



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

OCTOBER 24, 2005
Immediately Following
Public Outreach Committee Meeting

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 AND SEPTEMBER 13, 2005**
- 4. TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) REGIONAL FUND GRANT AWARDS FOR FY 2005/06**

H. Hilken/4642

hhilken@baaqmd.gov

The Committee will consider recommending Board of Directors approval of FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Fund grant awards.

- 5. AB 1390 METHODOLOGY FOR CARL MOYER PROGRAM**

H. Hilken/4642

hhilken@baaqmd.gov

Staff will provide the Committee with an overview of the methodology to be used during the upcoming Carl Moyer Program funding cycle to comply with the requirements of AB1390 (Lowenthal).

- 6. 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).

7. **TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, November 9, 2005, 939 ELLIS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA**
8. **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

Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and Members
of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: October 7, 2005

Re: Mobile Source Committee Draft Minutes

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve attached draft minutes of the Mobile Source Committee meetings of July 14, 2005 and September 13, 2005.

DISCUSSION

Attached for your review and approval are the draft minutes of the July 14, 2005 and September 13, 2005, Mobile Source Committee meetings.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

**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
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., Tuesday, September 13, 2005

1. Call to Order – Roll Call: Director Pam Torliatt called the meeting to order at 9:50 a.m.

Present: Scott Haggerty, Chairperson (9:54 a.m.); Patrick Kwok, Pamela Torliatt, Marland Townsend.

Absent: Jerry Hill, Jake McGoldrick, Nate Miley, John Silva, Tim Smith, Shelia Young.

2. Public Comment Period: Sam Altshuler, P.E., PG&E, offered to provide a presentation comparing the cost of diesel versus natural gas fuel. Director Torliatt requested that this issue be placed on the agenda for a future Mobile Source Committee meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes of July 14, 2005: Due to a lack of a quorum, this item was deferred.

Director Torliatt directed that item No. 6 be taken out of order.

6. Presentation on Plug-in Hybrid Motor Vehicles: *California Air Resources Board staff provided the Committee with an overview of plug-in hybrid motor vehicles.*

Chairperson Haggerty arrived at 9:54 a.m.

Craig Childers, Zero-Emission Vehicle Section, CARB, provided his presentation entitled “Plug In Hybrids (PHEVs)” which addressed PHEV economic viability, mileage and emissions in urban useage; fuel versatility; hydrogen and electric fueling infrastructure and home refueling. He reviewed the findings of the 2001 Electric Power Research Institute Phase I PHEV Study, which concluded that PHEVs are increasingly marketable. He noted that incentives for automakers to manufacture PHEVs can be developed through changing consumer behavior and getting past the transition from low to mass production. After reviewing California’s ZEV regulations and current PHEV research activity, he concluded that both hydrogen and electric fuels will increasingly enable ZEVs with renewable and domestic produced fuels, and fast refuelability and greater range.

Chairperson Haggerty called for public comment, and the following individual spoke:

Felix Kramer
California Car Initiative
Palo Alto, California

Committee Action: None taken. This item is for information only.

- 4. Vehicle Buy Back Program Vehicle Scrapping Contractor Selection:** *The Committee considered recommending Board of Director approval of the selection of and contracts with Vehicle Buy Back Vehicle Scrapping Contractors.*

Committee Action: Due to the lack of a quorum, Chairperson Haggerty directed that this item be forwarded, without a Committee recommendation, to the full Board for consideration.

- 5. Selection of Contractor for Transportation Fund for Clean Air Performance Review:** *The Committee considered 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.*

Committee Action: Due to the lack of a quorum, Chairperson Haggerty directed that this item be forwarded, without a Committee recommendation, to the full Board for consideration.

- 7. Report on the “Great Race for Clean Air”:** *Staff reported on the upcoming Great Race for Clean Air scheduled for October 6, 2005.*

Teresa Lee, Director of Public Information & Outreach, stated that the District’s Tri-Valley Resource Team is sponsoring “The Great Race for Clean Air.” The first part of this two-part event will take place on October 6. Teams of elected officials, community activists and Spare the Air Resource Team members will participate in a race that aims to promote transit alternatives (bus, rail, ride-sharing, biking and walking). The second part is called “4 Modes in 4 weeks” and encourages the public to take photos documenting their taking four different modes of transit in four weeks.

Committee Action: None taken. This item is for information only.

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

- 9. Time and Place of Next Meeting:** 9:30 a.m., October 13, 2005, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109. Chairperson Haggerty also requested that the Mobile Source Committee be polled to see if the November meeting could be moved to the 9th instead of the 10th.

- 10. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 10:49 a.m.

James N. Corazza
Deputy Clerk of the Boards

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and Members
of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: October 17, 2005

Re: Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Regional Fund Grant Awards for
FY 2005/06

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Consider recommending Board of Director approval of staff recommendations for FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Fund grant awards listed on Attachment 1, totaling \$12.4 million.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Sections 44241 and 44242, the Air District has imposed a \$4 per vehicle annual surcharge on all motor vehicles registered within the boundaries of the Air District^a. This is the funding source for the Air District's program known as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA). TFCA revenues are awarded to public agencies to implement eligible projects that reduce motor vehicle emissions and support the implementation of selected transportation and mobile source control measures in the Air District's strategies to achieve state and national air quality standards.

By law, 60% of TFCA revenues are allocated by the Air District through a grant program known as the TFCA Regional Fund. A portion of the TFCA Regional Fund is earmarked for eligible programs implemented directly by the Air District, including the Smoking Vehicle Program, Vehicle Buy Back Program, Vehicle Incentive Program, and Spare the Air Program. The balance is allocated on a competitive basis to eligible projects proposed by public agencies.

