CNG Station and Install EV Charging Stations)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes for the City of Fullerton. The City was awarded \$370,500 under the FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program towards the expansion of the City's existing CNG station and the installation of 18 electric vehicle charging stations. 10 charging stations have been installed. As far as the CNG station expansion, as noted at some previous TAC

meetings, some of these publicly accessible stations are not having the demand that they were seeing before, or certainly not the increased demand that they were anticipating, and so now the City's finding that they really don't need that additional compressor that they were going to get under this project. Some of the other elements that were part of the expansion they still are going to go forward and do. But without adding the compressor, it's no longer an expansion project. We've discussed that with them, and they understand and so they're requesting to remove the tasks and funding for that element from the contract. That was \$282,500 that would be coming back to the MSRC.

As for the EV charging station portion of the project, they have installed 10. Of the 8 remaining, they have decided they don't need four of them after all. They want to eliminate those four, but there are four more stations to be installed. For the remaining four stations, those to be installed at the City Hall/Library, the City would like to install solar-powered chargers. These chargers have a higher equipment cost, but do not require trenching or electrical connections. The City also proposes to reduce the MSRC's contribution by \$9,778 from \$88,000 to \$78,222. If approved the request, the total contract value would be reduced from \$370,500 to \$78,222, with \$292,278 reverting to the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Linda Johnson commented I'm not familiar with the solar-powered charging stations. Are they reliable? Are they going to work if it's a rainy day? What's the liability on these? MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay replied solar power, if you see the ones that are affordable, solar power units have come out that will charge at 4 kilowatts an hour under good conditions. A plug-in hybrid charges at 3.3, but a battery electric charges at 7.2. The typical price for one of those portable ones is about \$60,000. I put in 10 Level IIs for \$8,000. I don't think it's a very cost-effective solution. But in a given situation where you don't have a good option, that's something that people do. They put them in state parks where there's limited access. What I question is, how they're going to address ADA because under California code your first space has to be ADA van accessible. So, it has to be 12 foot wide and I'm not sure how they're going to address that. With all of that said, I'm going to abstain because I'm not a fan.

Ms. Ravenstein added there weren't any cost-effectiveness criteria because there's not an actual emission reduction associated with the infrastructure, but there weren't really any standards in this solicitation. If they had originally proposed these units, they would have been able to get them.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor commented, that there are a couple scenarios in which a station could become less operable or pretty much inoperable. There are periods of obstructed sun. And if someone came in and had their vehicle parked there for a very long time and took the energy that was stored in that battery system, it's foreseeable that the battery would be depleted. It doesn't have the same robustness that a grid connected unit would have.

MSRC-TAC Vice Chair AJ Marquez commented that the footprints are quite large on these. If you've ever seen them, they take up almost two parking spaces.

MSTC-TAC Member Adriann Cardoso commented that this was sort of a formula program and they're able to apply for what they think will work best within their cities. Mr. Gorski replied we really didn't anticipate this being proposed. It's relatively new. Mr. Teebay added there was one project that we funded, that's falling apart, and they put in a huge solar array and they reduced the number of EVSE. I've forgotten what the number was, it went from 16 or 20 down to 4 because the solar is so expensive relative to the cost. They didn't have funding to do this. But it's within the parameters of the program.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON, THE  
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO  
APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF FULLERTON, CONTRACT #ML16010,  
DECREASED SCOPE AND VALUE AND ONE-YEAR CONTRACT  
TERM EXTENSION. WITH AN ABSTENSION BY MSRC-TAC  
ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY.

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

**Agenda Item #4 – Receive Update on MSRC Direction for FYs 2018-21 Work Program Development**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor reported that there's a lot going on right now with respect to the 2018-21 Work Program. The MSRC has been very engaged and we met with them a couple weeks ago and gave them an update. They took several actions at that time and have provided guidance for the next steps. The total Work Program value for the three-years is approximately \$64.2 million and there are two components: specifically the development of a large regionally significant project as well as continuation of the Major Events Transportation Program and some potential new Work Program categories. The MSRC was presented for the Regional Program with three specific options: (1) The Regional Goods Movement Clean Corridor, (2) the EV Ready Electric School Bus program, and (3) the EV Ready Communities Program. They had previously provided some initial guidance to us relative to the EV Ready Electric School Bus Program and the MSRC-TAC provided guidance relative to EV Readiness Community Program.

