



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE MSRC  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2020 MEETING MINUTES  
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765**

**All participants attended the meeting remotely pursuant to  
Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20**

**MSRC-TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

MSRC-TAC Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez, representing Orange County Board of Supervisors  
MSRC-TAC Vice-Chair Jenny Chan, representing Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Adriann Cardoso, representing Orange County Transportation Authority  
Jason Farin, representing Riverside County Board of Supervisors  
Steve Hillman, representing City of Los Angeles  
Jamie Lai, representing Cities of Orange County  
Minh Le, representing Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Laura Iannaccone (Alt.), representing Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Steven Lee, representing Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Rongsheng Luo, representing Southern California Association of Governments  
Kelly Lynn, representing San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
Sean O'Connor, representing Cities of San Bernardino County  
Tim Olson, Air Pollution Control Expert  
Nicole Soto, representing Regional Rideshare Agency  
Vicki White, representing South Coast Air Quality Management District  
Derek Winters, representing California Air Resources Board  
Dan York, representing Cities of Riverside County

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Patricia Kwon, South Coast AQMD  
Samira Raja  
Rick Teebay  
Mark Abramowitz  
Tony Chang  
Alek Von Houghton

**SCAQMD STAFF & CONTRACTORS**

Leah Alfaro, Contracts Assistant

Maria Allen, MSRC Administrative Liaison

Naveen Berry, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer

Ray Gorski, Technical Advisor

John Kampa, Financial Analyst

Daphne Hsu, Senior Deputy District Counsel

Matt MacKenzie, Contracts Assistant

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator

Matt Miyasato, South Coast AQMD DEO of Science Technology and Advancement

Joseph Impullitti, South Coast AQMD Technology Demonstration Manager

Penny Shaw-Cedillo, MSRC Administrative Liaison

CALL TO ORDER

- Call to Order  
MSRC-TAC Chair Anthony (AJ) Marquez called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Receive and Approve**

**Agenda Item #1 – Minutes of January 9, 2020 MSRC-TAC Meeting**

The minutes for the January 9, 2020 MSRC-TAC Meeting were included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC VOTED TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 9, 2020 MSRC-TAC MEETING. MSRC-TAC MEMBER JAMIE LAI ABSTAINED.

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

**Information Only - Receive and File**

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

The Contracts Administrator’s Report for August 27, 2020 through September 23, 2020 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE MSRC CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT FOR AUGUST 27, 2020 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 23, 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 August 2020 was included in the agenda package.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER SEAN O’CONNOR, UNDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS #1 – #3, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2020.

ACTION: No further action is required.

**ACTION CALENDAR**

[MSRC Member Steven Lee arrived during the discussion of this item]

**Agenda Item #4 – Consider Four-Month Term Extension by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Metro), Contract #MS16090 (\$2,500,000 – Expansion of the Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Transit Station)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator explained that Los Angeles County Metro is requesting a four-month term extension as part of the MSRC’s 14-16 Transportation Control Measures Partnership Program. Metro was awarded \$2.5 million for the expansion of the Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Transit Station. They have completed most of the improvements, but there are some elements that are not complete yet for various reasons. LA County Metro has requested a four-month contract term extension to complete the work. Ms. Ravenstein noted that what they’ve asked for seems to be enough time to complete the actual construction, but she was not 100% sure if this would also allow enough time for them to complete their final report. She doesn’t know whether they really took that into account in how much time they were requesting.

MSRC-TAC Chair A.J. Marquez asked if Metro should be contacted and asked if they’ve considered the extension to include their final report, rather than vote on it now then have them come back four to five months later asking for another extension.

Ms. Ravenstein answered Chair Marquez by stating his suggestion is an option. Another option is the TAC could recommend a longer extension than Metro has requested. She added that though it hasn’t happened for a little while, it’s not all that uncommon for the TAC to recommend a slightly longer extension if they felt that what was being requested might not be adequate. She added that this contract would expire October 26, so it would have to be extended at least a couple of months just to keep it open while we seek further clarification from them.