The Air District received 74 grant applications totaling \$22.4 million in funding requests for the FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Fund; \$12.4 million is available for allocation. Three applications were found to be ineligible because they did not meet program policies and two project sponsors withdrew their applications. Staff is recommending awarding grants totaling \$12.4 million to 52 of the 69 eligible projects. The recommended projects are listed on Attachment 1.

DISCUSSION

^a Revenues from an additional \$2 surcharge in motor vehicle registrations, authorized by Assembly Bill 923, are not part of TFCA. These revenues will be used to implement the Air District's Mobile Source Incentive Fund (MSIF), which will provide incentives for the implementation of additional mobile source projects.

Below is a discussion of the TFCA Regional Fund process.

TFCA REGIONAL FUND SCHEDULE

The milestone dates of the grant application and review process are outlined below:

Action	Date
Issue Application Guidance	April 14, 2005
Application Workshop	May 17, 2005
Application Submittal Deadline	June 30, 2005
Evaluate Applications	July 1- September 23, 2005

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Board-adopted criteria to score and rank proposals for FY 2005/06 are shown in Table 1. The evaluation criteria emphasize cost effectiveness in reducing emissions by allotting 60% of the total possible points to this criterion. Cost effectiveness is calculated by dividing the total TFCA funds proposed for the project by the estimated lifetime emission reductions for the project, yielding TFCA funds per ton of reduced emissions. The Board-approved cost effectiveness threshold is \$90,000/ton of reduced emissions.

Table 1 - FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Fund Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Points
1. TFCA Cost Effectiveness	60
2. Other Project Attributes	15
3. Clean Air Policies and Programs-	10
4. Disadvantaged Community	10
5. Promote Alternative Transportation Modes	5
Total	100

The Board has established a 40-point minimum score for projects to be eligible to receive TFCA Regional Funds. The intent of this policy is to assure that TFCA funding is provided only to projects that achieve an acceptable level of cost effectiveness and benefit to the region.

RETURNED AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The Board has adopted policies to govern the TFCA program. Staff reviewed the applications to determine eligibility, based on compliance with all relevant policies. Table 2 provides a listing of grant applications that were not evaluated because the applications were not eligible for funding based on one or more of the Board-adopted policies.

Additionally, the City of Martinez withdrew an application for an arterial management project because, after submitting the application, its staff realized that the project was not eligible under current TFCA policies. The City of Alameda also withdrew an application for a signal timing project due to a change in the project scope, which made it not ready to be implemented during this funding cycle.

Table 2: Returned Applications – Not Eligible

Sponsor	Project	Reason
City of Petaluma	Guaranteed Ride Home Program	Did not comply with TFCA Policy # 9 re: minimum grant amount
City of Petaluma	Vanpool Subsidy	Did not comply with TFCA Policy # 9 re: minimum grant amount
City of Petaluma	Transit Kiosk	Did not comply with TFCA Policy # 9 re: minimum grant amount

AVAILABLE FUNDS

TFCA Regional Funds totaling approximately \$12.4 million are available for allocation in FY 2005/06. The available funds consist of anticipated receipts from motor vehicles registered in the Air District during calendar year 2005, interest on TFCA Regional Funds, and unexpended funds from previously funded projects. Table 3 provides a summary of the total TFCA Regional Funds currently available.

Table 3: FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Funds

Source/Program	Amount	Comment
1. Projected CY 2005 DMV Receipts	\$22,292,670	Based on CY 2004 actual receipts
2. FY 2005/06 District Admin. Cost	\$1,085,646	Per adopted Air District FY 2005/2006 budget
3. FY 2005/06 County Program Manager Funds	\$8,482,810	40% of (Line 1 minus Line 2)
4. New FY 2005/06 Funds Available for Regional Fund	\$12,724,214	Line 1 minus Line 2 minus Line 3
5. Projected CY 2005 Regional Fund Interest	\$1,262,025	Based on CY 2004 actual Regional Fund interest
6. Total Available New Funds for Regional Fund	\$13,986,239	Line 4 plus Line 5
7. Returned Funds	\$4,868,662	Canceled projects, projects completed under budget, projects with reduced funding needs due to reduction in scope
8. Clean Air in Motion Program Funds	\$3,920,689	Alameda County and Santa Clara County Program Manager Funds to MTC to fund the Vehicle Buy Back Program in exchange for CMAQ funds ^b
9. Total Available Regional Funds	\$22,775,590	Line 6 plus Line 7 plus Line 8
10. FY 2005/06 Board-Approved District Projects	\$10,339,521	Smoking Vehicle Program \$832,150 Vehicle Buy Back \$7,359,121 Spare The Air \$899,437 VIP Incentives \$500,000 Air District Overhead Costs \$748,813
11. Total Available for FY 2005/06 Regional Fund Grant Awards	\$12,436,069	Line 9 minus Line 10
12. Regional Fund Grant Awards	\$12,435,361	52 Regional Fund Projects

PROJECT FUNDING

Attachment 1 lists the final project scores and ranking for the project applications that are recommended for funding. There were 56 projects, totaling \$14.8 million in funding requested, that achieved the minimum 40-point score and met the \$90,000 per ton cost-effectiveness level. The available \$12.4 million in TFCA Regional Funds is not sufficient to fund all 56 projects, which include four demonstration projects (05R29, 05R42, 05R46 and 05R72). Staff recommends that these four demonstration projects, totaling \$2.4 million, not be funded at this time. Although the Air District funded demonstration projects previously,

^b The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), through its Clean Air in Motion Program, committed CMAQ funds to augment the Air District's Vehicle Buy Back (VBB) Program. However, the Federal Highway Administration has indicated that vehicle buy back programs are not eligible for CMAQ funding. MTC worked with the Air District and these two TFCA Program Managers to exchange funding so that the Air District can use the Program Manager funds to augment the VBB Program, and the Program Managers get CMAQ funding from MTC to implement CMAQ-eligible projects locally.

staff recommends not funding them in this funding cycle because the Regional Fund is oversubscribed and the remaining 52 projects have proven emissions reduction capability as opposed to these demonstration projects.

