



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC
THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2020 MEETING MINUTES
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765 - Room CC8**

MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York, representing Cities of Riverside County
MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez, representing Orange County Board of Supervisors
Martin Buford, representing Regional Rideshare Agency
Adriann Cardoso, representing Orange County Transportation Authority
Jenny Chan (Alternate), representing Riverside County Transportation Commission
Jason Farin, representing Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Steve Hillman, representing City of Los Angeles
Jaime Lai, representing Cities of Orange County
Minh Le, representing Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Steven Lee, representing Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Kelly Lynn, representing San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Tim Olson, Air Pollution Control Expert (California Energy Commission)
Cliff Thorne (Alternate), representing Orange County Transportation Authority
Vicki White, representing South Coast Air Quality Management District
Derek Winters, representing California Air Resources Board

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lauren Dunlap, SoCalGas

SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant
Maria Allen, Secretary
Naveen Berry, Asst. Deputy Executive Officer
Penny Shaw Cedillo, MSRC Administrative Liaison
Ray Gorski, Technical Advisor
John Kampa, Financial Analyst
Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel
Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant
Ashkaan Nikravan, Senior Staff Specialist
Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order
MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1 through 3)
Receive and Approve

Agenda Item #1 – Minutes of the June 6 and September 5, 2019 MSRC-TAC Meetings

The minutes of the June 6 and September 5, 2019 MSRC-TAC meetings were included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND APPROVED THE MINUTES
OF THE JUNE 6 AND SEPTEMBER 5, 2019 MSRC-TAC MEETINGS.

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

Agenda Item #2 – MSRC Contracts Administrator's Report

The Contracts Administrator's Report for December 27, 2019 through February 26, 2020 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE
CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT FOR DECEMBER 27,
2019 THROUGH FEBRUARY 26, 2020.

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 January 2020 was distributed at the meeting.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC VICE CHAIR AJ MARQUEZ, UNDER
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE
FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF JANUARY 2020 AND
THE 13TH BIENNIAL AB 2766 AUDIT COVERING FYS 2015-16 AND
2016-17.

ACTION: No further action is required.

ACTION CALENDAR (Items 4 through 7)

Agenda Item #4 – Consider One-Year Term Extension for the City of Azusa, Contract #ML16032 (\$474,925 – Implement “Complete Streets” Pedestrian Access Project)

The City requests a one-year contract term extension due to delays associated with the larger project of which this is a part, and to align construction with Azusa Pacific University’s summer break to minimize impacts on pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER VICKI WHITE, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR
THE CITY OF AZUSA, CONTRACT #ML16032, A ONE-YEAR TERM
EXTENSION.

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

Agenda Item #5 – Consider Two-Year Contract Term Extension by Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), Contract #MS14059 (\$1,250,000 – Implement Various Signal Synchronization Projects)

RCTC requests a two-year contract term extension due to the Coachella Valley Associated Governments’ Regional Synchronization Project taking longer than anticipated due to the necessary coordination with the numerous jurisdictions, the wide variety of existing equipment, and planning for synchronization that will be utilizing

rapidly changing technology.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER VICKI WHITE, THE MSRC-
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR
RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,
CONTRACT # MS14059, A TWO-YEAR TERM EXTENSION.

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

FYs 2016-18 WORK PROGRAM

[MSRC-TAC Members Martin Buford, Adriann Cardoso, Jason Farin and Jaime Lai arrived during the discussion of item #6]

Agenda Item #6 – Consider Recommendation Regarding Extending Submittal Deadline Under the Hydrogen Infrastructure Partnership Program

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator reported that in April 2018 as part of the 2016-18 Work Program, the MSRC released a Program Opportunity Notice (PON) for Hydrogen Infrastructure Partnerships. The value of this was initially targeted at \$3 million. It seeks to encourage the establishment of new and expanded hydrogen fueling stations by public and private entities. The primary intent was to provide funding that can be used to improve the financial viability of a candidate hydrogen fueling station that has already undergone vetting by a public agency that has experience pertaining to the selection, management and oversight of hydrogen refueling stations. The PON has a submittal date of April 10, 2020. To date, the MSRC has made one award under the PON, in the amount of \$1 million, to UC Irvine for the expansion of their hydrogen station. The solicitation also has a geographic funding minimum of \$500,000 per county. In parallel to this, the California Energy Commission (CEC) has released their Clean Transportation Program for Hydrogen Refueling Infrastructure in January. With that release, there was a marked increase in interest in the MSRC's PON. The submission deadline for the CEC's solicitation is April 30, 2020 with anticipated notice of proposed awards in June. MSRC Staff recommend the MSRC-TAC recommend to the MSRC to extend the submittal deadline to April 9, 2021.