Chair Marquez asked the TAC members if based on the two options they would prefer an administrative extension and wait till they come back with a revised request to include time for their final report, or at the TAC’s discretion add some time to this extension to include the final report.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER DAN YORK AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER STEVEN LEE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY METRO, CONTRACT #MS16090, A TWELVE-MONTH TERM EXTENSION.

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

**Agenda Item #5 – Consider Substitution of 40 Public Access Charging Ports for 32 Public Access Charging Stations, Substitution of 10 Limited Access Charging Ports for 7 Limited Access Stations, Location Changes, Reallocation of Funds Between Tasks, and 19-Month Term Extension by City of Santa Monica, Contract #ML18080 (\$121,500 – Install EV Charging Stations)**

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator explained that the City of Santa Monica was awarded \$121,500 under MSRC's Local Government Partnership Program to install 40 public access charging ports and 10 limited access charging ports. The City is requesting quite a few modifications to this project. They didn't necessarily distinguish between a station and port. They proposed to install 32 public access stations and seven limited access stations. They've decided that in some cases that it would better serve their needs to do some dual-port stations. The total number of ports that they want to install is greater than might have been implied by their original proposal. They want to increase the number of ports from 32 to 40 for the public access side and from seven to ten on the limited access side. Then there are some changes to the station locations. They're asking \$944 to be reallocated from limited access to public access, and they are asking for a 19-month term extension due to some delays associated with budget, staff cuts and the shift in city priorities due to COVID-19. Lots of little things, but in the long run, the MSRC would be getting more ports installed for the same amount of MSRC funding with a 19-month delay.

ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER ADRIANN CARDOSO AND  
SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER RONGSHENG LUO, THE MSRC-  
TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE FOR THE  
CITY OF SANTA MONICA CONTRACT #ML18080, A NINETEEN-MONTH  
TERM EXTENSION AND CHARGING STATION/PORT SUBSTITUTIONS.

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

**Agenda Item #6 – Consider RFP for Zero and Near-Zero Trucking to the Warehouse, Distribution and Intermodal Facilities in Riverside & San Bernardino Counties and RFP for Zero and Near-Zero Cargo Handling Equipment at Warehouse, Distribution and Intermodal Facilities in Riverside & San Bernardino Counties**

MSRC-TAC Member Tim Olson stated that the Inland Ports Subcommittee identified two different topic areas. The first topic is related to supporting on-road Class 7 and 8, near-zero and zero emission vehicles and infrastructure. \$14 million is the proposed allocation for this RFP, to begin in November 2020. This is based on input from a Program Opportunity Notice (PON) process back in the spring. Several different proposal idea concept papers were submitted then, and we think we will get some significant responses. Pretty much every major original equipment manufacturer looks like they're interested in this. The second item is for off-road, \$6 million within the distribution center and warehouse system.

MSRC-TAC Chair A.J. Marquez asked has the Subcommittee discussed the draft RFP? Is there a Subcommittee recommendation?

Mr. Olson answered Chair Marquez that the Subcommittee has met more than once. The Subcommittee recommended the main structure of the two different RFPs and they discussed how they would recommend the allocation money for each one of those. A significant amount of time has passed so the guidance to the staff was to develop these two RFPs, but we didn't go

through detailed discussion of the individual elements of the RFP criteria.

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator stated that the drafts were provided to the Subcommittee members and they were provided an opportunity to provide input. There hasn't been a lot of time to do that, but most of their recommendations have been reflected in the drafts included in the agenda. Ray may have further changes to bring forward as a result of any other comments that he might have received after the agenda went to print last week.

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor stated that we did receive comments and those were incorporated except for a couple that came in post publication, but the majority of the Subcommittee members did provide written comments and those were incorporated into the documents presented today. The way this typically would work is that we're not trying to rush something if there hasn't been sufficient vetting through the committee. Mr. Gorski is not sure if the TAC members have had an opportunity to read the RFPs or not; it's a lot of material. That said, the TAC is in a position to do one of two things today. The first would be to have an action to move these forward for MSRC consideration based upon the work that the Subcommittee has done prior to this, as well as the incorporation of comments from the majority of the Subcommittee members. The second is to simply request that the Subcommittee formally review, discuss and move a recommendation to the TAC. That of course can be accommodated, also this isn't something which is so time critical that waiting four weeks would make a substantive difference. The MSRC was briefed last month and told that under the best case scenario the RFPs would be brought forward for their consideration in October. But the MSRC wants things to be right, as opposed to right away, and does appreciate the thoughtful review and guidance provided by the TAC. Either path is an acceptable path forward.