Included in the list of 52 projects recommended for approval are two (05R35 and 05R36) that staff recommends be awarded grants on a conditional basis. Project sponsors that are awarded TFCA grants with a conditional status must provide specific documentation to the Air District before December 31, 2005 to secure TFCA Regional Fund grants. If project sponsors are unable to provide this documentation, the grants will automatically be rescinded. The sponsors of projects 05R35 and 05R36 must provide proper documentation that confirms the California Air Resources Board certification of the retrofit devices proposed to be used for the implementation of the projects.

Attachment 2 lists the project applications that are not recommended for funding.

GRANT SUMMARY

Table 4 shows the funding by project type for the projects not administered by the Air District that are recommended to receive TFCA Regional Fund grant awards.

**Table 4: FY 2005/06 TFCA Regional Fund Applications
Recommended for Funding by Project Type**

Project Type	No. of Projects	TFCA \$	% of Total TFCA Regional Fund \$
Low-Emission Heavy-Duty Vehicles	1	\$400,000	3.2%
Repower – Natural Gas	4	\$1,353,300	10.9%
Shuttle Programs	8	\$2,345,177	18.9%
Smart Growth Projects	4	\$1,008,248	8.1%
Bicycle Projects	15	\$1,327,910	10.7%
Arterial Management Projects	2	\$121,000	1.0%
Ridesharing Projects	5	\$1,299,816	10.4%
Reducing Existing Diesel Emissions	10	\$3,081,070	24.8%
Shuttle Buses – Natural Gas	2	\$1,486,340	11.9%
Clean Fuel School Buses	1	\$12,500	0.1%
Totals	52	\$12,435,361	100%

EMISSION REDUCTIONS

The 52 projects recommended for funding will result in emission reductions of 351 tons of ozone precursors and particulate matter, and 48,541 tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) over the life of the projects. The resulting overall cost effectiveness for these projects is \$30,592/ton^c.

BUDGET CONSIDERATION/FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Prepared by: J. Ortellado
Reviewed by: H. Hilken

^c TFCA dollars per ton of emissions reduction (ozone precursors and weighted particulate matter). The cost effectiveness calculations used for project evaluation includes a weighted factor of 10 for the reduction of particulate matter emissions.

ATTACHMENT 1
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Project Scores and Ranking - Projects Recommended for Funding

Proj#	Cnty (1)	Sponsor	Project Description	Yrs Eff	TFCA\$ Per Ton (2)	TFCA\$ Awarded	Cumulative \$Total	CRITERIA POINT SCORES					TOTAL SCORE
								TFCA Funding Eff.	Other Attrib.	Local Clean Air Plng.	Dis. Comm.	Promote Alt. Modes	
05R17	CC	West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee	Bicycle cage parking facilities, lockers and racks at transit centers, schools, employment sites and businesses: Richmond BART station, Richmond Parkway Transit Center, Park & Ride lots in El Cerrito, and 7 schools in west Contra Costa.	10	\$25,840	\$147,500	\$147,500	57	6	8	7	5	83
05R23	MAR	City of San Rafael	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane (12 miles) and Class-3 bicycle route (12 miles).	15	\$11,194	\$150,000	\$297,500	60	10	5	3	5	83
05R09	SC	City of Sunnyvale	Construct Class-2 bicycle lanes on Evelyn Avenue between Sunnyvale Avenue and Reed Avenue (1.7 miles).	15	\$37,920	\$35,900	\$333,400	51	12	10	0	5	78
05R11	ALA	Oakland Unified School District	Purchase and install a 50-bicycle cage parking facility for Roosevelt Middle School to complement the active bicycle education program at the school and serve a disadvantaged community.	10	\$48,764	\$20,000	\$353,400	45	12	4	10	5	76
05R74	SC	City of Gilroy	Implement streetscaping improvements, including bulb-outs, widened sidewalks, enhanced bus stops, and bicycle and pedestrian amenities, along Monterey Street, between Sixth and Eight Streets, to create a pedestrian-friendly downtown environment to promote transit, walking and bicycle trips in Gilroy.	20	\$45,916	\$405,000	\$758,400	47	12	5	7	5	76
05R65	REG	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Implement the Regional Rideshare Program, which provides coordinated carpool, vanpool formation assistance and information on transportation alternatives, such as Bike to Work Day, Rideshare Thursdays and Spare the Air, in an effort to reduce the number of individuals driving alone in the nine-county Bay Area.	1	\$28,189	\$1,000,000	\$1,758,400	55	6	10	0	5	76
05R13	CC	County of Contra Costa	Purchase and install 24 electronic lockers that are rented on-demand at the Pleasant Hill BART station, the site of a PATH pilot project involving shared bicycles, electric bicycles and Segway Human Transporter.	10	\$21,697	\$20,400	\$1,778,800	59	6	5	0	5	75
05R25	SF	County of San Francisco	Reduce vehicular lanes from 4 to 3 and construct Class-2 bicycle lane and pedestrian improvements on Broadway Street between Fillmore Street and Franklin Street (0.5 miles).	15	\$30,299	\$25,300	\$1,804,100	54	6	10	0	5	75
05R45	SF	San Francisco MUNI	Retrofit 12 MUNI diesel transit vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission control devices.	5	\$11,133	\$135,000	\$1,939,100	60	0	10	5	0	75
05R44	SF	San Francisco MUNI	Retrofit 45 MUNI diesel transit vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission control devices.	5	\$11,133	\$506,250	\$2,445,350	60	0	10	5	0	75

(1) REG = regional or multi-county.

