



BAY AREA
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MOBILE SOURCE COMMITTEE**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

SCOTT HAGGERTY - CHAIRPERSON

**JERRY HILL
JAKE McGOLDRICK
JOHN SILVA
SHELIA YOUNG**

TIM SMITH – VICE CHAIRPERSON

**PATRICK KWOK
NATE MILEY
PAMELA TORLIATT**

**TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 13, 2005
9:30 A.M.**

**FOURTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
DISTRICT OFFICES**

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** *(Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items Pursuant to Government Code § 54954.3) Members of the public are afforded the opportunity to speak on any agenda item. All agendas for regular meetings are posted at District headquarters, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA, at least 72 hours in advance of a regular meeting. At the beginning of the regular meeting agenda, an opportunity is also provided for the public to speak on any subject within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction. Speakers will be limited to three (3) minutes each.*
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 14, 2005**
- 4. VEHICLE BUY BACK PROGRAM VEHICLE SCRAPPING CONTRACTOR SELECTION**
H. Hilken/4642
hhilken@baaqmd.gov
The Committee will consider recommending Board of Director approval of the selection of and contracts with Vehicle Buy Back Vehicle Scrapping Contractors.
- 5. SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR FOR TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR PERFORMANCE REVIEW**
H. Hilken/4642
hhilken@baaqmd.gov
The Committee will consider recommending Board of Director approval of the selection of and contract with consultant to perform a performance audit of selected Transportation Fund for Clean Air projects.
- 6. PRESENTATION ON PLUG-IN HYBRID MOTOR VEHICLES**
H. Hilken/4642
hhilken@baaqmd.gov
California Air Resources Board staff will provide the Committee with an overview of plug-in hybrid motor vehicles.

7. REPORT ON THE “GREAT RACE FOR CLEAN AIR”

T. Lee/4905
tlee@baaqmd.gov

Staff will report on the upcoming Great Race for Clean Air scheduled for October 6, 2005.

8. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/OTHER BUSINESS

Any member of the Committee, or its staff, on his or her own initiative or in response to questions posed by the public, may: ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or report on his or her own activities, provide a reference to staff regarding factual information, request staff to report back at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda. (Gov't Code § 54954.2).

9. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING: 9:30 a.m., October 13, 2005, 939 ELLIS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

10. ADJOURNMENT

**CONTACT CLERK OF THE BOARDS - 939 ELLIS STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109**

**(415) 749-4965
FAX: (415) 928-8560
BAAQMD homepage:
www.baaqmd.gov**

- To submit written comments on an agenda item in advance of the meeting.
- To request, in advance of the meeting, to be placed on the list to testify on an agenda item.
- To request special accommodations for those persons with disabilities notification to the Clerk's Office should be given at least three working days prior to the date of the meeting so that arrangements can be made accordingly.

**Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, California 94109
(415) 771-6000**

DRAFT MINUTES

Summary of Board of Directors
Mobile Source Committee Meeting
9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 14, 2005

1. **Call to Order – Roll Call:** Chairperson Scott Haggerty called the meeting to order at 9:42 a.m.

Present: Scott Haggerty, Chairperson; Patrick Kwok, Jake McGoldrick, Tim Smith, Pamela Torliatt.

Absent: Jerry Hill, Nate Miley, John Silva, Shelia Young.

Also Present: Julia Miller, Marland Townsend, Gayle B. Uilkema.
2. **Public Comment Period:** There were none.
3. **Approval of Minutes of April 25, 2005:** Director Smith moved approval of the minutes; seconded by Director Torliatt, carried unanimously without objection.
4. **Vehicle Buy Back Program Fiscal Year 2004/2005 Annual Report:** *Staff provided an overview of the Vehicle Buy Back Program annual report for fiscal year 2004/2005.*

Vanessa Mongeon, Environmental Planner, presented the annual report for the Vehicle Buy Back (VBB) Program and provided an overview of the Program. Ms. Mongeon noted that the VBB Program is one of the most cost-effective TFCA-funded programs, with an estimated cost effectiveness of \$8,600 per ton of reduced emissions for fiscal year 2004/2005.