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York commented, getting the CEC vetting out the projects is going to help us get where we need to go. It does not hurt us. These monies would have rolled over to a similar program in the next Work Program.

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson commented that the CEC's solicitation is about \$115 million; \$47.5 million is available now. Our encumbrance periods are four years and four years for liquidation.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee inquired about the marked increase in interest. What is the flavor? What are we looking at--municipalities, government agencies, private sector? Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor reported, we presume that the proponents of larger-scale projects are fuel providers. We have a letter received from Shell, whom we have had numerous conversations with. Ms. Ravenstein commented, there is a variety of interest.

Mr. Olson commented, there is a capability for co-locating light-duty and transit bus fueling at the same location. There will be another CEC solicitation just dedicated for medium- and heavy-duty ZEV infrastructure. This would be another \$47.5 million, probably towards the middle to the end of the second quarter. In this case, ZEV would mean both electric and hydrogen would be eligible.

Mr. York asked how we go about sending out a notification to proponents that the deadline will be extended. Ms. Ravenstein replied, I would certainly reach out to CEC to see if there is any way that they can notify their list. Also, the people who are registered on the MSRC website would get a notification. Mr. York commented, if the CEC gets a list of projects, regardless of whether they award or not, would they be willing to share that list and that type of project with the MSRC staff to see if there was anything of merit there? Mr. Olson commented, the timing is a little tricky because once a proposal is submitted it is pretty much confidential discussion until the notice of award occurs. But if an applicant to the CEC solicitation states they potentially have MSRC co-funding, that is a good sign. We require some level of match. Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, commented, the South Coast AQMD could help with some of the outreach assistance. Mr. York commented, the expectation is these monies will be spent on similar projects and this extension of time helps us achieve that.

MSRC-TAC Member Minh Le commented, the amount of money that is available for the CEC funding program, how big is that on a total basis and on a per project basis? And how much funding would be available from MSRC that would effectively goose that project? If the CEC is looking to fund five projects and contribute \$1 million each, the projects' total cost might be \$10 million. And then we are adding in an extra increment to help make that project go, is that the concept? Mr. Olson commented, for light-duty, the kind of industry average at this point is about \$2 to \$3 million per station and historically the CEC has put up anywhere from 50% to 80% of the total cost. As time passes, we are getting more and more matching money commitments. It is going to be in that kind of range. The other thing we like is multiple replications. So, if you are proposing 10 stations, as opposed to one, you are probably going to do better. Shell and First Element are packaging several projects under one proposal, same with some of the industrial gas companies. Mr. Le commented, so let us say there is a \$3 million project.

The CEC might support it with \$0.5 to \$2 million dollars, and then the funds from the MSRC would support it how much more? Mr. Olson commented, we require that at least 25% of your match needs to be cash. The rest could be the value of real estate, or other in-kind value services.

Mr. Berry asked, based on the overall plan that the MSRC has, is it better to leverage that upcoming solicitation for medium- and heavy-duty or is it better to leverage this light-duty oriented with co-location? Mr. Olson replied, it is your choice, it depends on what your applicant is proposing.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC ALTERNATE JENNY CHAN AND
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER MARTIN BUFORD, THE
MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO
EXTEND THE SUBMITTAL DEADLINE UNDER THE HYDROGEN
INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM TO APRIL 9, 2021

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

FYs 2018-21 WORK PROGRAM

Agenda Item #7 – Consider Partnership with South Coast AQMD on Implementation of a Voucher Incentive Program (VIP) Plus-Up Incentive

[MSRC-TAC Member Kelly Lynn arrived during the discussion of item #7]

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported this item is to consider a partnership with the South Coast AQMD on implementing a Voucher Incentive Program Plus-Up Incentive. Under the Carl Moyer Program there has been the Voucher Incentive Program called VIP. VIP provides incentive funding for the cost of replacing older, higher polluting vehicles with newer, lower emission vehicles that meet the 0.2 g/bhp-hr NOx standard, the current standard for NOx. This program is limited to the smaller fleets, 10 or fewer vehicles. They put in an application through approved dealers. They do not have to submit an application to the air district. Their current vehicle must have an engine model 2009 or older and be in compliance with CARB's Truck and Bus Regulation. If the applicant is found to be eligible and issued a voucher, that amount is deducted from the purchase price of the newer vehicle. It does not necessarily have to be a brand-new truck. Those voucher amounts vary by vehicle class and mileage. The maximum voucher amount, for the vehicles with the highest mileage on the current vehicle, is \$60,000. MSRC staff spoke with South Coast AQMD staff about ways to leverage this existing program, something we can do for these smaller fleets to try to get them to go above and beyond to get something cleaner. Given the technology developments there are engines that can meet the .02 gram standard. It is an opportunity to partner and think about adding MSRC funds on top of what the applicant would get under the normal Voucher Incentive