(2) TFCA\$ divided by estimated lifetime emission reductions (ozone precursors and weighted PM). N/A to infrastructure to support fuel cell vehicles. May include TFCA County Program Manager funds.

ATTACHMENT 1
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Project Scores and Ranking - Projects Recommended for Funding

Proj#	Cnty (1)	Sponsor	Project Description	Yrs Eff	TFCA\$ Per Ton (2)	TFCA\$ Awarded	Cumulative \$Total	CRITERIA POINT SCORES					TOTAL SCORE
								TFCA Funding Eff.	Other Attrib.	Local Clean Air Png.	Dis. Comm.	Promote Alt. Modes	
05R12	SOL	City of Benicia	Purchase and install bicycle lockers at City Hall and bicycle lockers and racks at City Park, City Hall, City Library, Police Department, Corporation Yard, High School, Middle School, and the I-780 Park & Ride Lot, and Industrial Way at I-680 (a future Park & Ride Lot) (total of lockers for 10 bicycles and racks for 50 bicycles).	10	\$21,741	\$10,000	\$2,455,350	59	4	5	0	5	73
05R10	ALA	University of California, Berkeley	Purchase and install 245 new bicycle racks in 5 areas of central campus and adjacent to central campus: Arts Quad, Greek Theatre, Memorial Stadium, University Art Museum, and Pimentel Hall.	10	\$29,036	\$47,750	\$2,503,100	55	3	10	0	5	73
05R30	SOL	Vallejo City Unified School District	Replace 1 Vallejo City Unified School District 1988 diesel bus with a compressed natural gas bus.	20	\$27,495	\$12,500	\$2,515,600	56	9	2	2	3	72
05R18	SM	City of Daly City	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane between John Muir Drive and John Daly Boulevard (0.45 miles).	15	\$52,617	\$60,000	\$2,575,600	43	12	5	7	5	72
05R39	SC	City of San Jose	Retrofit 46 heavy-duty diesel solid waste collection vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission reduction devices.	5	\$11,991	\$483,000	\$3,058,600	60	0	8	3	0	71
05R49	SON	West County Transportation Agency	Repower 12 heavy-duty diesel school buses with cleaner diesel engines.	10	\$5,045	\$258,000	\$3,316,600	60	3	3	4	0	70
05R16	ALA	City of Oakland	Construct Class-1 bicycle path (west-side) and Class-2 bicycle lane (east-side) on Lakeshore Avenue, from El Embarcadero to East 18th Street (1 mile), and provide pedestrian improvements: new signalization, stop signs, bulb-outs and lane reduction.	20	\$56,768	\$350,000	\$3,666,600	41	11	10	4	4	70
05R47	ALA	City of San Ramon	Replace 18 heavy-duty diesel solid waste collection vehicles and 2 heavy-duty diesel street sweepers with compressed natural gas vehicles.	10	\$26,714	\$899,300	\$4,565,900	56	3	10	0	0	69
05R26	SF	County of San Francisco	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane between Lyell Street and Bayshore Boulevard (1.2 miles).	15	\$73,199	\$129,500	\$4,695,400	33	13	10	7	5	68
05R32	SF	County of San Francisco	Retrofit 13 municipal solid waste collection vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission control devices.	5	\$22,848	\$136,500	\$4,831,900	58	0	10	0	0	68
05R31	SF	County of San Francisco	Retrofit 28 municipal solid waste collection vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission control devices.	5	\$23,064	\$294,000	\$5,125,900	58	0	10	0	0	68
05R35	CC	County of Contra Costa	Retrofit 21 heavy-duty diesel trucks used to maintain and clean County's streets with PM only Level 3 emission control devices (not yet certified by ARB) .	5	\$51,046	\$262,500	\$5,388,400	60	0	5	0	0	65

(1) REG = regional or multi-county.

(2) TFCA\$ divided by estimated lifetime emission reductions (ozone precursors and weighted PM). N/A to infrastructure to support fuel cell vehicles. May include TFCA County Program Manager funds.

ATTACHMENT 1
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Project Scores and Ranking - Projects Recommended for Funding