Chair Marquez stated that he went through both RFPs and as usual Ms. Ravenstein and her staff have done a very thorough job. He feels comfortable with the material in the RFPs. If the Subcommittee has weighed in via comments and not a formal meeting, he's also comfortable with that as well. He is leaning towards moving this item forward for MSRC approval, but asked if any members of the Subcommittee had any other ideas that can be discussed during the meeting.

MSRC-TAC member Derek Winters stated that CARB supports zero emission projects over natural gas projects and asked if there is some way that the RFPs can weigh the emission reductions to rank zero emission projects higher than the rest. But he acknowledges there might be a mixture of blended fuel for infrastructure projects or at least trucking equipment that is purchased, noting the passage of Executive Orders and the clean cars regulation passage a couple months ago, that the TAC should weigh zero emission more heavily than natural gas.

Mr. Olson stated he agreed with Mr. Winters' comments and noted the RFPs reflect the many comments that needed to be deliberated over having a split between off-road and on-road. A key thing in the RFPs presented is that you will see the total capital stack in these projects and not be subject to guessing where the other funding is coming from. Mr. Gorski and Ms. Ravenstein did a good job identifying and highlighting that. This would reflect basically how to get as many near term emission reductions as possible and in a very balanced way. Based on the PON process some companies prefer electric drive, some prefer natural gas and some prefer a mix.

MSRC-TAC member Minh Le commented that he would like to address the scoring of Criterion

#1, because when he looks at funding decisions he wants to know how much the applicants would be funding. He would like to see how committed the applicants are to move forward with this project with or without MSRC funding. He would like to look at those numbers and make a criterion for cost effectiveness and know if there's going to be more leverage of non-MSRC funding. He would like to see it more spelled out.

MSRC-TAC Member Dan York stated that both RFPs are well-written and he can support a recommendation moving the item forward to the MSRC. He would like to know the thought process of splitting the 20 million. He stated that at a minimum, the MSRC should understand why the TAC is recommending the 14/6 funding split and the reasoning behind it.

Mr. Tim Olson stated the Subcommittee may be open to modifying that split. Based on the PON process, there will probably be at least two to three off-road projects. Mr. Olson stated based on this the Subcommittee roughly estimated about 30% of the money for off-road projects. He estimates there will be more of a demand for on-road projects, but that percent number could be open to other input if the TAC would like to modify it.

Mr. Gorski stated that flexibility was built into the RFPs, if the off-road component was substantially oversubscribed, but the on-road component was undersubscribed, the MSRC retains the discretion to move funds between those two solicitations. During the deliberative process there was a review of the funding requests under the PON and staff did their best to try to reflect those ratios when apportioning the money between the two RFPs.

#### Public Comment

Rick Teebay stated he would like to express his concern regarding whether or not the off-road program would include things like yard tractors, which he would support, but he thinks electric forklifts should be off the list because companies should be doing that automatically. Mr. Teebay brought up another concern that some of the covered costs could include solar canopies for the electrical installations and also renewable natural gas. He noted that several years ago a public site was going to put in 20 or so electric vehicle chargers under a solar canopy and they came back to the TAC stating they spent all the monies on the solar canopy and were only putting in four ports. Though he supports solar and renewable energy, he's not sure if it's appropriate use of funding. Mr. Teebay noted he didn't see anything on public hydrogen stations. Though a medium-duty/heavy-duty hydrogen station may be expensive, if it went to a captive fleet that might preclude others from accessing that site. So he thinks there should be something for eligible sites to include those like the Ports of LA, Long Beach and Ontario. Mr. Teebay stated he thinks it's really important that there's a lot of funding for zero emission vehicles and not a lot for infrastructure.

