



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC  
THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 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  
Jenny Chan (Alt.), Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Steve Hillman, City of Los Angeles  
Jaime Lai, Cities of Orange County  
Steven Lee, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Rongsheng Luo, Southern California Association of Governments  
Kelly Lynn, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
Tim Olson, California Energy Commission (via conference call)  
Rick Teebay (Alt.), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Cliff Thorne, Orange County Transportation Authority  
Andy Silva, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors  
Vicki White, South Coast Air Quality Management District

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Manny Alarcón, SoCalGas  
Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas

**SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS**

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant  
Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer  
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Liaison  
Ray Gorski, Technical Advisor  
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 Vice-Chair AJ Marquez 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).

[MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay arrived at 1:45 p.m., during the discussion of consent calendar]

**CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 4)**  
**Receive and Approve**

**Agenda Item #1 – Minutes for the February 6, 2019 MSRC Meeting**

The Minutes for the February 6, 2019 MSRC-TAC Meeting were distributed at the meeting. Minutes for the January 10, 2019 meeting were not yet available.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 THROUGH #4, THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE FEBRUARY 6, 2019 MEETING MINUTES. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY ABSTAINED.

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

**Agenda Item #2 – Summary of Final Report by MSRC Contractors**

One final report was submitted for MSRC-TAC review and approval during June:

- Foothill Transit, MS18008 (\$100,000 – Special Transit Service to LA County Fair)

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT SUMMARY LISTED ABOVE. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY ABSTAINED.

ACTION: The final report summary will be included on the MSRC's next agenda for final action.

**Information Only – Receive and File**

**Agenda Item #3 – MSRC Contracts Administrator's Report**

The Contracts Administrator's Report for April 25, 2019 through May 29, 2019 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT FOR APRIL 25, 2019 THROUGH MAY 29, 2019. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY ABSTAINED.

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

**Agenda Item #4 – Financial Report on AB 2766 Discretionary Fund**

The Financial Report on the AB 2766 Discretionary Fund for May 2019 was distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE HILLMAN, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #4, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF MAY 2019. MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY ABSTAINED.

ACTION: No further action is required.

**ACTION CALENDAR (Items 5 through 11)**

[MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn arrived at 1:51 p.m., during the discussion of item #5]

**Agenda Item #5 – Consider FY 2019-20 Administrative Budget**

Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, reported there's about a little over a million dollars cap for administrative fees and we're projecting about 75% of that expenditure level. We'll go through the exercise to see if there's any adjustments that need to be made for the subsequent year over the summer and we'll report back to the Committee as we progress.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO AND

SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE CLIFF THORNE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE THE FY 2019-20 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET.

ACTION: MSRC staff will include the FY 2019-20 Administrative Budget on the next MSRC agenda for consideration.

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider One-Year Term Extension by County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Contract #ML14023 (\$230,000 – Upgrade Westchester Maintenance Facility)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the County of Los Angeles. They were awarded \$230,000 to upgrade their vehicle maintenance facility in Westchester. This had previously been extended twice, each time for one year. The County has indicated that they have internal processing and project filing delays and issues with contract capacity. She had asked, for more detail on the nature of these delays. The last time they requested an extension, they had indicated some problems with funding issues, and she has not received a response yet with additional information. She'll note that this contract is not immediately about to expire; it goes to September 1, 2019. Unlike a lot of the other MSRC contracts, there's no operational period associated with it. Because it's a maintenance facility, we don't require an operational period. We don't have quite the kind of leeway that we would have on some of our other contracts.

MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair AJ Marquez commented these are upgrades to build CNG work bays. Ms. Ravenstein replied, these are for an existing maintenance facility to make it suitable to work on CNG vehicles. The MSRC does not fund building a new building and making it suitable. If you're building a new building, you should just make that part of your project, but for an existing building the MSRC has funded retrofits. The kind of work that they're going to do includes installing methane gas detection alarms, modifying the ventilation system, removing existing radiant tube heaters and replacing them with forced air heating, and removing existing lighting fixtures.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White asked, is there any way to get a stronger commitment that establishes new milestone dates that they're going to have to meet, so that way we don't end up in this situation again with another extension? Ms. Ravenstein replied, it certainly can be done. The TAC has made recommendations in the past that an extension could be granted contingent upon some particular milestone being met by a date, otherwise, the contract will terminate. Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor added there's a timing issue here, this contract ends in September.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Rick Teebay asked, could we recommend the extension subject to current status and milestone information being provided by certain date? What that does is give a 12-month extension provided they provide some additional details. Mr. Gorski clarified, you want to make a contingency that the MSRC-TAC would recommend extending the contract for a period of 12-months contingent upon the County providing by a date certain, additional information you'll lay out. What date did you want that by? Mr. Teebay replied, July 31st, give them some

time to respond. Mr. Gorski replied, what's the remedy if they do not supply the information by the 31st of July? You're recommending that contract terminate in September?