The budget for fiscal year 2004/2005 was \$3.8 million. Currently, there are three vehicle dismantling contractors with a total of 20 dismantling yards in the Bay Area, where an average of 600 light-duty vehicles are scrapped per month for the VBB Program. Ms. Mongeon reviewed the changes authorized by the Board of Directors in October 2004 and stated that staff has no recommended changes for the 2005/2006 funding cycle for this program.

During discussion it was noted that approximately 60-70% of the vehicles being scrapped are model years 1982 to 1985.

Committee Action: Director Smith moved to receive and file the report; seconded by Director Kwok; carried unanimously without objection.

- 5. Vehicle Buy Back Program Direct Mail Campaign Contract Extension:** *The Committee considered recommending Board of Director approval of a one-year contract extension for the Vehicle Buy Back Program Direct Mail campaign.*

Ms. Mongeon presented the report and reviewed the background and importance of direct mail to the Vehicle Buy Back Program. The original contract to Ad Mail was approved by the Board of Directors in May 2004 and it included a provision for a one-year renewal. Staff recommends renewing the contract for one year in the amount of up to \$90,000.

Committee Action: Director Torliatt moved the staff recommendation; seconded by Director McGoldrick.

In response to a question from Director Haggerty, Ms. Mongeon stated that approximately \$75,000 has been spent on the direct mail campaign so far. The motion then carried unanimously without objection.

- 6. Transportation Fund for Clean Air County Program Manager Expenditure Plans for Fiscal Year 2005/2006:** *The Committee considered recommending Board of Director approval of fiscal year 2005/2006 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager expenditure plans.*

Juan Ortellado, Grant Programs Manager, presented the report and stated that the Air District reviews the TFCA Program Manager (PM) expenditure plans and provides recommendations to the Board of Directors for their approval. Mr. Ortellado reviewed the project evaluation guidelines and discussed the County Program Manager expenditure plans for fiscal year 2005/2006. Staff is recommending 62 projects for approval as well as the swapping of TFCA and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds proposed by the Alameda and Santa Clara Program Managers.

Mr. Ortellado reviewed the TFCA County Program Manager expenditure plans for fiscal year 2005/2006 summarized in Tables 1 and 2 of the staff report. Staff recommended that the Committee recommend Board of Director approval of County Program Manager expenditure plans for fiscal year 2005/2006 summarized on Tables 1 and 2 of the staff report.

In response to a question from Director McGoldrick, David Chan of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority explained the differences between the two bicycle locker projects for San Francisco County.

Committee Action: Director Smith moved the Committee recommend Board of Director approval of the staff recommendation; seconded by Director Torliatt; carried unanimously without objection.

- 7. Vehicle Incentive Program for Fiscal Year 2005/2006:** *The Committee considered recommending Board of Directors approval of the Vehicle Incentive Program (VIP) for fiscal year 2005/2006, including 2) allocation of \$500,000 in Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds for the fiscal year 2005/2006 VIP funding cycle; and b) approval of the VIP guidelines.*

Andrea Gordon, Senior Environmental Planner, provided an overview of the program and noted that staff is not recommending any changes in the proposed guidelines or incentive amounts. The Vehicle Incentive Program guidelines, process, and procedures were reviewed. Staff recommends Board of Director approval of the following:

- Allocation of \$500,000 in TFCA Regional funds for the fiscal year 2005/2006 VIP cycle, and
- Approval of the VIP guidelines in Attachments A and B of the staff report.

There was discussion on plug-in hybrids and Jack Broadbent, Executive Officer/APCO stated that this item will be brought back to the Committee at a later date.

Committee Action: Director Smith moved that the Committee recommend Board of Director approval of the staff recommendation; seconded by Director Kwok; carried unanimously without objection.

8. Committee Member Comments/Other Business: There were none.

9. Time and Place of Next Meeting: Chairperson Haggerty announced that the August 11, 2005 meeting was cancelled. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 8, 2005, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109

10. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Mary Romaidis
Clerk of the Boards

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Inter-office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and
Members of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research

Date: September 6, 2005

Re: Vehicle Scrapping Contractor Selection for the Vehicle Buy Back Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend Board of Directors approval of:

- 1) the selection of Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc., Pick-N-Pull, and Pick Your Part as the vehicle scrapping contractors for the fiscal year (FY) 2005/06 Vehicle Buy Back (VBB) Program; and
- 2) the authorization for the Executive Officer/APCO to execute contracts for vehicle scrapping and related services with Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc., Pick-N-Pull, and Pick Your Part, that will distribute, on a monthly reimbursement basis, the \$7 million allocated for this purpose to the VBB Program in FY 2005/06.