**ON MOTION BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER TIM OLSON AND SECONDED BY MSRC-TAC MEMBER MINH LE, THE MSRC-TAC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR ZERO AND NEAR-ZERO TRUCKING AND THE RFP FOR ZERO AND NEAR-ZERO CARGO HANDLING EQUIPMENT, BOTH AT WAREHOUSE, DISTRIBUTION AND INTERMODAL FACILITIES IN RIVERSIDE & SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES.**

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

**Agenda Item #7 – Consider Proposed Partnership with South Coast AQMD and Regional Partners on Large-Scale Zero Emission Demonstration**

South Coast AQMD Assistant Deputy Executive Officer Naveen Berry explained that South Coast AQMD is working with several local regional entities on a proposal that is under consideration for submittal to the CARB/California Energy Commission (CEC) joint solicitation for a large-scale Zero Emission Truck Demonstration Program. Joe Impullitti is the Technology Demonstration Manager and he'll summarize on a high level the proposal that the South Coast AQMD is developing, and still working on detailed budget items as well as potential funding partners.

South Coast AQMD Technology Demonstration Manager Joseph Impullitti gave a presentation about the proposed partnership with the MSRC. Mr. Impullitti stated that NFI Industries and Schneider National are leaders in clean transportation and in a position to pilot the deployment of zero emission trucks at scale in partnership with South Coast AQMD. Collectively the two fleets will deploy 100 Class 8 commercially available electric tractors, both from Daimler and Volvo. The collaboration effort will leverage the AQMD's previous smaller-scale heavy-duty electric truck demonstrations. By implementing two significant deployments and charging infrastructure to support 50 vehicles at each site, the larger number of trucks deployed will support the commercialization of technologies by the OEMs. It will achieve larger economies of scale, developing new fleet management and learnings and best practices, and verify whether the grid can support the charging of many vehicles at one site. The project would also significantly reduce emissions in the impacted communities where they operate.

NFI's main campus is located in Chino, which is located within San Bernardino County. NFI currently has a fleet of 65 vehicles, the majority of which are diesel. NFI hauls straight from both the Ports of LA and Long Beach to its Chino campus and then it hauls the empty containers back to the Ports to pick up more goods. It has multiple customers and many of those customers are high profile brand names. The company is now at a critical turning point within its mission of wanting to go completely electric. In order to reach scale with electric vehicles NFI will have to build out a site that has truck parking for 65 heavy duty battery electric trucks, a maintenance shop for the battery electric trucks and development of state of the art charging station for the trucks, which will include a microgrid for resiliency and cost control.

Schneider has made sustainability a core focus of its business since 1978, and to have an emphasis on fuel efficiency, freight consolidation, and energy conservation. In partnership with Daimler Trucks North America (DTNA), Schneider is beginning the process of electrifying its fleet to become an early adopter of zero emission technology. Schneider is ranked as the fifth largest for-hire fleet and runs a fleet of 9,000 company owned tractors nationwide. Schneider was the first truckload carrier to sign on to the Environmental Protection Agency's Smart Way transport partnership and like NFI, Schneider has also made extensive planning and site preparations for this project in close partnership with DNTA's Electric Mobility Group. Schneider has confirmed infrastructure requirements and hardware specifications for both charging and energy storage. The project plan includes detailed site plans prepared by their electricians, hardware selections, and operational details that are necessary to deploy 50

eCascadias at their truck yard.

Most of the interstate travel for these 100 battery electric trucks will occur along the I-710, which aligns this project with several other vital transportation electrification initiatives that are happening in this region. For example, nearly one hundred percent of NFI's trips involve the I-710 at some point along the route. Collectively, NFI battery electric trucks will log between 1,300 to 5,850 miles per day on the I-710. Similarly, Schneider's truck routes will include the I-710 at least for 45% of the time and log between 787 and 2,362 zero emission miles per day on the I-710 according to some early estimates.