Proj#	Cnty (1)	Sponsor	Project Description	Yrs Eff	TFCA\$ Per Ton (2)	TFCA\$ Awarded	Cumulative \$Total	CRITERIA POINT SCORES					TOTAL SCORE
								TFCA Funding Eff.	Other Attrib.	Local Clean Air Plng.	Dis. Comm.	Promote Alt. Modes	
05R19	SM	City of Daly City	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane between Lake Merced Boulevard and Westmoor Avenue (1.5 miles).	15	\$62,307	\$50,000	\$5,438,400	38	6	5	10	5	64
05R24	SF	County of San Francisco	Develop and implement a web-based point-to-point bicycle route planning tool for San Francisco.	10	\$74,560	\$200,000	\$5,638,400	32	15	10	1	5	63
05R60	ALA	City of San Leandro	Operation of a peak-period weekday compressed natural gas shuttle to/from the San Leandro BART station to major employment sites in the central and western areas of San Leandro	1	\$55,149	\$63,000	\$5,701,400	42	10	5	0	3	60
05R48	SC	City of Palo Alto	Replace 2 heavy-duty diesel street sweepers with compressed natural gas vehicles.	10	\$47,573	\$136,000	\$5,837,400	46	6	8	0	0	60
05R36	SC	City of San Jose	Retrofit 18 City-owned heavy-duty diesel vehicles, used by the Transportation Department, with PM only Level 3 (not yet certified by ARB) emission control devices.	5	\$34,092	\$206,550	\$6,043,950	52	0	6	0	0	58
05R41	SF	San Francisco International Airport	Replace 12 diesel shuttle vehicles for parking and hotel courtesy shuttles with compressed natural gas vehicles.	5	\$55,526	\$326,340	\$6,370,290	42	6	10	0	0	58
05R37	SM	City of South San Francisco	Retrofit 8 heavy-duty diesel solid waste collection vehicles with PM/NOx Level 3 emission reduction devices.	5	\$28,924	\$88,200	\$6,458,490	55	0	2	0	0	57
05R43	ALA	City of Alameda	Replace 5 heavy-duty diesel utility vehicles with compressed natural gas vehicles.	5	\$57,975	\$400,000	\$6,858,490	41	6	10	0	0	57
05R55	SM	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	Operation of 27 peak-period shuttles to/from various Caltrain stations and employment sites on the Peninsula, using 4 compressed natural gas vehicles, 9 gasoline vehicles, and 22 diesel vehicles with a ARB-certified PM filter.	1	\$77,541	\$1,000,000	\$7,858,490	31	8	10	3	5	57
05R56	SM	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	Operation of one 25-passenger gasoline shuttle bus route from the Tamien and San Jose Diridon Caltrain stations and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's light rail system, providing access to employment centers, special events and other destination points on the Peninsula.	1	\$73,251	\$26,442	\$7,884,932	33	8	10	0	5	56
05R76	SOL	City of Vallejo	Relocate 8 existing Vallejo Transit bus stops currently located in unsafe areas along major roadways to safer areas with improved walkways and passenger waiting facilities.	20	\$70,174	\$85,000	\$7,969,932	34	9	5	5	3	56
05R57	SM	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	Operation of two 25-passenger gasoline shuttle bus routes from the Broadway and Atherton Caltrain stations to the Millbrae and Redwood City Caltrain stations, providing access to employment centers, special events and other destination points on the Peninsula.	1	\$74,285	\$67,735	\$8,037,667	32	8	10	0	5	55

(1) REG = regional or multi-county.

(2) TFCA\$ divided by estimated lifetime emission reductions (ozone precursors and weighted PM). N/A to infrastructure to support fuel cell vehicles. May include TFCA County Program Manager funds.

ATTACHMENT 1
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Project Scores and Ranking - Projects Recommended for Funding

Proj#	Cnty (1)	Sponsor	Project Description	Yrs Eff	TFCA\$ Per Ton (2)	TFCA\$ Awarded	Cumulative \$Total	CRITERIA POINT SCORES					TOTAL SCORE
								TFCA Funding Eff.	Other Attrib.	Local Clean Air Plng.	Dis. Comm.	Promote Alt. Modes	
05R52	ALA	San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	Operation of 2 peak-period shuttle buses between the Pleasanton ACE train station in Downtown Pleasanton and the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station. The shuttle buses will serve employment sites located in the Bernal and Hacienda Business Parks.	1	\$51,631	\$44,000	\$8,081,667	44	3	4	0	3	54
05R33	SC	San Jose International Airport	Replace 20 diesel shuttle vehicles with compressed natural gas shuttle vehicles at San Jose International Airport.	7	\$47,625	\$1,160,000	\$9,241,667	46	3	5	0	0	54
05R54	SC	San Jose State University	Implement Transportation Solutions, a transportation demand management program which provides alternative commute incentives, such as the University Transit Pass program, and ridesharing information to students and employees of San Jose State University.	1	\$73,875	\$100,000	\$9,341,667	33	3	8	3	5	52
05R69	SF	Presidio Trust	Operation of four 26-passenger compressed natural gas shuttle bus routes for the Presidio employees, residents and visitors, from the Presidio to the Embarcadero BART station, Transbay Bus Terminal, and the San Francisco Ferry Building.	1	\$75,134	\$150,000	\$9,491,667	32	8	10	0	2	52
05R20	REG	BART	Purchase and install 80 electronic bicycle lockers that are rented on-demand at MacArthur, Ashby, West Oakland, Rockridge, and Lake Merritt BART stations.	10	\$77,076	\$241,560	\$9,733,227	31	8	8	0	5	52
05R40	REG	Caltrans District 4	Retrofit 53 heavy-duty diesel trucks with PM/NOx Level 3 emission reduction devices.	5	\$45,011	\$911,070	\$10,644,297	47	0	5	0	0	52
05R62	ALA	City of Berkeley	Market alternative transportation options to Berkeley residents, employees and students.	1	\$73,220	\$44,216	\$10,688,513	33	3	10	0	5	51
05R07	SF	County of San Francisco	Reduce vehicular lanes from 4 to 3, create wider curb lanes for transit buses, and relocate and extend existing bus zones on 25th Avenue between Fulton and Lake Streets.	20	\$82,106	\$80,000	\$10,768,513	28	10	10	0	3	51
05R63	ALA	City of Berkeley	Operation of one peak-period 24-passenger gasoline shuttle bus route from the Ashby BART station to the West Berkeley area employers during morning and afternoon weekday peak periods.	1	\$40,924	\$20,600	\$10,789,113	49	0	0	0	0	49
05R38	SOL	County of Solano	Retrofit 2 heavy-duty diesel dump trucks with PM/NOx Level 3 emission reduction devices and 2 heavy-duty diesel dump trucks with PM only Level 3 emission reduction devices.	5	\$49,640	\$58,000	\$10,847,113	45	0	4	0	0	49
05R61	ALA	Alameda County CMA	Door-to-door marketing of travel information options to households in Oakland (Fruitvale) and Alameda (Park Street/North Shore) neighborhoods.	1	\$78,540	\$135,000	\$10,982,113	30	3	5	5	5	48

(1) REG = regional or multi-county.