We went through as staff and tried to give the MSRC at least some initial assessment of each of the three options to help them guide their decision process. We tried to provide an evaluation on the three specific criteria that we have adopted: (1) the complexity of the

overall program, (2) time to implement, and (3) how it supports the South Coast AQMD objectives. We tried to identify for the MSRC membership what the key elements of each of these potential concepts were. A zero near zero focus program for goods movement would demonstrate emerging technologies including vehicles and infrastructure and have quite a few project partners that could potentially participate in this. This would be a program with a high degree of support for South Coast AQMD goals. We tried to be realistic with the MSRC. We didn't want to try to sell them something which we thought would be super easy to do. We told them that for the Regional Goods Movement Clean Corridor, it is a very complex program that has a lot of moving parts and the time to implement was going to be high and long. Specifically, there's a long lead time on some of these vehicles and engines, and infrastructure takes a long time to implement. We just want to make sure that they were aware that should they choose this option, they would need to understand it's not something that TAC could just make happen overnight.

We went through the EV Ready School Bus Program. We thought this one was relatively, at least compared to first option, much easier to do. There are still a lot of moving parts-- a lot of school districts. But we know who they are, and where they live, and therefore it would be a little easier to get your hands around. Nothing happens quickly, but we felt that this one could be implemented faster than a Regional Corridor Program. As to whether it supports the AQMP goals, we only ranked it in kind of the mid-range because if you're going to electrify school buses, that's great, but the buses that you're replacing for the South Coast AQMD all are already primarily low emission natural gas buses. So, you're getting a little increment of air pollution reduction, but you're replacing one low-emission strategy with a somewhat lower emission strategy. It would be beneficial, but it's not targeting what has been identified by the South Coast AQMD as being the greatest offenders.

The EV Ready Communities, this would be interesting because it could have a nexus to the Local Government Partnership Program in working with communities. We felt that the complexity for this was probably a little bit more than for the school bus but less than the regional corridor. The time to implement would be a little bit higher than the school bus but not as bad as the corridor. It supports the South Coast AQMD goals. It does result in air quality benefits but it's not one of the major categories identified by the South Coast AQMD and their AQMP. In the final analysis, the MSRC selected unanimously, with a lot of discussion, the Regional Goods Movement Clean Corridor Program for emphasis in the 2018-21 Work Program. It directly addresses the top priorities of the South Coast AQMD, when you look at their roadmap for cleaning the region's air, specifically heavy-duty diesel trucks and off-road equipment. Those are the top two emissions categories for NOx ozone precursors. When you look at the priorities as articulated in the AQMP, reducing emissions from those categories are #1 and #2.

The MSRC believed that it has regional impact throughout the entire AQMD. It targets those emissions which are most important to clean up, but it does have a role for everyone in the program, the ports, the San Pedro Bay ports, and the maritime ports.