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Hillman asked, have they submitted any interim reports? Ms. Ravenstein replied, they had submitted a progress report in January, but it was not very informative. It didn't indicate that they were behind. In the future, we will not be as accepting of a progress report like that.

Ms. White added we could set a reasonable date in the future that they provide copies of all the permits and approvals.

Ms. Ravenstein commented that there is the task to have selected their subcontractor, which is supposed to be completed approximately seven months before they actually complete the modifications. One possible approach would be to say, if we recommend granting your extension request provided that you do select the subcontractor by this date, otherwise the contract will terminate. That gives them the time to move forward.

Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer commented that if what this means in terms of contract capacity is really limited resources, are they going to be able to address this more detailed scheduled realistically by the end of July. Mr. Gorski replied, the contract is executed. The only potential issue is that seven-month date, that might not be even feasible for them to meet, we will pretty much have simply terminated the contract by September or allowed it to terminate in September.

MSRC-TAC Member Andy Silva commented if we give them the year extension, what triggers the seven-month date? Ms. Ravenstein replied, if the TAC so chooses, they could recommend to grant the one-year extension contingent on the County being able to demonstrate they have selected their contractor within seven months of the date that the contract is extended from, or in other words by April 1, 2020. That is a suggestion of what the TAC could do.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER VICKI WHITE, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,  
CONTRACT #ML14023, A ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION WITH A  
CONTINGENCY THAT THE COUNTY PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION OF  
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR SELECTION BY APRIL 2020.

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

**Agenda Item #7 – Consider One-Year Term Extension by County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Contract #ML14024 (\$230,000 – Upgrade Baldwin Park Maintenance Facility)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. They were awarded \$230,000 to upgrade

their Baldwin Park maintenance facility to accommodate the maintenance of gaseous fueled vehicles. The County communicated that they encountered unexpected compliance issues associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act and a potential need for hazardous materials abatement. The County requested a one-year contract term extension and it was processed administratively. Then the County indicated that the setbacks in obtaining Building Department approval took even longer than previously thought. They also discovered that the project budget exceeded their original estimate by a substantial amount, and they needed additional time to secure funding for the shortfall. The County requested a one-year contract term extension to complete the project. The County now states that internal processing and project filing delays, and issues with contract capacity and bid process, have further impeded progress on the project. The County requests a one-year contract term extension.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE CLIFF THORNES, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, CONTRACT #ML14024, A ONE-YEAR TERM EXTENSION WITH A CONTINGENCY THAT THE COUNTY PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR SELECTION BY APRIL 2020.

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

**Agenda Item #8 – Consider Modified Statement of Work and 29-Month Term Extension for City of Long Beach, Contract #ML16017 (\$1,445,400 – Purchase 50 Medium- and 19 Heavy-Duty Natural Gas Vehicles & Install CNG Station)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from the City of Long Beach. The City came in under the FYs 2014-16 Local Government Match Program and requested to purchase a large number of vehicles and install a CNG station. Originally, they were going to purchase 48 medium-duty and 16 heavy-duty natural gas vehicles. Then the City wanted to increase the numbers of vehicles and switch some of the kinds of vehicles. Normally, that's not a big thing but the City likes to have the specific types of vehicles listed in the contract. Since they wanted to increase the numbers of vehicles--they went up from 48 medium-duty to 50 and from 16 heavy-duty to 19, with no change in the overall funding amount--they agreed to take less per vehicle. Now, the City has changed their mind a little bit more. They have different needs in their departments. They have very large fleets. They have created an unusual situation here. Normally, we would never consider reducing the number of vehicles to be funded in a contract without reducing the contract value. Because they increased the number of vehicles over what was originally awarded, and now they want to decrease the number of vehicles but it's still more than the amount for which they were originally approved and for the same amount of money, Legal deemed that it would be acceptable should the MSRC wish to approve the changes that the City wants. The City is requesting to reduce the number of heavy-duty vehicles in the contract from 19 to 17, with no change in the contract amount. They're also requesting a 29-month term extension because there are a lot of changes in vehicle models and types.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White asked, what's driving all these changes and number of vehicles, are they are getting co-funding for these vehicles and they're trying to coordinate all the co-funds that they are going to use to purchase these vehicles? Ms. Ravenstein replied, it's always possible, but it really looks more like it's different departments. When you look at the different types of vehicles that they're getting, they're going from sweeping trucks to tow trucks. They were getting mini flatbeds and now they're getting dump trucks. It really seems like the needs of the City are changing. Mr. Gorski added, there's a technical concern and that is that 29 months is a long time. Executive Orders for natural gas systems, which would be used to retrofit these vehicles, change on an annual basis. If you look at the last two years, there have been a lot of those certified kits which are no longer needed in the marketplace. There's a reason for that, the demand is going down and some of these OEMs who manufactured the CNG conversion systems which go on to another OEM's engine simply stepped away momentarily from the marketplace. I'm not sure there's going to be product available, if we wait twenty-nine months.