Program. We are looking at vehicles that are generally going to be propane or natural gas vehicles, not diesel, to meet the .02 gram standard. We do not have a hundred percent certainty of what the dollar amount is. It is possible that what we are talking about may still might not be enough for all of the small fleets, but what we are proposing is a fairly good starting place. We are looking at taking the money they get out of the Carl Moyer fund, and adding on from the MSRC, and coming up with a maximum incentive. It would vary by the vehicle class. For Class 7 or 8 that would be up to \$100,000 or 90% of the total cost of a new truck, whichever is lower. I am hearing that these trucks are going out the door for \$180,000. So, really the option for 90% of the cost of the truck does not even come into play here. That was put in because, especially for some of the smaller class trucks, we wanted to make sure we are not paying 100% of the cost of somebody's vehicle. We are looking at \$80,000 or 90% of the total cost for Class 6; and \$60,000 or 90% for Class 5.

This is a very streamlined process compared to some of the other kinds of grant processes. Other than these funding caps, all of the other requirements of the VIP program would remain in place. We checked with CARB; they have no policy concerns with this approach. There are some little details about the reporting and so forth but as a general approach, they thought it was okay. This item did not go before a subcommittee because there is some feeling of urgency. The Carl Moyer Program for 2020 is going to the South Coast AQMD Board tomorrow. The funding tables are expected to be released soon for the regular VIP Program, and we would like to see the Plus Up available as soon as possible. There was a feeling that in order for this program to be viable, a minimum amount of \$5 million would be appropriate and that would match \$5 million in the VIP funds. The amounts of the vouchers issued would depend upon what kinds of trucks applied. There are different classes and the original trucks that they are replacing have different mileages. But if all the trucks were eligible for the maximum VIP voucher amount of \$60,000, and all of them that came were Class 8, then that \$5 million from MSRC would get 100 of the low NOx trucks. If you get a bunch of smaller trucks, you can have a greater number; if your vouchers are less than the maximum amount then you might have smaller numbers. CARB is actually working on adding their own low NOx incentive to the Statewide program in the next few months. They are looking at a lower incentive amount than what we are proposing, and we are not sure when that is going to happen. If and when CARB has their program, the MSRC could continue to provide the differential.

The MSRC staff has thought about how outreach and marketing could be done in coordination with South Coast AQMD. We also have the Better World Group, and there is a dealer workshop on April 7th. The dealers are the primary mechanism through which this information is disseminated, and they do all of the interaction with the truck owners. MSRC staff will definitely be participating in the workshop. Ash Nikravan is the primary staff person at South Coast AQMD for implementing the VIP program.

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson commented, under CARB's HVIP program they do not allow stacking. They have different conditions, that may change in this next round, but they did not require scrappage. Their level was \$40,000 per truck. Their staff informed me they are going to require in-state renewable natural gas (RNG) use which has to be documented. 90% of the RNG being consumed in the state is from out of state. So, the idea is, in-state development and you have about 100 projects that are in some stage. A couple in operation, a lot are under development and some are being planned for the next three years. There is probably lots of supply, but it could be a timing issue to get the incentive, you have to have the local in-state source of supply. Will CARB's HVIP program allow stacking with your incentive program? MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented, in the past CARB said no combination of state monies can be combined for any one project. HVIP does not typically allow stacking because they do not require scrapping and what they are funding is what they call the incremental cost of that newer technology. They do not want the remaining cost to be funded for that vehicle. The MSRC incentive on top of our Carl Moyer Voucher Incentive Program incentive, still may not be enough to get that smaller fleet to purchase low NOx vehicle. That is still a differential of \$80,000 to \$100,000, they have to come up with to make that happen. It is worth providing this incentive because we want to give them that option. The second phase of this is that when CARB comes out with their low NOx funding tables for the Carl Moyer Voucher Incentive Program, they are thinking of opening it up to larger fleets. Right now, the VIP is designed for smaller fleets of 10 trucks and fewer. If they open it up to larger fleets, there will be a high demand for these funds. At that time, there may need to be a fleet limit. Maybe that might be a good time to add the renewable fuel requirement as well.

Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, commented, they are also graduating natural gas engines from the HVIP program. The year that they left it in at that \$40,000 level and with the RNG requirement, they were actually already oversubscribed. So, that funding is not really available right now anyways. It makes it even more important for independent owner operators to have this option. The South Coast AQMD is not just working on the VIP but also on other more innovative approaches, which include some trade down work. We are trying to take many different approaches.

Mr. Olson asked, will CARB be requiring a similar condition on in-state RNG for Carl Moyer? Any change in the guidelines? Mr. Berry replied, I have not heard that yet, but that may be a direction they go.

MSRC-TAC Chair Dan York commented, for the VIP Plus Up Program, you are asking the MSRC to match dollar-for-dollar with South Coast AQMD? Ms. Ravenstein replied, the total amount going into the program is dollar-for-dollar. But depending on the specific truck that somebody has applied for and how many miles they drive, in some cases the MSRC's funding contribution is going to be bigger than the South Coast contribution, and in some cases smaller. Mr. York replied, is there a window of time that you want to allow this to go? The MSRC has to give staff some direction, (1) a

recommendation for a VIP Plus Up, (2) a recommendation of accepting the three-class table, (3) a dollar amount for the program, and (4) a time that we would at least have a report back.

MSRC-TAC Member Minh Le asked, how many less than 10 vehicle fleets are being purchased per year right now? Mr. Berry replied under VIP there is currently about 100. The real driver is the Truck and Bus Regulation, that is forcing the fleet to turn over their older trucks, so they will be eligible to continue to drive.

Mr. Le asked, has research been done on what are the real market barriers for these small independent operators? It may not just be upfront cash, there could be other types of programs, financing programs in particular, where a little bit of funds from the MSRC can help with buy down and interest rate. Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, responded, the MSRC not being a legal entity, we do not have the ability to contract or do any type of a business transaction per se. By statute we are obligated to utilize the South Coast AQMD to act on the MSRC's behalf. The question would be, would the South Coast AQMD be willing or in a position to act in a capacity of working with lending institutions to help lower the interest rate or other financial barriers for a small independent operator. South Coast AQMD has looked at this and at this point I am not aware that the South AQMD is willing to take on that amount of liability on behalf of the MSRC. MSRC-TAC Member Vicki White commented, that is exactly the program that CARB has, a loan guarantee program. They put funds into this program that helps buy down the loan for the fleets. They have a long list of lenders. We connect the small fleets with the lender list, they can call any of the lenders to negotiate the rate for their truck. Mr. Le asked, how much do you think the purchase price gets transferred to the end user? Meaning if you incentivize \$100,000, are they lowering their sticker price by \$100,000 exactly? Ms. White replied, we receive the actual invoices from the dealer, and we have already funded about 200 of these trucks. We already have a sense of what the cost is for these trucks with different size engines. The invoice is received as total truck cost with all the taxes, the delivery fee, other fees, and the reduction from the grant on that invoice. Mr. Le commented, what is to prevent a dealer from saying okay if you came with cash instead of going through South Coast AQMD's program, I can probably sell that truck for a little bit less. Ms. White commented, each of the dealers that are participating in the VIP program have to be approved by us and sign a contract with us. There are certain fair practices requirements in that contract; they do not mark up the price. We do a fairly good job of monitoring that, if we do see a significant markup that was unexpected, we will pursue that. The most we can do is disqualify that dealer and alert the customer to find another dealership for a better price. Mr. Berry commented, we also do a periodic audit of the dealers.

MSRC-TAC Member Martin Buford asked, wondering if the truck owner paying 10% is enough? What portion of this does the business get to write off? Will it be the percentage that they contributed or the entire amount of the vehicle? Ms. White responded, applicants receive a 1099 from us for the entire cost of the vehicle. There will be tax

implications. It is considered a grant and we are required to issue the 1099 to them for receiving the grant. John Kampa, Financial Analyst, commented, with the accelerated depreciation method applied to Section 179, that would be through their tax preparer that would help them along with that. So, they qualify in a sense, they can accelerate the depreciation, get a bigger write off upfront from purchase of these vehicles that qualifies under that section. Ms. White commented, we are going to be maxed out at the \$100,000. These trucks are \$186,000 to \$200,000. There is still a pretty big differential cost they have to pay.