Goods movement goes all the way to the Inland ports, and they liked the idea of the Inland ports as a focus on the distribution warehouses in the Inland Empire. It targets both on-road and off-road vehicles, those first two priorities within the South Coast District plan. It does have the ability to have participation on the “Last Mile” segment of goods movement. If you’re in Orange County and want goods delivered to Coast Plaza, well, you can use zero-emission trucks under a demonstration program to do it. So, really this can capture emission reductions in all elements of goods movement. We emphasized to the MSRC that this type of large-scale program is going to take time to implement and they should not expect shovel-ready projects necessarily within the next year or so. We’re going to try to deliver some, but this is a complex program that takes time. Infrastructure is a long lead item. If it’s hydrogen, if it’s natural gas, if it’s electric--it takes time to put in. There’s a backlog for key technologies, both in zero-emission and the near zero emission. That’s good because it shows that they’re gaining in popularity. But it’s something we’ll need to factor into the timeline. And some of the zero-emission technologies are currently produced at low volume, so their timeline is going to be inherently long anyway. The point I made to the MSRC, and the point I’ll make now, is that if you look at the five scope changes that you are asked to review, any project that the MSRC funds actually takes longer than you might think it would. Every Work Program element requires a few years and often they come back and request additional time consideration. The MSRC was very vocal in their direction. They did approve the outreach coordinator to get started. The Better World Group Advisers has been instructed to go out and actively seek and secure significant co-funding to augment that \$62.4 million dollars that the MSRC has. The MSRC members want near term action, there was quite a bit of discussion about what can we do in the near term to get some of this money flowing. There was one specific MSRC member’s action item to investigate a partnership between the South Coast AQMD, the California HVIP Program, and the Port of Long Beach to develop a cooperative for independent drayage truck drivers. The goal is to retire some older diesel trucks and replace them with new near zero emission trucks. This is one where the South Coast AQMD has expressed a lot of interest. There’s going to be a conference call on Monday and it’s going to have the participation of the South Coast AQMD, the Port of Long Beach and MSRC potentially and they’re going to talk about this, based upon the comments from the MSRC member who was the SCAG representative. The district is very interested in that idea and would like to partner with the MSRC potentially. So, we’re going to investigate that and bring back, potentially in the near term, a draft of how that could happen. There is an opportunity to have some near-term successes from this program and that’s what we’re going to pursue. I wish Naveen Berry was here because he is the point person on the South Coast AQMD side, he is the one who approached the MSRC and said we can make this work and we’re going to try to do that. This is going to be one element of the overall plan. The overall plan is going to be developed over the next couple months.

The big question for today though is based upon what the MSRC has done, they’ve taken the money and wrapped into a three-year work program and they guided us to put in place a Regional Goods Clean Corridor. The question is how do TAC members want to

participate in this process. It's an open question that doesn't have to be answered today, but there's going to be a lot of work to do and there's going to be opportunities for TAC members to take a leadership position or at least have a participative role in working on some of these elements. For example, if you are from the Inland Empire and we're going to have a program to identify warehouse distribution centers within the Inland Empire. Well, maybe you'd want to participate in putting together the listing, who we are going to go after and what we're going to offer because you probably come from an agency which has a vested interest in cleaning up the emissions at the warehouses within your jurisdiction. San Bernardino and Riverside would probably want to participate on the Inland port side of it. If you come from Los Angeles, you're probably very interested in the maritime ports and the 710 Corridor. So, if you're with Metro who's done a lot of work in looking at the 710 Corridor, if you're with the City of Los Angeles, the Port is going to be a participant in this program. If you are in Orange County there are some goods movement projects that can be done. There are demonstration projects that the MSRC could fund working with some of the folks that do Last Mile, such as UPS, FedEx and DHL to do some zero-emission fleet demonstrations to go to places which are in Orange County.

The MSRC was starting to resonate on, when you say goods movement clean corridor, you think of a road, it's more than that. It's the infrastructure that needs to be placed throughout the region to support these advanced technologies. It's working with where the goods come into, where the goods are broken down, to where they're finally distributed, Maritime Port, Inland Port, and near Last Mile distribution. All those are going to be little separate programs in and of themselves which are going to be under the umbrella of the Goods Movement Corridor. What you're going to see in the scoping plan, is that we're going to take it and pretty much build it from the bottom up, meaning that if you're going to have this, you're going to need infrastructure. If there's going to be an infrastructure component, is it going to be electric, is it going to be natural gas, or it might be propane too.