BACKGROUND

In FY 2005/06, the Air District will enter its tenth funding cycle for the VBB Program. Through the nine previous funding cycles, the Air District has allocated a total of approximately \$20 million and has scrapped over 27,000 vehicles. During the FY 2004/05 funding cycle, vehicle eligibility and incentive levels were revised so that model year 1985 and older vehicles are eligible for the VBB Program and \$650 is paid for each purchased vehicle. Funding allocated to the current FY 2004/05 contracts with the scrapping firms is expected to be expended within the next month. The Air District's FY 2005/06 budget allocates \$7 million in TFCA funds to continue implementation of the VBB Program.

DISCUSSION

In July 2005, the Air District issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking contractors for the FY 2005/06 VBB Program. The scope of work contained in the RFP conforms to the California Air Resources Board-adopted Voluntary Accelerated Light-Duty Vehicle Retirement (VAVR) Regulation that went into effect in July 2000. The RFP was mailed to 29 companies and posted on the Air District and Association of Bay Area Governments websites. Responses to the RFP were due in August 2005.

The Air District received three proposals in response to the RFP. The proposals were submitted by Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc. (EES), Pick-N-Pull Auto Dismantlers, and Pick Your Part Auto Recycling. The Air District has previously contracted

with all three bidders to carry out the VBB Program. Therefore, Air District staff is familiar with their performance related to this program.

Air District staff evaluated the new proposals using five criteria set forth in the RFP. The criteria were:

1. **Price** (50 points maximum). Points awarded based on the overhead price.
2. **Available Resources/Customer Relations** (20 points maximum). Points awarded based on responsiveness to queries and requests, and the estimated number of days it would take for the contractor to purchase a vehicle.
3. **Coverage/Availability** (15 points maximum). Points awarded based on the number and geographical distribution of scrapping sites, number of buy back days per month, and convenience of daily schedules.
4. **Advertising** (5 points maximum). Points awarded according to the advertising budget and description of the proposed campaign to target potential sellers of eligible vehicles.
5. **Understanding of the Program and Thoroughness of the Proposal** (10 points maximum). Points awarded based on the extent to which a proposal demonstrates an understanding of the VBB Program and responds thoroughly to the RFP.

The results of the staff evaluation of the proposals are summarized below.

Price Evaluation. The overhead bid prices per vehicle for each proposal are presented in Table 1 below. Because proposals in recent years have included steadily increasing general overhead and advertising costs, the RFP specifically outlined expected costs for those items. Two of the three proposals included the expected level of \$200 for general overhead costs and all three included the expected \$20 for advertising overhead costs. The third proposal from EES had a higher general overhead rate of \$220 per vehicle. The reason for this higher rate appears to be related to the fact that EES manages ten independent dismantling yards. The other bidders operate their own dismantling yards.

**Table 1
Overhead Bid Prices**

Funding Levels	Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc.	Pick-N-Pull	Pick Your Part
Price paid per vehicle	\$650	\$650	\$650
Cost for General Overhead	\$220	\$200	\$200
Cost for Advertising Overhead	\$20	\$20	\$20
Total Cost per vehicle	\$890	\$870	\$870

Available Resources/Customer Relations Evaluation. All three proposals scored well under this category. This category includes number of staff answering calls, hours of telephone availability, and ability to process the necessary paperwork to determine vehicle eligibility. All proposals indicate that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) registration history would be reviewed in advance of the vehicle buy back date to establish if a vehicle meets the requirements of the VBB Program. All proposing companies have the capability of processing the vehicle in one day, but typically would process the vehicle purchase in three days.

Coverage/Availability Evaluation. EES scored highest in this category because their coverage has increased to a total of ten yards in the Bay Area. The ten EES vehicle buy back locations are located in Hayward, the city of Napa, Newark, Pittsburg, Richmond, San Francisco, San Jose, and Santa Rosa, San Ramon, and Pinole. Pick-N-Pull has six vehicle buy back sites, located in Fairfield, Newark, Oakland, Richmond, San Jose, and Windsor. Pick Your Part has a total of three buy back sites located in Milpitas, Hayward, and San Francisco.