MSRC-TAC Member Jamie Lai asked, the small fleets are 10 or less. Are they coming in and trying to replace their whole fleet at the same time? Or are they coming in and just replacing like two or three at a time? Ms. White replied, it is a range. Ashkaan Nikravan, Senior Staff Specialist commented, usually they come in for one or two at a time. As a small business, it is hard for them to give up several trucks at a time. Some of them are skeptical. They apply and realize this is real. We have quite a few return customers. As long as they have 10 or fewer, they are welcome to come back.

MSRC-TAC Member Steven Lee asked, on average is it about a 100 vehicles per year? Mr. Nikravan commented, last year it was. The momentum has been increasing. The previous years, prior to the Truck and Bus regulation, we did 500 trucks, but that was because there were no regulations at that point. Mr. Lee commented, it sounds like until FY 2021 that this program would be \$5 million. Ms. Ravenstein replied, the MSRC might want to check on how it is going when CARB comes out with their low NOx incentive and evaluate at that time. Mr. Lee asked, we need to set a limitation on the time? Mr. York commented, at the end of the day without giving some direction or boundary, we have got an overall \$65 million program that we are delivering up to the MSRC. I think it would be advantageous that we make that kind of recommendation.

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson asked, is there a waitlist? Mr. Berry replied, typically we run out of funds for the program. Mr. Olson asked, do you have funds for bigger fleets? Ms. White commented, technically the small fleets can apply under the Carl Moyer Program as well. But they are going to be competing with all the larger fleets and the off-road fleets. Carl Moyer funds all heavy-duty vehicle types of equipment, on- and off-road and infrastructure. So, this program was actually taking Carl Moyer funds and creating a streamlined program just for the small trucking fleets. We have a 15-day process to approve or deny the application. We review, make a quick decision, even if it gets rejected because of missing information they can work with the dealer to reapply. It moves quickly. As we get closer to that final compliance date, January 1, 2023, there will be more participation. If CARB opens it up to larger fleets, the money will be spent very quickly. Mr. Olson asked, is there a deadline on purchase orders. Mr. Nikravan replied, for VIP, delivery is required no later than December 31st of that calendar year. That could be a good indicator of what the progress is up until that point, should you want to reallocate or decide to modify. Mr. Berry asked, do we have a timeline on our program that says that after they get the voucher approved, they must take delivery in a certain

length of time? Mr. Nikravan replied, the absolute final delivery date is December 31st. Mr. Olson commented, the reason I am raising that up is our uptake increased from 40% to 95% once we required a 30-day purchase order.

Mr. York commented, for the MSRC that sounds like the good news is South Coast AQMD is administering. For the MSRC, we are looking at the VIP Plus Up December 31, 2020 for a dollar amount up to \$5 million, for Class 7 and 8 at a \$100,000, Class 6 at \$80,000, and Class 5 at \$60,000. Do you think that MSRC is going to come back to this group and suggest partnering in the bigger program or it was really focused just on the smaller fleets? Mr. Gorski replied, there is always the opportunity for the MSRC to partner with the South Coast AQMD on the larger Carl Moyer Program, especially if there is a backup list at their end of their evaluation period in which they were oversubscribed. When that presents itself, this group can make your decision as to how much of that backup list you would like to fund.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC CHAIR DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVE LEE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE THE PARTNERSHIP WITH SOUTH COAST AQMD ON IMPLEMENTATION OF A VOUCHER INCENTIVE PROGRAM (VIP) PLUS UP INCENTIVE WITH AN INITIAL FUNDING ALLOCATION OF \$5,000,000 AND AMENDMENT TO THE SUNSET DATE TO DECEMBER 31, 2021.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Agenda Item #8 – Other Business

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor commented we have two programs, the MAP Program, and the VIP Plus-Up Incentive which a recommendation to bring before the MSRC was made. Both are focused on getting drayage trucks and other heavy-duty trucks towards near zero. There is a lot of additional activity that is going on in the zero-emission arena, as well as the recently closed PON for the Inland Ports. For the \$20 million targeted funding amount we received over \$95 million in applications. We have different levels of conceptual papers. It is going to be a team effort for us to go through and try to find where the best opportunities are for the MSRC for the Inland Empire warehouse distribution logistics centers.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:33 P.M.

NEXT MEETING: Next meeting: Thursday, April 2, 2020, 1:30 p.m., at the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Minutes prepared by Penny Shaw Cedillo)