(2) TFCA\$ divided by estimated lifetime emission reductions (ozone precursors and weighted PM). N/A to infrastructure to support fuel cell vehicles. May include TFCA County Program Manager funds.

ATTACHMENT 1
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Project Scores and Ranking - Projects Recommended for Funding

Proj#	Cnty (1)	Sponsor	Project Description	Yrs Eff	TFCA\$ Per Ton (2)	TFCA\$ Awarded	Cumulative \$Total	CRITERIA POINT SCORES					TOTAL SCORE
								TFCA Funding Eff.	Other Attrib.	Local Clean Air Plng.	Dis. Comm.	Promote Alt. Modes	
05R53	ALA	San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	Operation of 2 peak-period shuttle buses between the Pleasanton ACE train station in Downtown Pleasanton and the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station. The buses will serve employment sites located in the Stoneridge Business Park/Stoneridge Mall area in west Pleasanton.	1	\$64,971	\$44,000	\$11,026,113	37	3	4	0	3	47
05R50	SC	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	Operation of 8 peak-period shuttle bus routes from the Great America ACE train station in Santa Clara to employment sites in Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, San Jose, and Milpitas.	1	\$76,029	\$950,000	\$11,976,113	31	3	10	0	3	47
05R34	ALA	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Repower 2 heavy-duty diesel trucks with compressed natural gas engines.	10	\$66,763	\$60,000	\$12,036,113	36	6	2	0	0	44
05R14	ALA	County of Alameda	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane (1.3 miles) on South Livermore Road and Tesla Road, connecting to existing 3-mile Class-2 bicycle lane.	15	\$88,699	\$165,000	\$12,201,113	25	9	5	0	5	44
05R75	SF	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District	Construct a bus-boarding island on Folsom Street at First Street in San Francisco to relocate a bus stop and close a gap in the South of Market service area.	20	\$86,168	\$36,000	\$12,237,113	26	10	5	0	2	43
05R22	SF	University of California, San Francisco	Purchase and install 2 bicycle storage facilities with electronic access to hold a total of 12 bicycles.	10	\$84,647	\$25,000	\$12,262,113	27	3	5	0	5	40
05R08	SF	Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority	Construct Class-2 bicycle lane on JFK Drive between Kezar and Crossover Drives (1.5 miles), install ADA compliant curb-cuts and improve pedestrian cross-walks at five heavily used pedestrian crossings of JFK Drive.	20	\$85,389	\$173,248	\$12,435,361	27	7	3	0	3	40

(1) REG = regional or multi-county.

(2) TFCA\$ divided by estimated lifetime emission reductions (ozone precursors and weighted PM). N/A to infrastructure to support fuel cell vehicles. May include TFCA County Program Manager funds.

ATTACHMENT 2
TFCA Regional Fund Applications - FY2005/06
Projects Not Recommended for Funding

Listed below, in alphabetical order by project sponsor, are those project applications that are not recommended for funding.

Proj#	Cnty	Sponsor	Project Description	TFCA\$ Requested
05R29	ALA	AC Transit	Hydrogen Hybrid Bus Demonstration	\$1,070,000
05R72	ALA	AC Transit	Hydrogen Electrolyzer Fueling Station	\$165,000
05R68	ALA	Alameda County CMA	NETBUS	\$243,016
05R70	ALA	Alameda County CMA	Transit Signal Priority - Grand/MacArthur, 35th to High St.	\$419,550
05R71	ALA	Alameda County CMA	East Bay Incident Management System	\$480,000
05R21	REG	BART	Attended Bicycle Parking at Berkeley, Fruitvale and Embarcadero BART Stations	\$306,630
05R59	SOL	City of Benicia	Shuttle Bus Service - Benicia Industrial Park	\$35,935
05R67	SOL	City of Benicia	Regional Express Route - Vallejo Ferry & Walnut Creek BART	\$50,000
05R58	SC	City of San Jose	Shuttle Bus Service - Edenvale Technology Park	\$85,500
05R51	SON	City of Santa Rosa	SMART Regional Multi-Use Path - Santa Rosa Phase 4	\$397,000
05R27	SOL	City of Suisun	McCoy Creek Trail - Phase One	\$50,000
05R66	SOL	City of Vallejo	Baylink Ferry Shuttle to Mare Island	\$108,600
05R15	ALA	County of Alameda	Foothill Blvd. Bicycle Lane Gap Closure	\$1,300,000
05R06	SF	County of San Francisco	Lincoln / Kezar ITMS	\$1,500,000
05R28	ALA	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority	4 Diesel/Electric Hybrid Buses	\$350,000
05R46	NAP	Napa Valley Unified School District	Three Plug-In Hybrid Electric School Buses	\$615,000
05R42	SF	San Francisco International Airport	Purchase of 2 Hydrogen-Powered Shuttles	\$556,000

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Office Memorandum

To: Chairperson Haggerty and Members
of the Mobile Source Committee

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: October 17, 2005

Re: AB 1390 Methodology for Carl Moyer Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Receive and file staff's revised methodology, as presented in Attachment A, to comply with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 1390 in allocating Carl Moyer Program and other State funding subject to AB 1390.