Advertising Evaluation. Pick Your Part and EES proposals scored higher under this criterion for their use of diverse methods of advertising, while Pick-N-Pull only uses one method: print advertising. As noted above, the FY 2005/06 RFP specifically outlined expected advertising overhead costs of \$20 per vehicle. All of the proposals submitted the same advertising overhead cost.

Understanding of the Program and Thoroughness of the Proposal Evaluation. All three firms that submitted proposals have a good understanding of the program, as evidenced in their proposals and by past experience with the VBB Program.

The scoring and total points for each of the RFP’s criteria is contained in Table 2 below. Based on the point scores in Table 2, staff recommends that the District select Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc., Pick-N-Pull, and Pick Your Part as vehicle scrapping contractors for FY 2005/06 and that the \$7 million in FY 2005/06 funding allocated to the scrapping of vehicles under the VBB Program be distributed on a monthly reimbursement basis to all three contractors until all the funds have been expended.

**Table 2
Points for Each Criterion**

Criteria	Environmental Engineering Studies, Inc.	Pick -N- Pull	Pick Your Part
Price (50 points)	48	49	49
Available Resources/Customer Relations (20 points)	18	18	18
Coverage/Availability (15 points)	14	11	8
Advertising (5 points)	4	3	4
Understands program/ thoroughness of proposal (10 points)	8	8	8
Total Points for All Criteria	92	89	87

BUDGET CONSIDERATION / FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Funds to implement the FY 2005/06 VBB Program are included in Program 612 of the Air District's approved FY 2005/06 budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Hilken
Planning and Research Director

FORWARDED: _____

Prepared by: Vanessa Mongeon
Reviewed by: Juan Ortellado

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Inter-office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and
Members of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research

Date: September 6, 2005

Re: Selection of Contractor for Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA)
Performance Review

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend Board of Directors approval of:

- 1) the selection of ICF Consulting as the contractor to conduct performance reviews of selected TFCA projects; and
- 2) the authorization for the Executive Officer/APCO to execute a contract with the selected contractor for an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the provision of the performance review services.

BACKGROUND

The Air District is authorized under the California Health and Safety Code Sections 44220, 44223 and 44225 to collect a surcharge on the State-imposed motor vehicle registration fee. The revenues from the surcharge are distributed to public agencies through the Transportation Fund for Clean Air for the execution of specified projects and programs to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 44241. These funds provide incentives to implement mobile source and transportation measures required by the California Clean Air Act of 1988 to be included in Bay Area strategies to achieve State air quality standards.

In response to a directive received from the Committee, staff issued a request for statement of qualifications (RFQ) for a contractor to conduct performance reviews of TFCA-funded projects. The proposed performance reviews will evaluate the cost effectiveness of four different TFCA project categories. Two of these categories, arterial management projects and smart growth projects, are being evaluated as directed by the Committee. Staff is also recommending the evaluation of ridesharing programs and bicycle projects. The proposed performance reviews will evaluate approximately 80 of the 655 TFCA projects in the four previously mentioned categories, which have been completed since the inception of the program. The goal is to gather data to better assess emission reductions and cost effectiveness of selected categories of projects. If approved by the Board, the selected contractor will begin work in October 2005, with the final report being completed by July 2006. A summary of staff's evaluation of proposals is presented below.

DISCUSSION

Request for Statement of Qualifications

On May 18, 2005, the Air District issued a RFQ seeking a contractor to conduct a performance review of TFCA-funded projects. The scope of work contained in the RFQ follows:

1. Analyze a statistically significant number of completed TFCA-funded projects to determine the emission reductions achieved by these projects. Project types to be evaluated include the following:
 - a. ridesharing programs, including local programs, and regional programs,
 - b. arterial traffic management projects, including signal timing projects, incident management projects, and transit signal priority projects,
 - c. bicycle projects, including Class I bicycle paths, Class II bicycle lanes, Class III bicycle routes, bicycle lockers, bicycle racks, and attended bicycle stations, and
 - d. smart growth projects, including traffic calming projects, and pedestrian projects.
2. Evaluate the information typically collected by the Air District in the initial analysis of the TFCA application process and at completion of projects and recommend any changes necessary to improve the emission reduction evaluation of projects.
3. Conduct a literature search to report on the range of emission reductions achieved by the project types listed in item 2 above.