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson commented, we have a natural gas vehicle buy-down program and we noticed a reform was needed because recipient applicants were kind of sitting on their vouchers. It looked like the typical time frame we expected, 180 days, ended up being more like 240 days. Purchase orders weren't being issued until 120-150 days into the application process and we changed that to we wanted a purchase order within 30 days. The uptake went from 40% to 98% in about two months. And by the way, we don't pay the reimbursement until the vehicle is delivered. Ms. Ravenstein replied, we don't either, but some of this is that they need some of this time to do the five-years of operation on some of these vehicles that they've already taken delivery on and been reimbursed.

Mr. Silva commented, the question is are they acting in good faith and are they acting competently? Mr. Gorski replied, from when we go out there, the answer is yes. They have a big operation, they've converted 46. They executed a lot of the contract already but as Cynthia said, if it's more of an administrative extension than a performance well then that's different.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Cliff Thorne asked, regarding the contract term extension, it was stated we needed to cover the full five-years of vehicle operations, are they asking for funding for vehicles that are participating after these vehicles have met their useful life? Ms. Ravenstein replied, no, some of these vehicles have already been purchased and placed into service but now this contract expires in 2023. So, we're already into a time frame where there is less than 5 years from its expiration, some of these vehicles might need an extension just to meet the five years, the ones that they already bought.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE CITY  
OF LONG BEACH, CONTRACT #ML16017, A MODIFIED STATEMENT OF  
WORK AND 29-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #9 – Consider Modified Project List and 10-Month Term Extension for Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Contract #MS18002 (\$2,500,000 – Regional Active Transportation Partnership Program)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this request comes from SCAG. They were awarded a \$2.5 million contract for the Go Human Regional Active Transportation Program. SCAG requests to decrease the scope and value of one of the events on the previously approved event list. SCAG proposes to utilize the cost savings to fund an additional event in Long Beach and requests a 10-month contract term extension to allow time to implement the additional event. Lastly, SCAG requests to reduce the scope of some of the co-funding projects. If these changes were approved, total co-funding would be \$3,325,795, which would still exceed the required amount of \$2,500,000.

MSRC-TAC member Andy Silva asked, what were the components that didn't qualify? Ms. Ravenstein replied, they were being done outside of South Coast AQMD.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER KELLY LYNN, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS,  
CONTRACT #MS18002, A MODIFIED PROJECT LIST AND 10-MONTH  
TERM EXTENSION.

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

**FYs 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM**

**Agenda Item #10 – Consider Additional Research and Outreach in Support of FYs 2018-21 Work Program Development, Reallocation of Costs Between Tasks, and \$15,000 Contract Value Increase by Better World Group Advisors (BWG), Contract #MS16030 (\$256,619 – Programmatic Outreach Services to the MSRC)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported that at the May 2, 2019 meeting, the MSRC-TAC received an update on the research and outreach conducted by BWG on behalf of the MSRC. BWG's initial efforts focused on assessing other funding providers' active and potential programs that would most closely align with the MSRC's priorities for their Regional Goods Movement Program. BWG's report included recommended next steps to further develop and explore relationships with the first entities contacted as well as additional collaborative opportunities to be pursued. BWG has provided a proposal to implement this second phase of research and outreach for a total estimated cost of \$25,165. Of this, it is projected that approximately \$1,500 is available under the existing contract's task for participation in meetings. There is also approximately \$8,500 available for reallocation from the task for conducting Work Program development workshops. An additional \$15,000 would need to be allocated as part of the FYs 2018-21 Work Program should the MSRC choose to accept BWG's proposal.

