



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC  
THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2019 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  
Steve 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  
Tim Olson, California Energy Commission (via conference call)  
Andy Silva, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors  
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas  
Denise Arriaga Ibarra, OCTA  
Louis Zhao, OCTA

**SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS**

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant  
Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer  
John Kampa, Financial Analyst  
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel  
Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant  
Jennifer Nordbak, Secretary  
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order  
MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

**STATUS REPORT**

- Clean Transportation Policy Update

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

- Election of MSRC-TAC Chair and Vice Chair

Naveen Berry conducted the annual election of MSRC-TAC Chair and Vice Chair.

Nominations for Chair were opened.

A MOTION WAS INTRODUCED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER AJ MARQUEZ TO NOMINATE DAN YORK AS CHAIR FOR ANOTHER TERM.

No further nominations were offered, so nominations were closed.

THE ABOVE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Nominations for Vice Chair were opened.

A MOTION WAS INTRODUCED BY MSRC-TAC CHAIR DAN YORK, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO, TO NOMINATE AJ MARQUEZ AS VICE CHAIR.

No further nominations were offered, so nominations were closed.

THE ABOVE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 3)**  
**Receive and Approve**

**Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the January 10, 2019 and February 7, 2019, MSRC-TAC Meetings**

The minutes for the January 10 and February 7, 2019 MSRC-TAC meetings were not available.

**Information Only – Receive and File**

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

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for March 28, 2019 through April 24, 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, UNDER APPROVAL  
OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #2 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS  
ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR MARCH 28, 2019 THROUGH APRIL 24,  
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 April 2019 was distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC VICE CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, UNDER APPROVAL  
OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #2 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL  
REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL 2019.

ACTION: No further action is required.

**ACTION CALENDAR (Items 4 through 6)**

**Agenda Item #4 – Consider Nine-Month Term Extension for the City of Riverside, Contract #ML16034 (\$500,000 - Implement “Complete Streets” Project)**

The City of Riverside requests a nine-month extension due to delays associated with an unusually heavy rain season and multiple design change requests from property owners.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER JASON FARIN AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHEUNG LUO, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE, CONTRACT #ML16034, A NINE-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #5 – Consider Engine Retention in Lieu of Scrapping for the City of Santa Monica, Contract #MS16115 (\$870,000 – Repower Transit Buses with Near-Zero Engines)**

Rather than scrapping all 58 engines, the City requests to retain one engine to be used for training purposes.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN HILLMAN, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA, CONTRACT #MS16115, TO ALLOW THE RETENTION OF ONE ENGINE FOR TRAINING PURPOSES IN LIEU OF SCRAPPING.

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

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider Reduced Scope and Value for the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Contract #MS16029 (\$851,883 – Regional Bikeway Projects)**

For the San Juan Capistrano Bicycle Lanes Gap Closure Project, OCTA requests to reduce the number of segments supported by the MSRC from seven to five, with a corresponding reduction in funding from \$66,360 to \$61,113. Additionally, for the Lambert Road Bikeway, OCTA requests to eliminate the lighting and bicycle locker elements with a corresponding reduction in funding from \$51,023 to \$40,800.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE LINDA JOHNSON, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR OCTA, CONTRACT #MS16029, A

REDUCED SCOPE AND VALUE. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE ADRIANN CARDOSO ABSTAINED.

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

## **2018-21 WORK PROGRAM**

### **Agenda Item #7 – Update on Landscape for MSRC’s Regional Goods Movement Program (Better World Group Advisors)**

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, reported the written report that the Better World Group put together provides a really good overview of what’s going on within the goods movement sector throughout the South Coast region. It points out specific near-term opportunities that the MSRC and TAC may want to consider pursuing. There were two specific actions that the Better World Group did on behalf of the program: (1) research other active and potential programs within the goods movement sector within the South Coast Air Basin. That’s important because before we can figure out what the MSRC’s most appropriate role is, we need to understand what the lay of the land is and what other entities are doing; and (2) initiate contacts and develop a contact plan for representatives of the MSRC and TAC to start to forge some potential partnerships. The goal is, while the MSRC has identified substantial funding to support goods movement emission reduction projects, these are very expensive programs. We need to assess the potential to leverage the MSRC’s investment with other monies which are available from either local or state agencies which have similar goals.