There's a lot of emerging near zero propanes being certified. There's going to be infrastructure. Thought needs to go into where to place it strategically if we want to affect goods movement between West and East, and identifying locations for potential demonstrations. There's a lot of them within Riverside, Mira Loma, Moreno Valley, Fontana, and all those distribution warehouses that they're building. Those would be great to do electric infrastructure, electric yard tractors, electric cargo handling equipment, potentially natural gas vehicles, when they come in. What kind of incentive programs do we need to put in place to make that happen?

Taking this building block Lego approach for all the elements, within each little Lego there's going to be who are the potential participants: Transportation Commissions, Councils of Governments, private sector, Clean Energy and other infrastructure providers. Over the next couple months, we will be putting it together. The question on the table is, we want the TAC members to have a role in this longer-term Regional

Program because it's going to directly impact your jurisdictions and the agencies that you work with. So, over the next couple of months, as we're going through this, we're going to be reaching out asking if you would like to help us with this component or is there another component that you want to help us with. We don't have all the answers yet. That's what the MSRC has charged us to go off and figure out. This can be an exciting program; it can have a lot of benefit and work very well with other programs which are being implemented both statewide and locally.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented that if this is the program that Naveen was thinking of, you may have heard of Proposition 1B Goods Movement Emission Reduction Program, that was what we called the \$1 billion dollar program, approved by the California voters back in 2006. The South Coast Air basin received about 50% of those funds. We're at the tail end of that program now. This year we're looking at return funds on the order of \$15 to \$20 million. Those could potentially be used as a partnering situation with MSRC, but we have certain timelines to spend those funds. Under the Prop 1B Program, the South Coast AQMD has already invested about \$50 million in Prop 1B funds going towards near zero trucks. And in addition to that, the Prop 1B program is allowing fleets to apply now to reserve funds for electric trucks that are expected to be commercially available on the order of one to four years from now. We have a lot of lessons learned. Since 2010, we've been funding about 2,000 truck replacement projects each year, up until this year. We have about \$15 to \$20 million of return funds and we're thinking of allocating that this year to associate a specific solicitation for near zero truck and electric truck replacement projects. That is probably the first option available that we can discuss partnering on. Prop 1B has a set of guidelines, that's probably a good model of a Regional Goods Movement Program. A lot of lessons learned under those guideline requirements that I'd be happy to share. Mr. Gorski replied, I think at some point the TAC may want to entertain you giving a presentation on something like that.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee commented that maybe a comment or suggestion for the Better World Group is to give us like a cheat sheet providing what they're thinking and the strategy of it as well. We can kind of implement or help regarding the strategy plan and the vision of this plan. A lot of people's schedules are busy too, I think we do well in regard to email exchange. If we have any further questions or clarifications that we need to make, we can piggyback off some of the suggestions that the Better World Group might have and stem some conversation that way. Also, we can help each other strategize with regards to how to outreach within each organization. We have a lot of departments that handle these kinds of things, so we can help identify those type of personnel and have them in the email chain or a video conferencing or even a presentation.

Ms. White commented, that there's a new program that we started a couple of years now, the Community Protection Program, its AB 617. South Coast AQMD is the leader in identifying these communities in our basin that have significant concerns and we've gone to out to all these communities and we're hearing that trucks are their primary concern.

They're not only living next to the freeways; they are living next to the freeways where the trucks are. I don't want you to feel like goods movement is kind of a remote problem that may not be faced by cities and communities, but it really is one of their top concerns.

MSRC-TAC Member Rongsheng Luo asked if this was more of a sole source type of solicitation? Mr. Gorski replied it's going to have a lot of different solicitation strategies as a function of what we're going for. The first one presented by the MSRC was they wanted a cooperative, which means that someone could come in and be a participant. We're investigating that. We're working with the South Coast AQMD directly on something like that. I think it was clearly articulated as to what that vision was. We're certainly taking that as an action item for near-term response.

**ACTION: No further action required.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Agenda Item #12 – Other Business**

No other business.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No public comment.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC  
MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:23 P.M.

**NEXT MEETING:** Next meeting: Thursday, April 4, 2019, 1:30 p.m., at the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)