BACKGROUND

On October 11, 2001, Governor Davis signed into law the provisions of AB 1390 (Chapter 763, Statutes of 2001). This law, codified as Health and Safety Code Section 43023.5, applies to State funds appropriated to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and diesel engines used in trucks, buses, marine vessels and other mobile sources. Specifically, AB 1390 requires that air districts with more than one million residents ensure that "not less than 50 percent of the funds subject to (the) provisions (of the Budget Act of 2001) ... are expended in a manner that directly reduces air contaminants or reduces the public health risks associated with air contaminants, ..., including, but not limited to airborne toxics and particulate matter, in communities with the most significant exposure to air contaminants or localized air contaminants, or both, including, but not limited to communities of minority populations or low-income populations." The three incentive programs affected by AB 1390 are the Carl Moyer Program, the Lower Emission School Bus Program, and the (now defunct) electric vehicle grant program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Air districts subject to the AB 1390 mandate are required to develop a methodology to ensure that State grant funds are allocated in accordance with the provisions of AB 1390. In April 2002, Air District staff presented a methodology for determining compliance with AB 1390 to the Mobile Source Committee. This methodology was based upon allocating funds to projects in areas with high exposure of children and elderly residents to particulate matter (PM10). PM exposure was calculated by multiplying the total PM10 emissions within each 1 x 1 kilometer grid square times the population of children and elderly people within that grid square to estimate the annual person-tons PM exposure for each grid square. The methodology defined "high" exposure to PM10 as any grid square with a total PM10 exposure of 75,000 person-tons per year or more. Staff used this methodology to select projects to comply with AB 1390 during the most recent three Carl

Moyer Program funding cycles: fiscal year (FY) 2001/02 (Year 4), FY 2002/03 (Year 5), and FY 2003/04 (Year 6).

REVISED METHODOLOGY

Staff has developed a revised AB 1390 methodology, as described in Attachment A, for the upcoming FY 04/05 (Year 7) and subsequent Moyer funding cycles. Examples to show how the revised method will be used to evaluate and score applications are provided in Attachment B. The revisions are intended to:

- Ensure that all communities with significant exposure to PM will be considered in accordance with the purpose of AB 1390;
- Broaden the scope of the methodology to include additional relevant factors, including low-income status and direct project impact, in addition to PM exposure;
- Provide a means to weight these factors to ensure that funds allocated to comply with AB 1390 are allocated to the projects that will provide the greatest benefit, directly reducing emissions in the most heavily polluted areas.

The revised methodology continues to be based upon identification of geographic areas with high levels of PM exposure among sensitive populations (children and elderly). However, the revised methodology includes several changes, namely:

1. PM exposure will be based on fine particulates (PM2.5) rather than PM10. PM2.5 is the component of PM that has been shown to have the most direct impact on human health.
2. The revised methodology defines three levels of impacted community, based upon the level of PM exposure, with greater weight given for higher levels of exposure.
3. The revised methodology includes income data (which is not addressed in the Air District's current AB 1390 methodology). For the purpose of AB 1390, impacted communities (based on PM exposure) that are also low-income will receive greater weight in the project selection process.
4. The revised methodology will analyze project applications in greater detail as to where the equipment covered by the application would be deployed, to determine how each project would potentially reduce emissions in an impacted community. Projects that most directly reduce emissions in an impacted community would receive greater weight in the project selection process.

BUDGET CONSIDERATION/FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. State funds conveyed through CARB cover the direct costs of Carl Moyer Program grants awarded by the Air District. The Air District does incur administrative costs to manage the Carl Moyer Program. However, the revised methodology is not expected to result in any appreciable increase in the Air District's cost to administer the program.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Prepared by: David Burch
Reviewed by: Juan Ortellado

Attachments

Attachment A

Revised AB 1390 Methodology

Background

Health and Safety Code Section 43023.5 (AB 1390 - Lowenthal) requires that air districts with more than one million residents ensure that not less than 50 percent of State funds appropriated to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and diesel engines used in trucks, buses, marine vessels and other mobile sources, “*are expended in a manner that directly reduces air contaminants or reduces the public health risks associated with air contaminants, ..., including, but not limited to airborne toxics and particulate matter, in communities with the most significant exposure to air contaminants or localized air contaminants, or both, including, but not limited to communities of minority populations or low-income populations.*”

This document describes the revised methodology that Air District staff will use to select and prioritize projects for the purpose of complying with the AB 1390 mandate. This document focuses on the process to allocate Carl Moyer Program funds starting with the FY 2004/05 (Year 7) funding cycle. Staff will also use the criteria described below to comply with the requirements for any funding subject to AB 1390, including State funds provided to the Air District for both the Carl Moyer Program and the Low Emission School Bus Program.

Description of Methodology

The revised methodology takes into account the following factors:

- PM2.5 exposure among sensitive populations; i.e., children and elderly residents.
- Low-income areas
- Project impact; i.e., the degree to which a project would directly reduce emissions in an impacted community
- Project cost-effectiveness

Air District staff will evaluate each Carl Moyer Program application to determine: 1) whether the project qualifies for the purposes of AB 1390, based upon the criteria described below; and 2) its cost-effectiveness in reducing emissions. Applications that meet the AB 1390 criteria and the Carl Moyer Program cost-effectiveness threshold will be included on a list of AB 1390-qualified projects, ranked by AB 1390 point score, from highest score to lowest score. If two projects have an equal AB 1390 point score, the project with the best cost-effectiveness (i.e., lower \$\$/ton of emissions reduced) will receive priority. Using this approach, staff will go down the AB 1390 project list until at least 50% of the available funds have been awarded to projects that meet the AB 1390 criteria. Once the requirement to allocate 50% of the State funds to AB 1390-qualified projects has been met, staff will allocate the remaining available funds based solely upon the cost-effectiveness of all remaining applications that were submitted and deemed eligible for Carl Moyer Program funding.