The ports of entry, the maritime ports in the Los Angeles/Long Beach area, are the largest in the country and 40% of all containerized cargo comes through those ports on an annual basis. Understand that we transport a lot right through the South Coast Basin as it goes from the maritime ports to the Inland Ports. We understand that the largest component of air pollution that we suffer in this region is because of the goods movement that takes place between our ports and the Inland Empire. We all understand the challenge because we’re familiar with the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, which goes into the challenges facing this region in great detail. We understand that goods movement distribution is not simply a problem which initiates at the ports of entry and ends up in the Inland Empire. This is a large metropolitan area, goods movement happens along every corridor, along every street to every retail distribution center. Therefore, it’s a regional problem as opposed to an isolated program for which you can address the emissions at both ends and think that you solved the problem. Goods movement happens throughout everyone’s neighborhood.

The Better World Group went out and spent a fair amount of time canvassing agencies which are currently involved in goods movement and formally made contact on behalf of the committee. Some are the contacts included Naveen Berry, our liaison from South Coast Air Quality Management District; Nicholas Nairn-Birch from the California Air Resources Board (CARB); representatives from the California Energy Commission (CEC), who were asked to provide their insight as to potential opportunities for future partnerships with the MSRC; the California Transportation Commission (CTC); the Ports; and Southern California Edison because of their Make Ready Program, regarding which they discussed taking the lead and doing some heavy-

duty and medium-duty vehicle infrastructure. Then the Better World Group talked to the Los Angeles CleanTech Incubator, which is partnered with the City of Los Angeles, the Mayors of Long Beach and Los Angeles and the Ports to put together a roadmap for how we will address electrification in transportation, infrastructure and goods movement in support of the upcoming 2028 Olympics. They are using the Olympics as a benchmark for seeing how much progress we can get between now and 2028. They've set very ambitious goals and one of their key advisers is Mary Nichols from CARB. It's a very high-level group with many stakeholders. Staff has also had conversations with stakeholders such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). There are going to be some real opportunities to engage SCAG and their efforts and potential ability to bring additional financial resources to the table to implement some programs. We're currently hoping that focus goes toward Last Mile delivery.

To provide a few of the highlights, here are some ideas which have been put on the table by some of the potential project partners, starting with CARB. They have recognized that there's a lot of emphasis being put on goods movement that is being implemented at the Ports, but there are probably unmet opportunities to focus resources on goods movement at the other end of the supply chain. They have suggested that off-road vehicles that are used in cargo handling could be a potential opportunity for the MSRC to pursue. They specifically identified transportation refrigeration units, or "reefers". We would need to work with Senior Deputy District Counsel Daphne Hsu to have certainty that the MSRC is able to fund that type of equipment. If the answer is yes, all these reefers which have to be operating diesel generators to stay cold could potentially be plugged in and utilize grid power. That could be a relatively significant reduction in emissions. They also suggested as a possible project some of the heavy-duty forklifts which are being operated at the warehouse distribution centers in the Inland Empire, potentially using that as a model and then to continue collaborative efforts with CARB and the South Coast AQMD relative to some potential opportunities under AB 617, which is the investment in disadvantaged communities to look at projects that could be implemented to achieve emission reductions in those areas which are disproportionately impacted by goods movement pollution.

With respect to CEC, they are in the process of beginning their 2020-2021 Investment Plan. It was suggested by CEC that this would be a very good time for the MSRC to take a direct role in working with them to help come up with how the investments will be made for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel Vehicle Technology Program. This would be a great opportunity to work directly with sister agency and find out during the planning process how the MSRC and the CEC can collaborate on a goods movement program, especially as it pertains to vehicle demonstrations as well as infrastructure.

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer Naveen Berry spoke with the Better World Group on behalf of South Coast AQMD. We see some direct near-term opportunities here. The MSRC has already suggested to explore opportunities to work with independent truck owner operators, especially those which operate drayage, that is the movement of containers in and out of the ports all the way to the warehouse distribution centers, to help get some of the folks that are independent truckers into cleaner vehicles. What's attractive about this type of program is that there are currently other funds available that could be leveraged, specifically the HVIP Program from CARB, which has set aside a significant amount of money from the Climate Investment Program. They also have very substantial per vehicle incentives available. We're looking at an HVIP incentive that's on the order of \$45,000 per truck. If the MSRC could also potentially leverage some of the new VIP money which is offered from the South Coast AQMD, that could

be another funding increment. There's a real opportunity in the very near term to design a program which could be almost a cooperative, which would have the MSRC as one of the primary stakeholders, but would take into account HVIP money, potentially VIP money for those fleets which operate less than 10 vehicles, and target disadvantaged areas. Also, the South Coast AQMD has the administrative authority for two specific elements of the VW Settlement Program: the heavy-duty drayage truck element as well as the freight and marine category. That is an amount of funding which is approximately \$150 million dollars.