We've broken out the costs for trucks for each fleet as well as their infrastructure and other requirements. The solicitation requires workforce development, marketing, and outreach as well as project management, which would bring the total cost for both of those sites to over \$77.7 million. With respect to potential project funding, first of all, we have the CARB/CEC Drayage Pilot solicitation that should be out within next couple of weeks. There will be \$40 million available: \$20 million from CARB for vehicles, and \$20 million from CEC for infrastructure. The fleets have committed cash and in-kind funding for this project. This is very important because the solicitation is going to require that these are commercial vehicles and they want the vehicles to continue on in service for life of the vehicles after the project ends and so the fleets will be owners of those vehicles. The South Coast AQMD is committed to cash funding and will be the lead agency for these projects, the Ports have committed cash and in-kind funding as well. We are also in process of requesting MSRC funding and finally, we've been in discussion with Metro for cash funding of the trucks in this project.

Mr. Berry stated he wanted to let the TAC know that as indicated, the solicitation is not out yet; we don't know what the final version looks like so some of the items included in our earlier high-level estimates may be changing as well, based on what is allowed to be covered by the solicitations versus what may not be covered. So I just wanted to make sure that we are all clearly understanding that this a very preliminary high-level budget discussion as well and a lot of it will be driven by the final solicitation.

MSRC-TAC Member Le asked how did South Coast AQMD chose those two firms to work with?

Mr. Impullitti stated that it was their willingness, number one to host electric vehicles which is going to be quite a challenge to convert their operation to complete electric. Also an effort is involved in projects. We have current projects with Volvo and with Daimler, so we're leveraging those. Those are some of the reasons because we're familiar with them and we can leverage existing assets from projects that were already in progress.

Mr. Le asked a follow-up question stating Mr. Impullitti mentioned various other funding sources and based on the numbers he saw they don't quite come up to the 75 million, so where are those other pockets of money to add up to 75 million, how much are the companies putting in, and how much is the MSRC being asked to provide?

Mr. Impullitti stated they haven't received the solicitation yet and it would probably help a lot because from the workshops that we've been to, CARB is going to dedicate a certain amount per vehicle. So that would be a starting point and then from that we kind of work backwards and

figure out what the fleets would contribute. The other entities would also contribute towards the vehicles. They currently do not know how many awards there would be, if it would go towards just two projects or an additional project.

Mr. Berry stated, that once the solicitation is released, they can get some of those details and get a tighter budget overall and give the MSRC-TAC an update on the progress. This presentation was just to give the TAC an overview. The South Coast AQMD shares the same concerns that these fleets and the OEMs are all to have some skin in the game, so they're trying to figure out exactly what the costs of the battery electric trucks will be, how can everybody's pencils be sharpened in that regard as well, so everybody has a certain amount of skin the game. They think that's a vital commitment to the project as well. So he appreciates the concerns brought up.

Mr. Le, stated that he understands wanting to work with the same company as in past projects, especially those that have performed well, but thinks we should also be open to working with other companies that we may not be so familiar with because they may end up being better in the long run, so he wanted to express some concern about that moving forward with proposals. Mr. Le also stated that there might be other companies that have products that would be interested in partnering that the South Coast AQMD may not necessarily have a pre-existing deep relationship with that could give them a very strong proposal as well.

Mr. Berry stated that they had many discussions regarding that subject. The importance that they emphasized was working with Volvo and Daimler, not necessarily because they've had good previous experience only, but also that they are very traditional truck OEMs that actually have the maintenance, the review, the data collection and a lot of other pieces in place. They've already started to talk about what they want to do with the secondary market and such as well, so these are traditional established truck OEMs that have what they would call the full package, providing a service to a fleet. Especially large fleets that are willing to take the risk of incorporating 50 trucks into their fleet are certainly a challenge, but Mr. Le's points are well taken that they continue to expand, not only the truck OEMs, but also the fleets that they work with. Mr. Berry mentioned that at another time they can certainly give the TAC an overview of all the different fleets that they work with and their demonstration projects.

MSRC-TAC Member Dan York stated the \$75 million, at \$750,000 per vehicle to get 100 vehicles, is a staggering number, but that is because of the infrastructure. Mr. York inquired when this is presented to the MSRC what share would be coming from that pot? Out of 100, how many vehicles are coming up the 710? He would be curious to hear a future report listing some other ancillary benefits that would really help promote this program to a much broader audience because the numbers are staggering.