The RFQ was mailed to 137 firms. The RFQ was also posted on the Air District’s website. Proposals were due at the Air District by June 20, 2005. The procedures used for the RFQ comply with the Air District’s Administrative Code Division II, Section 4.6, and with applicable portions of the California Public Contract Code Section 1100, et seq.

The Air District received four proposals in response to the RFQ by the June 20, 2005, 4:00 PM deadline. The proposals were submitted by:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Office Location</u>
Design, Community & Environment	Berkeley, CA
ETF Associates	Laguna Niguel, CA
ICF Consulting	San Francisco, CA
Transit Resource Center	Grass Valley, CA

Evaluation of Proposals

The RFQ set forth four criteria to be used in evaluating the qualifications. Air District staff evaluated the submitted qualifications using these criteria and contacted references provided by the applicants. Scores were then assigned for each criterion. The table below shows the evaluation criteria and each firm’s score for each criterion.

Scoring of Proposals

CRITERIA	MAX. PTS.	Design, Community & Environment	ETF Associates	ICF Consulting	Transit Resource Center
1. Experience with evaluating emission reductions from TCM projects	40	23	8	37	10
2. Demonstrated knowledge, ability, qualifications, and time commitment of the personnel assigned to the project	25	18	5	21	10
3. Ability to provide high-quality products within budget and on time, verified by list of references	25	20	15	21	10
4. Direct cost rates/personnel billing rates	10	7	7	9	9
Total	100	68	35	88	39

ICF Consulting received a total score of 88 points, the highest overall score, followed by Design, Community & Environment with a score of 68 points, Transit Resource Center with 39 points, and ETF Associates with 35 points. ICF was ranked as having the best experience in evaluating emission reductions from TCM projects, with direct experience carrying out the scope of work outlined in the RFQ. Qualifications received from the remaining three submittals did not demonstrate adequate direct experience in carrying out the scope of work outlined in the RFQ.

ICF also scored the highest points for demonstrated knowledge, ability, qualifications and time commitment. The statement of qualifications submitted by ICF specifically discussed in detail the approach that would be taken in completing each of the tasks in the RFQ. ICF staff’s qualifications were also commensurate with the work described in the RFQ. The statements of qualifications received from the other three firms were not as strong with respect to this criterion as that submitted by ICF.

All firms submitting a statement of qualifications were highly recommended by their references for providing high-quality products within budget and on time. Firms that provided references for work conducted directly related to the work contained in the RFQ received higher scores. Direct cost rates and personnel billing rates did not show much variation between the firms and those with slightly lower rates received slightly higher scores. The budget estimate provided by ICF contained fixed costs of \$48,610 (e.g., development of work plan and schedule, literature review, protocol for evaluations and report preparation), leaving up to approximately \$150,000 in variable costs for individual TFCA project reviews, which range from \$1,590 to \$3,000 per project.

BUDGET CONSIDERATION/FINANCIAL IMPACT

The performance review cost, funded by TFCA, is included in the Air District's FY 2005/06 budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research

FORWARDED: _____

Prepared by: J. Steinberger
Reviewed by: J. Ortellado

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Inter-office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and
Members of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research

Date: September 6, 2005

Re: Presentation on Plug-in Hybrid Motor Vehicles

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Receive and file.

BACKGROUND

Hybrid vehicles use a combination of internal combustion engines, electric motors and batteries for traction power. The use of batteries and electric motors allows some, but not all, hybrids to travel in an all-electric, or zero-emission, mode for short distances. The on-board engines recharge the batteries. A growing number of researchers, public interest groups, and at least one automobile manufacturer are actively investigating the feasibility of recharging hybrids by “plugging” into the electrical grid, as well as increasing on-board electrical storage by adding additional batteries. A vehicle that recharges from the electrical grid will produce less overall emissions. An increase in the all-electric mode also reduces petroleum use and greenhouse gases.