The CTC has SB 1, their Trade Corridor Enhancement Program and Congestion Corridors Program. This is interesting because it's a little bit different. They have the opportunity to make investments in goods movement that aren't necessarily directly tied to a vehicle, meaning that there are opportunities to look at efficiency improvements and other strategies to reduce the overall footprint that goods movement makes on this region. We'll want to find out more about this and investigate if there are going to be any opportunities.

At the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles there are numerous projects and substantial money which has been invested because of their role as being the point of embarkation for the goods movement problems within this region. They have several projects which are ongoing, and they have several projects that they are scoping but there's opportunity for the MSRC to partner on expansion of an existing project or--probably more practical--to look at the next wave of projects that are going to be implementing, to see if the MSRC could secure a partnership role. They're looking at the off-road cargo handling equipment and the infrastructure which is necessary, both on the land and the port side to enable the large-scale deployment of advanced technology vehicles: hydrogen fuel cell battery electric, and of course near-zero natural gas vehicles.

Southern California Edison has a very large program to help offset the cost of implementing electric vehicle charging infrastructure for medium- and heavy-duty fleets. Edison has stated that they want to ensure that we don't duplicate efforts, meaning if they are currently charged with doing a program, we should try not to displace them. However, they also noted that they do not have programs necessarily along some of the key corridors, so those could be opportunities. This one will take coordination also with entities like Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as well as the municipal utilities to ensure that the MSRC, when we look at doing infrastructure, is truly leveraging other people's money as opposed to simply displacing their money or being duplicative of money that they already have. The bottom line is we should use their money to the extent we can first.

And then finally the Los Angeles CleanTech Incubator, this entity is important is because they have been recognized as an entity which is putting together the plan that a lot of folks are going to be doing demonstration projects against.

These are the overarching recommendations: invest in initiatives at the Ports, work with South Coast AQMD to implement a program to target the independent owner-operators to get them in clean trucks and leverage available monies of which there are substantial available monies out there. The MSRC could be that little increment that puts it over the top. When they say explore collaborative opportunities beyond California, they're talking about some of the other associations such as Calstart, entities that have historically had a role in helping to establish policy.

Next month you will receive a recommendation for the next phase of the work for the Better World Group to initiate. The funding that the Committee gives the Better World Group is incremental and task oriented, meaning that they don't have a blank check to go off and do this work. We give them specific tasks and they come back with a specific cost proposal and then you make a decision as to whether or not that is in keeping with the program's best interest.

With the work of the Better World Group and some of the other conversations we've been having with other potential stakeholders, what appears to be shaping up is how to engage the TAC and how to get everyone around the table directly involved in this process. I would recommend the TAC consider forming either working groups or subcommittees. There are probably a minimum of four immediate working groups that could be put together to help flesh out and get the ball rolling on some of these opportunities. The first would be the Inland Ports Working Group. This would be specifically focusing on opportunities in the Inland Empire at the warehouse distribution centers. That appears to be logical for a couple reasons. It's a major contributor to the emissions from goods movement and it probably has fewer resources being applied to it than some of the other ones like the maritime ports. Also recommended is a working group to look at Last Mile opportunities, this would be for the smaller trucks which take the goods and deliver them directly to the retail outlets. SCAG has already done a sizable amount of work in this area and they were able to provide some really interesting potential partnerships that the MSRC could start to explore to do some demonstration programs. We also need to continue to work with the Ports working group because of all the activity that's ongoing. There definitely are going to be opportunities to work with the Long Beach and Los Angeles ports to do new demonstration programs, expand programs and help propagate clean technologies. And finally, there is the potential to look at a near-zero emission truck cooperative. This would be focusing on leveraging existing monies to target independent truck owner operators who perform drayage services out of the maritime ports. Some of them drive all the way to the Inland Empire. When you look at the demographics of drayage truck operators, there are approximately 16,000 trucks which are in the port drayage truck registry, and most of those are not operated by big firms. There are some big firms--the TTSIs--but a lot of these are smaller independent owner-operators that make their living by doing as many container hauls as they can and these are the folks that probably would be most receptive to, and the beneficiaries of, a program which could help get them into a near-zero emission vehicle.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan asked in looking at the overarching recommendations that came out of the study, I don't see the Last Mile. That's the one that is the most helpful and it's not listed here. Mr. Gorski replied that was an omission. It's in the report and everyone realizes that it's an essential element. The MSRC recognizes that the Last Mile opportunity has the highest potential because when you look at the current state of technologies, the vehicles which are coming to market first are going to be the smaller Class 4 through 6 vehicles. Those are the ones that are going to be most available commercially at a cost which is going to be a little more in cost parity with conventional vehicles. There's a lot of emphasis of course being placed on drayage trucks, Class 7 and especially Class 8 drayage trucks. But when you're thinking about what's going to be an opportunity to get some near-term emission reductions, the Last Mile is going to be important. The investments are being made by UPS, FedEx, Amazon--these people are investing a lot of money into this. Potential Partnerships with UPS and FedEx for their package delivery trucks are going to be a near-term opportunity, probably even more so than the Class 8 drayage tractors which are coming out of the Ports. They are still range limited. They go to some of the peel off yards or they go to some of the near dock areas, but they still pretty much operate only in short haul. We