Mr. Berry stated that he does agree with Mr. York and that they are actually trying to find entities with common interests in implementing zero emission vehicles. He agrees that it is a very expensive project initially because it's first of a kind, in that large of a rollout. They are continuing to look at that aspect, but that's why it's even more vital that they find partners with similar goals such as Metro and their I-710 coordination as well so they can all leverage their funds towards this big amount of money that's available from the state to accomplish that and share those learnings, not just within the entities that are potential funding partners, but especially with the fleets and the utilities and CARB. and share that perspective lessons learned and that's exactly what the goal of that solicitation is but they can certainly expand on some of

the ancillary benefits above and beyond the focus of emission reductions.

Mr. Olson asked to follow-up on Minh Le's earlier question on how the South Coast AQMD selected NFI, Schneider, Daimler and Volvo. In the PON process there were quite a few proposals which proposed fifty-plus vehicles and so the demand is out there for other Southern California fleets and associated OEMs. Mr. Olson noted that he understands South Coast AQMD's questioning as to who has made enough progress and will it appeal in this case to the Energy Commission and CARB in a proposal from Southern California. Mr. Olson said he can understand using that as a selection criterion. He also wanted to point out that in the PON discussed earlier that that demand was heavily dependent on HVIP money. When the money has been stalled, with this waiting list and not enough funding coming, that's a factor because of the high cost of this, will this end up with less than fifty vehicles going forward with each proposal? Mr. Olson also asked if the two proposers' teams will be submitting anything to these Inland Ports RFPs that the TAC just discussed? Would they be seeking co-funding from that or is South Coast AQMD looking for a different dedicated funding source? Mr. Olson also commented that since the Energy Commission is part of that joint solicitation on the infrastructure, typically the historic way of looking at this is the state agency will only put up 50% maximum of the total cost, but in the case of infrastructure, because of the high cost he thinks it's going to be a lot less than that which means other partners have to come to the table on the infrastructure, particularly utilities. He noted it's one of the reasons that he recommended in the RFP process through the MSRC that they understand the entire capital stack and get as close to a commitment as possible from every member of the project team. Mr. Olson asked if the money really is not there, the total capital's not there, when will they gather the partners? And if fleets are in with less than 50 trucks, could other fleets have participated in this at a lower level? And is there an equity process in this, and are there other fleets that could have also benefited from it?

South Coast AQMD DEO of Science Technology and Advancement Matt Miyasato responded to Mr. Olson's and Mr. Le's questions by stating that they are going to ensure that the fleets have skin in the game as Mr. Le has brought this up several times. However they are bound by the requirements the Energy Commission and CARB are going to outline in the solicitation, which is a minimum of 50 trucks per site. And so there are very few fleets that have that kind of capital to invest in a phase out of all of their diesel trucks to electric and so it's been difficult to find early hand raisers that are willing to invest, not only in the base cost the vehicles, but also the infrastructure. South Coast AQMD has worked with the Ports to put out essentially a request for participation and as Mr. Olson alluded to, they're only willing to participate in twos or five to ten trucks. There's not that many national scale fleets that can do 50 in one shot, or over some 12-month period. So we are going to make sure that they abide by their commitment to put in funding, they will put in infrastructure, they will put in their costs for the vehicles and so rest assured, they will have skin in the game and South Coast AQMD would be happy to report back to the MSRC in terms of what that cost is. To address other questions, if there are other fleets that want to participate at a lower level, AQMD would be happy to entertain that. They've been telling people if they can't participate with them on this large solicitation, is there a smaller number that they should be facilitating to help the fleets roll out for electric or fuel cell trucks. With respect to HVIP, some of the same responders to the TAC's PON were the same fleets that are participating in the AQMD's program, so they fully anticipate that the fleets are going to request additional funding to make up for a shortfall through the MSRC, but that's something that AQMD will work with the TAC on as they put the proposal together because they do believe that the Energy Commission and CARB will put a cap on per truck costs and so they want to

ensure the region reaps the benefit of the full amount of this funding. AQMD wants to make it as attractive to the companies as possible by providing share costs and so they will work that through and make a recommendation on what they think that cost share should be per truck. Dr. Miyasato agreed with Mr. Olson, that for the infrastructure costs the utilities--Charge Ready for Edison and the other local utilities--should be putting funding in toward infrastructure. They are requiring that the fleets develop a plan and start working with utilities to ensure that that is well underway before they even submit.