AB 1390 Criteria:

- **Impacted Community:** An Impacted Community will be defined to include any area (2 x 2 km grid square) which falls within the top 50% of total aggregate PM2.5 exposure for the Bay Area. PM exposure will be calculated by multiplying the total PM2.5 emissions within each grid square times the population of children and elderly people within that grid square. This yields the annual person-tons PM exposure for children and elderly within each grid square. Areas with the highest PM2.5 exposure will receive more points, as shown in Table 1, Column A.

- **Low-Income Area:** An Impacted Community (as defined above) in which 40% or more of households have incomes of 185% of the federal poverty level or less (based on Year 2000 Census data) will qualify for 5 or 10 additional points, as shown in Table 1, Columns B and C. This definition of “Low-Income” area is based upon the method used by the Northern California Council for the Community in its analysis entitled *The Bay Area’s Concentrated Poverty Neighborhoods*, using Year 2000 Census data. This analysis lists neighborhoods in which at least 40% of households have incomes below 185% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL); i.e., \$30,895 or less for a family of four. The Air District already uses this method and report to identify disadvantaged communities for purposes of the Transportation Fund for Clean Air evaluation criterion #4. *Note: no community could qualify as AB 1390-eligible on the basis of income data only.*
- **Project Impact Factor:** To qualify for consideration as an AB 1390-eligible project, the applicant must demonstrate that the project would reduce emissions in an Impacted Community. To qualify for the purpose of AB 1390, the equipment (vehicle or engine) covered by the application would be required to operate at least 30% of its total annual operating time or miles in an Impacted Community. Applications in which the equipment would operate in an Impacted Community for a higher percentage of operating time or miles would receive greater weight, as follows:
 - 30%-50% of miles or hours in Impacted Community: multiply Impacted Community points by factor of 1
 - 51%-80% of miles or hours in Impacted Community: multiply Impacted Community points by factor of 1.5
 - 81% or more of miles or hours in Impacted Community: multiply Impacted Community points by factor of 2

The total AB 1390 score would be calculated by multiplying a project’s Impacted Community and Low-Income points by the Project Impact Factor, as shown in the following formula:

$$\text{PM Exposure points} + \text{Low-Income Area points} = \text{Impacted Community points}$$

$$\text{Impacted Community points} \times \text{Project Impact Factor} = \text{Adjusted AB 1390 score}$$

Table 1 – Impacted Community Points

Column A		Column B		Column C	
PM Exposure *	# Points	Low-Income Areas	# Points	Low-Income Areas	# Points
Within highest 20% (1% - 20%)	30	40-59% of households below 185% of FPL	5	60% + of households below 185% of FPL	10
Within highest 35% (21% - 35%)	20	40-59% of households below 185% of FPL	5	60% + of households below 185% of FPL	10
Within highest 50% (36% - 50%)	10	40-59% of households below 185% of FPL	5	60% + of households below 185% of FPL	10
Not within highest 50% PM	0	NA		NA	

* PM2.5 exposure is expressed in terms of person-tons per year for elderly and children.

Attachment B provides examples that show how the revised methodology will be employed, based upon a hypothetical set of projects.

Attachment B

This Attachment provides examples of hypothetical applications for Carl Moyer Program funds, to show how the proposed AB 1390 scoring mechanism will work. Table 2 shows project scores and rankings based upon the hypothetical examples.

Application A

Project is located in area within top 20% PM exposure = 30 points
65% low income = 10 additional points
Impacted Community points = 40 points (30 + 10)
Equipment operates 40% of time in impacted area: factor = 1
Adjusted AB 1390 score = 40 x 1 = 40
Cost-effectiveness = \$12,000/ton

Application B

Project is located in area within top 35% PM exposure = 20 points
45% low income = 5 additional points
Impacted Community points = 25 points
Equipment operates 100% of time in impacted area: factor = 2
Adjusted AB 1390 score = 25 x 2 = 50
Cost-effectiveness = \$5,000/ton

Application C

Project is located in area within top 35% PM exposure = 20 points
60% low income = 10 additional points
Impacted Community points = 30 points
Equipment operates 100% of time in impacted area: factor = 2
Adjusted AB 1390 score = 30 x 2 = 60
Cost-effectiveness = \$13,000/ton

Application D

Project is located in area within top 50% PM exposure = 10 points
40% low income = 5 additional points
Impacted Community points = 15 points
Equipment operates 35% of time in impacted area: factor = 1
Adjusted AB 1390 score = 15 x 1 = 15
Cost-effectiveness = \$6,000/ton

Application E

Project is located in area within top 50% PM exposure = 10 points
Less than 40% low income = 0 additional points
Impacted Community points = 10 points
Equipment operates 60% of time in impacted area: factor = 1.5
Adjusted AB 1390 score = 10 x 1.5 = 15
Cost-effectiveness = \$8,000/ton

Application F

Project is not located in area within top 50% PM exposure = 0 points

60+ % low income = 10 additional points

Impacted Community points = 0 (Not Eligible)

Equipment operates 0% of time in impacted area: factor = 0 (Not Eligible)

Adjusted AB 1390 score = 0 (Not Eligible)

Cost-effectiveness = \$4,000/ton

(Application F would not qualify for purposes of AB 1390. Despite the high percentage of low income households, it would not qualify as an Impacted Community on the basis of PM exposure.)

Table 2

Application #	PM Exposure Points	Low Income Points	Project Impact Factor	AB 1390 Score	C-E \$/ton	Rank
App C	20	10	x 2	60	\$13,000	1
App B	20	5	x 2	50	\$5,000	2
App A	30	10	x 1	40	\$12,000	3
App D	10	5	x 1	15	\$6,000	4
App E	10	0	x 1.5	15	\$8,000	5
App F	0	10	0			N/A