have to worry about not only the short haul drayage, you have to worry about getting things to the Inland Empire and the retail outlets. Because of that, there's going to be a real opportunity for the Last Mile.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay added I'm really surprised with the partnering with UPS and FedEx. I would think Amazon with all the data they have. For UPS, especially, they've got it down. They know how to route their trucks already and I just don't see what we could add to that. Mr. Gorski replied what the MSRC can add is putting together some specific projects and get them into some zero-emission vehicles. The MSRC has worked with UPS in the past on technology demonstrations, as we worked with Sysco and other large entities which are associated with goods movement. There's work going on currently to work with those specific entities. We've just had some initial conversations. There will be a real opportunity to work with a package delivery company, to expand the number of vehicles that they'll be demonstrating within a defined geographic location. Mr. Teebay replied zero-emission vehicles would be assisting them with making them more price competitive causing that delta, that's really important. They typically rebuild their truck about every eight years. I worked with them on a different project and one of the things they saw was, that when they replace the diesel engine with something cleaner, even zero, they still weren't getting all the technology that was embedded in a zero-emission vehicle and they saw that as a far better investment than rebuilding their old engine.

MSRC-TAC Member Steve Lee questioned would getting them into trucks mean to fund those large companies to purchase these electric vehicles? Mr. Gorski replied that's an option to have a buy-down incentive to help them make that cost decision. Mr. Lee continued, to recap on our perspective and our steps on providing a regional programmatic approach, we're discontinuing all the existing previous programs, except the Major Events Center, and rolling into a three-year Work Program. With the pot of money that results from discontinuing all previous programs, utilize those funds to get into partnerships within these four categories that we decide to, if not more. Mr. Gorski replied this was just four examples put out on the table to stimulate discussion. The MSRC's emphasis this year, is really to recognize what the South Coast AQMD has been saying for the past two and a half years, that the emissions problem that we are faced with primarily is a result of goods movement within this region and to put resources to directly combat emissions generated from that largest source, goods movement. Mr. Lee commented when this first came about, Dan York mentioned we can leverage these funds in Sacramento, to potentially multiply the amount of funding that we might have, is that still in play in regard to a seeking some type of funds from Sacramento? Mr. Gorski replied that's exactly what the Better World Group has gone off and done. They've laid out the landscape of who's doing what within goods movement, where the money's coming from, and how much the investment is. They looked at the future and said this is what the potential for additional goods movement investment is and finally, this is where the MSRC has the opportunity to potentially partner with these agencies to leverage the funds that the MSRC has brought to the table. The next phase will be to more or less begin implementation and to start to have some really meaningful conversations about how the MSRC can potentially implement mutually beneficial programs that leverage MSRC funding with another color of money. Mr. Lee asked if this potentially might not be limited just to these agencies that are already listed. Could other entities, private companies, county transportation commissions or whatnot apply for these funds if in fact they fall into these categories of goods movement and innovative approaches? Mr. Gorski replied that's all to be determined. These committees are going to be charged to put together some specific approaches

and plans to start to implement programs or projects. At this point absolutely everyone's at the table. We've been having staff conversations with other potential stakeholders. One of the benchmarks that the MSRC should set is similar to what other agencies do, including the South Coast AQMD, and that is you leverage your funds at a minimum of two to one or better. We should look for those programs in which there's a real opportunity for the MSRC's investment to be met with an equal or greater co-investment. Mr. Lee commented in regards partnering and SB 1 funds, there are agencies that are eligible to receive some of that funding. Essentially for putting up \$10 million and you have \$10 million grant funding available, there's potentially \$20 million that can be available to the grantees. Mr. Gorski replied there's no reason why the MSRC should be the sole contributor to these programs. They have the ability to have a seat at the table for some of these future funding decisions and partner with other agencies who have mutual goals. Mr. Lee said if an entity wants to apply for this regional program funding, it should be tied to another funding source, so that we can co-fund. Mr. Gorski replied they should bring either hard cash, which is always the preference, or a meaningful in-kind contribution. Every program that I'm aware of, that's currently within the goods movement realm, has that as a minimum requirement.