Mr. Le commented on utilities, that the SCE's Charge Ready II program just got approved recently about a month ago from the California Public Utilities Commission. It seemed very focused around multi-unit dwellings and not very focused at all on heavy duty freight infrastructure. So how much can we really count on SCE if they're the utility of choice in those locations?

Mr. Berry stated that Charge Ready Transport was approved almost a year and half ago and he thinks the total funding was in the \$325 million range, but there is a big chunk of that still available for local fleets. The fleets have been in contact with Edison in that regard, working with them on trying to lay out a site review plan and a strategy to use Charge Ready Transport as the funding mechanism.

Mr. Olson asked if there a specific fund from the MSRC that the South Coast AQMD has identified to be seeking some kind of commitment or is the AQMD saying they need X amount of money up to a certain amount of money. Mr. Olson stated the MSRC has several different incentives: Inland Ports, Drayage, Marine Ports, Last Mile Delivery.

Dr. Miyasato answered that he would leave that to the MSRC's discretion. He would like to thank the MSRC especially for putting out the two solicitations that were just approved which will help with the South Coast AQMD's AQMP. This demonstration project is another program that he believes will eventually help with the AQMP towards reducing emissions. So that is totally up the MSRC-TAC's discretion and where they think it best fits, but this is clearly going to be reducing emissions along the 710's goods movement corridors.

Mr. Olson noted the South Coast AQMD's programs as well balanced and they move very quickly to try to take advantage of opportunities. He added that looking at it from representing the Energy Commission that they may have misjudged this by requiring 50 trucks when there is a limited amount of state money. He thinks that that requirement is driven by showing that it's a commercial project when in fact, there's not enough money. He doesn't think there's going to be enough money cobbled together to do all these projects and particularly when the state tends to look at this in the services areas. We've got to balance geographic distribution of how it is deployed so it's not likely it will all go to Southern California, so that means there's a limit. Because of the constraints on state funding the real thrust of new project is really going to come from local governments and air districts as the type of funding sources. He thinks it's a consequence of what's going on with the state budget and he thinks it's still a good effort to consider and if other entities might come to the table, who have similar objectives and that determines demand and the need for securing other funding.

Dr. Miyasato stated they disagree with the state's distribution of funds around equitability, but believe that South Coast deserves its fair share.

Mr. Gorski noted that at this point in time it's not essential that there be a formal action because the South Coast AQMD has yet to come forth with a formal funding request.

Mr. Le noted that once CARB and CEC release their solicitation, timing is limited and they're going to want all their commitments in terms of funding so he's respectful of that time schedule. He thinks there's still a lot to be discussed here because we don't know exactly what that framework of the solicitation is going to be and he would advise that we may need to pivot depending on what that solicitation looks like at the end.

Mr. Olson asked at what point does the South Coast AQMD need to see a commitment and when will the joint solicitation come out? If that's two weeks from now, with typically two months response time, maybe a little longer than that, does that give the AQMD enough time to get a commitment to put in their proposal knowing it would have to go through the TAC and the full MSRC board?

Dr. Miyasato stated that they anticipate the solicitation to come out imminently, in the first couple of weeks of October. 60 to 90 days is how long they'll keep it open. They would need to have letters of commitment or letters of support with some amount of commitment in that timeframe.

MSRC-TAC CHAIRMAN MOVED ITEM AS INFORMATION ONLY.

**ACTION:** No further action at this time.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

No others business.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No public comment.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MSRC-TAC MEETING  
ADJOURNED AT 2:44 P.M.

**NEXT MEETING:** Next meeting: Thursday, November 5, 2020, 1:30 p.m.

(Minutes prepared by Maria M. Allen)