District Board members have requested additional information on plug-in hybrids. Also, local governments have expressed interest in potentially converting existing hybrids into “plug-in” hybrids, or in joining research and development efforts to develop plug-in hybrid school buses, trucks and passenger vehicles. The increased interest in plug-in hybrids may result in requests to the Air District for funding to offset conversion or research costs.

To provide a better understanding of plug-in hybrids, staff from the California Air Resources Board will present an overview which will cover, in part:

- Recent and proposed research and technology demonstrations;
- Current plans of automobile manufacturers to produce plug-in hybrids;
- The relative advantages and disadvantages of plug-in hybrids relative to conventional and alternative fuel vehicles, including hydrogen fuel cells; and
- How plug-in hybrids fit into the current ZEV regulations and might influence future rule-making.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research

FORWARDED: _____

Prepared by: Michael Murphy

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Inter-office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and
Members of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Teresa Galvin Lee
Director of Public Information and Outreach

Date: September 6, 2005

Re: Great Race for Clean Air

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Informational.

BACKGROUND

The *Great Race for Clean Air* is a project of the Air District's Tri-Valley Resource Team. This two-part event is designed to promote transit alternatives, including rail, bus, ridesharing, biking and walking. The Great Race will culminate in an October 6, 2005 "Race Day". Six teams of elected officials and community activists will compete in a race while highlighting local accomplishments in clean air and alternative transportation. Several Board members have volunteered to lead a team in the October 6th event.

DISCUSSION

The *Great Race for Clean Air* has several objectives:

- To attract new riders to commute alternatives;
- To highlight the contributions that the Air District's Resource Teams make in improving air quality through programs and activities; and
- To commemorate the Air District's 50th anniversary and the environmental progress that the Bay Area has made over the past 50 years.

The *Great Race for Clean Air* has two components. The "Race Day" event involves four resource teams and is scheduled for October 6, 2005. The teams will complete transportation-related tasks--such as a bicycle safety quiz and a 511 trip planning exercise--at two pre-designated "pit-stops" and receive a puzzle piece. For example, the San Francisco team members will begin at the Presidio, bike to the Air District for their first pit stop and go on to 4th and Townsend before heading to the East Bay. The Santa Clara team will begin at Yahoo at Sunnyvale, then stop at Gunn High School in Palo Alto (to highlight Gunn's innovative high school commute program) and then proceed to the City of Sunnyvale. They will then carpool to Pleasanton and meet the other teams for the finale.

The puzzle pieces obtained at the pit-stops will be put together at the Pleasanton Commuter Choice Transportation Fair at the CarrAmerica Corporate Center at the end of the race, creating an air quality message. A grand prize will be awarded to the team that

AGENDA: 7

ranks highest based on scoring criteria including creativity of travel and the distance covered in the least amount of time. For example, a team bicycling, then riding a bus, train and/or ferry would score higher than a team that rides BART and rideshares to the finish line.

The second component of the *Great Race for Clean Air* is *4 Modes in 4 Weeks* which is a public challenge during the month of September. The *4 Modes in 4 Weeks* component is open to all Bay Area residents 16 years and older. Competitors are required to document, by photos, their use of four modes of alternative transportation during the month. The four images and entry form must be emailed or mailed to the Air District by October 5, 2005. The entry forms will be collected and the winner selected by a random drawing by the winning Resource Team on the day of the Great Race. The winner of the *4 Modes for 4 Weeks* contest need not be present to win. Residents are urged to visit www.sparetheair.org for contest rules, more race information and an entry form.

The outreach for the *4 Modes in 4 Weeks* includes a press release, bus ads, communications to the Spare the Air Employer network, materials distributed at community events, radio public service announcements, partnering with transit operators and developing a web presence at www.sparetheair.org.

The *Great Race for Clean Air* and *4 Modes in 4 Weeks* is an opportunity to highlight alternative modes of transportation and to carry the clean air message into October when the Spare the Air season is coming to a close. Participation by members of the Board is welcome and encouraged.

BUDGET CONSIDERATION/FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. Funding for this program has been allocated in the fiscal 2005-2006 budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Galvin Lee
Director of Public Information and Outreach

FORWARDED: _____

Prepared by: Teresa Galvin Lee
Reviewed by: Jean Roggenkamp