Mr. Teebay commented with the independent operators we really need to be careful, so that it minimizes or doesn't have a tax consequence for the operators. That's really important. Mr. Gorski replied that is pretty well understood though. The MSRC, South Coast AQMD, Carl Moyer Program, HVIP and the VIP Programs have given out money for a lot of years. It should be possible to find out what if any tax liabilities there are by accepting a grant on a program. The VIP Program at South Coast AQMD for example is specifically designed to target those types of operators--the fewer than 10 vehicle owners who currently operate a less than clean truck. Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer added on the tax liability issues, there are certain programs that requires to a tax form to the entity that's receiving the incentive and there are others that don't.

Mr. Lee asked with respect to the previous programs that we funded; do you know which ones are still eligible to apply for some of the funding that are available with this new approach? Mr. Gorski replied there's nothing. The Work Program from last year is done and right now what the MSRC has is a clean sheet of paper. There are a couple of program elements which they decided to continue, one being, the Major Event Center. Infrastructure is going to be an essential element of goods movement; however, it will be implemented very differently than in past years.

MSRC-TAC member Andy Silva commented that the South Coast AQMD is going to adopt an indirect source rule for warehouses and distribution centers; it's scheduled for December. San Bernardino County, as the local agency, actually did condition a new warehouse to have plug-in transportation refrigeration units but that's not a mandate. It's a mandate from us as the local land use authority, for a new warehouse to use that technology. On other entities to talk to I would add CE-CERT, at University of California Riverside because they do a lot of cool stuff and they would be an appropriate partner.

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York added I just want to point out that the MSRC is embarking on a clean slate and I think a lot of that's been because of this group's discussion leadership. It's going to be really important that we do read the report from the Better World Group. It's also important that we recall that for us to be successful in doing this for more than just a three-year program, we want to be thinking longer than that. To get too diluted on too many working groups and too

many secondary priorities and to also not be able to show a significant and a timely emissions reduction program, we should be mindful of that. The MSRC went along with staff's recommendation and the MSRC-TAC's recommendation, but there was also some reluctance in that. They still have an opportunity to redirect us. I want us to continue to be mindful that we want to deliver something to them, that they can say, hey look what we did sooner than later. There are a lot of good recommendations in here and some of these recommendations may not really play out for another three or four years and that's okay, because there may still be out of this group, maybe not necessarily a working group, but there may be something to where we invest a small amount of money to start developing that program, working with maybe South Coast AQMD so that in three or four years when that program is really ripe we'll already be ready and that'll be a stronger recommendation for us in a future Work Program.

MSRC-TAC Vice Chair AJ Marquez commented looking at the four working groups, the only one I see that's very applicable to Orange County's participation would be the Last Mile Program. We don't have a maritime port, there are warehouses obviously in Orange County, but not to the extent that there are the Inland Empire. Then of course drayage fleets would not be applicable to the County of Orange. Did the MSRC have any discussion regarding Orange County's participation, their stake in this program? Mr. Gorski replied I didn't think the MSRC had specific geographic recommendations, but I can assure you that the initial staff discussions we've had with stakeholders such as SCAG have really thought of Orange County as being a primary demonstration location. The reason that came up was because there are certain goods movement destinations within the greater Orange County area which generate an awful lot of trips. For example, if you look at Anaheim with all the destinations there, potentially looking at having some near zero-emission regions within the resort complex would be a potential demonstration. Orange County was the one that we more or less thought of first, not that it isn't replicable in all regions within the South Coast Basin. We felt that given the density and the number of attractions that draw visitors from all over and the amount of goods movement, it would be a wonderful region to identify for doing some last mile demonstrations.

MSRC-TAC Member Tom Olsen commented the four areas resonate with us at the Energy Commission. The work group ideas are really good. It's really kind of the outcome you want to see out of this and even this white paper the Better World Group produced is already out of date. I can make some recommendations to the MSRC's ability to get informed and then maybe better access to other sources of money. There's another kind of strategy of securing the money and making sure you're advocating your preferences. Then there's an implementation strategy, which lends itself more to these collaboration type of things. That could be some industry people, the ports, utilities, private investment sources too. We might want to think about what's the outcome we're looking for with the work groups.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Agenda Item #8 – Other Business**

No other business.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No public comment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**NEXT MEETING:** Next meeting: Thursday, June 6, 2019, 1:30 p.m., at the South Coast Air  
Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)