MSRC-TAC Member Andy Silva asked, whether they have a good handle on the warehouse industry because it's more complicated than it seems, it's very dispersed. I've probably been in every indirect source rule working group and they have one trade rep. and there are a dozen different kinds of warehouses. Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor replied, it's a big program that the MSRC has undertaken and it's going to take a lot of resources to pull it off. The Better World Group's forte is working at the state level. They have resources available to do that in a much timelier and more streamlined manner than certainly the direct MSRC support staff does. It's going to take other resources to work on the more local issues and establish that type of a dialogue and relationship. We see the Better World Group focusing on the policy side and the contacts at the higher levels within the regulatory agencies, often setting the stage to allow other people to go in and meet with the staff of that agency. If you recall in their first report, which we discussed a little bit last month, they laid out some specific next steps. What this would do pretty much is allow them to go on with the immediate next steps which they previously identified plus some additional ones. We will need to have them available for participation in this type of dialogue to understand exactly what they're doing, so we are all doing something which is complementary but not duplicative. There's some value-added when you consider the total outreach needed and the expertise that they have and the resources they have access to.

Mr. Silva asked, is there a timeline to come back to us with updates and such. Mr. Gorski replied, that is absolutely at the prerogative of this committee. You can have them come back submitting a monthly status update. We can usually get them, maybe not all of them here in person all of the time but on video conference. MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan asked, is that already included in their scope of work? Ms. Ravenstein replied, they expect the overall timeframe to accomplish the second phase will take approximately 12 weeks, so we could certainly get them to provide an update.

MSRC-TAC Alternate Jenny Chan commented, the objective is to help us develop the three-year Work Program? Ms. Ravenstein replied, yes. Mr. Gorski added the Better World Group will help us navigate the regulatory environment because the MSRC has as one of their objectives to leverage the money that the MSRC is allocating towards the Regional Goods Movement Program. The MSRC is setting aside on the order of \$64 million but given the scope of the overall goods movement problem within the South Coast region, we know that \$64 million is not really a lot of money. So, the intent is to work with other stakeholders and leverage MSRC dollars with other colors of money. We look to the Better World Group to help identify opportunities to leverage MSRC money. Often that means working at some of the higher levels within the regulatory agencies to help set the stage for us to come in and have discussions at the staff level about how to integrate our programs with some of the ongoing and future programs which will be implemented by the other agencies. Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, said as the South Coast AQMD representative, I thought they did a fantastic job of summarizing not only my discussion but their subsequent discussions with utilities and other state agencies and the local ports and so on. I thought it was a positive process. Mr. Silva asked, if this gets approved at the July Governing Board meeting, can we get an update at the October meeting? Ms. Ravenstein replied, sure, if not sooner.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ANDY SILVA, AND SECONDED  
BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE RICK TEEBAY, THE MSRC-TAC  
UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE  
BETTER WORLD GROUP ADVISORS, CONTRACT #MS16030,

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND OUTREACH, REALLOCATION OF COSTS, AND CONTRACT VALUE INCREASE.

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

**Agenda Item #11 – Consider Establishment of Regional Goods Movement Program Working Groups**

MSRC-TAC Chair AJ Marquez reported at the last meeting we discussed establishing working groups, we weren't going to call them subcommittees. Ms. Ravenstein sent out an email asking for folks to sign up for the different working groups. There's lots of work to do. We're going to need everyone's help in conjunction with what Better World Advisers is proposing that they're going to do for us. The next steps will be to look at project categories within each one of these working groups, which are the Inland Ports, The Last Mile, Maritime Ports and the Near-Zero Truck Cooperative. If anyone has any inclinations towards any one of categories, any passions or special aptitude, I would encourage you to sign up. The next step would be to start meeting.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor added at the last TAC meeting, the Better World Group give their presentation on their findings from their first phase of this research. Then there was a discussion by the membership relative to the potential formation of four specific working groups, but there was a desire to hold off until this meeting before those were etched in stone. One of the actions today would be to either adopt the four working groups as presented or make modifications, deletions and/or additions to that list. You have at your discretion today, the ability to say, well let's not do a near zero truck cooperative, let's do something else instead. The second element is that these are a little bit different than what the MSRC has had in the past. In the past we had subcommittees which were pretty much formally constrained by the policies that the MSRC has previously adopted, meaning that the membership is limited to only TAC members. If an MSRC member wants to participate that's allowable but must be done under the Brown Act. The thought of the working group is potentially to bring other individuals who have specific expertise and/or are identified stakeholders into the process to provide guidance and their technical expertise as well as to have individuals in that working group who might be actual participants in the program. We have had members of the TAC sign up for the initial proposed working groups. There's still the opportunity, of course to do that. The next step would be to come up with any guidelines as to who you would like to have included in addition to TAC members on those working groups, and any conditions/restrictions/constraints such as total number of people. In addition to the work the Better World Group Advisors are doing at their level, staff is having discussions with our direct stakeholders. We've met with member agencies who sit around this table. We've met with Metro, SCAG, and the California Air Resources Board and their team which implements some of the funding programs. Most of these entities have expressed interest in continuing to have a role in the MSRC process, maybe working group participation, maybe not. There's a lot of interest in what the MSRC is doing and there's a lot of advocacy for them to have an ongoing role as we move forward.

MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented, for the working group for the trucks, it's probably going to take some time to develop this program. Maybe a year down the road you might launch it for receiving applications or what not. So maybe you need to include zero-

emission trucks as well as low NOx trucks. I understand that the focus is on near-term reductions for this funding program, but I wouldn't want to limit that working group. Mr. Gorski replied, it's going to be the right vehicle for that driver. Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel commented, if there are members from outside of the TAC, that working group becomes subject to the Brown Act. If you invite someone in for informational purposes, that's fine but if someone's going to be there at the meeting as part of the working group that becomes a Brown Act meeting.

Mr. Gorski commented, regarding the folks we're talking about having participate, for example, we had a long meeting with a large contingent from the California Air Resources Board. This included the staff who are implementing the HVIP program with CalStart, who was also on the phone, the staff who are planning their next round of incentive programs. They offered for all the four initial categories to identify from CARB who they thought were key individuals to staff each of those four working groups. We spoke to Metro, and the staff that have done the goods movement work, probably would like to have, if not a direct role, at least a continued relationship. We're meeting with SBCTA because of the interest of the warehousing in the San Bernardino County area. There may be an opportunity there to have some of their expertise. We want to meet with Riverside County also; we've done some work with their RTMLA group. There are a lot of interested parties.

MSRC-TAC Member Andy Silva asked, do we really need a Ports group? Because they're working on their Clean Air Action Plan 2.0. They're already going down the road towards zero emission. Mr. Gorski replied, the issue with the Ports is that to implement the Clean Air Action Plan they're going to need \$1.5 billion including infrastructure. Their interest is to keep in the timing of the Clean Air Action Plan. They also want to be able to bring in as much money as possible and the MSRC is a potential source of revenue for their Clean Air Action Plan. They are very interested in a participatory role. Mr. Berry commented, we're really looking at that next three-year period, so their feasibility studies clearly show that near zero technology may be a more feasible path now with potentially down the road the zero-emission vehicles. So, they're going to need that funding help as well. The idea behind this three-year plan was to see how much different sources of the funds can be stacked and accelerate that turnover.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INLAND PORTS, LAST MILE, MARITIME PORTS, AND ZERO/NEAR ZERO TRUCK COOPERATIVE REGIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT PROGRAM WORKING GROUPS.

**ACTION:** These recommendations will be included on the next MSRC agenda for consideration.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

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

No comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Manny Alarcón, project manager for the Clean Transportation Group from SoCalGas commented, this is my first time to this meeting and we've reorganized and have gotten a lot of new people, I'm kind of a new one. Jason Lewis has moved on and I'm taking over his duties. We promote near zero technology with natural gas, we continue to educate our customers, help South Coast AQMD get the word out, get as many people signing up to these solicitations and trying to meet those clean air goals. We're not only trying to be near zero, we're also starting to get our feet wet in the zero-emission side with hydrogen. We're getting technical on that side, trying to become experts on the hydrogen side as well. The working group is actually a great opportunity. We'd like to also be able to offer our technical assistance and especially our knowledge with customers and what they have done with fleets and what they're looking for, to help if possible with any of these working groups, to be supportive in any way we can, we'll leave that up to you guys. If you'd like to reach out to us, we're available at any time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING  
ADJOURNED AT 2:47 P.M.

**NEXT MEETING:** Next meeting: Thursday, July 11, 2019, 1:30 p.m., at the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)