

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, California 94109
(415) 749-5073

APPROVED MINUTES

Summary of Board of Directors
Mobile Source Committee Meeting
Thursday, October 22, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice-Chairperson Jan Pepper called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Present: Chairperson Scott Haggerty; Vice-Chairperson Jan Pepper; and Directors John Avalos, David J. Canepa, David Hudson, Roger Kim (on behalf of Edwin Lee), Nate Miley and Karen Mitchoff.

Absent: Director Tom Bates.

Also Present: None.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA MATTERS: No requests received.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

Committee Comments: None.

Public Comments: No requests received.

Committee Action:

Director Hudson made a motion, seconded by Director Kim, to approve the Minutes of September 24, 2015; and the motion carried by the following vote of the Committee:

AYES: Avalos, Canepa, Hudson, Kim and Pepper.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Bates, Haggerty, Miley and Mitchoff.

4. OVERVIEW OF THE AIR DISTRICT'S TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAMS

Karen Schkolnick, Acting Director of the Strategic Incentives Division, introduced the topic and Chengfeng Wang, Supervising Air Quality Specialist of the Strategic Incentives Division, who gave the staff presentation *Overview of the Air District's Trip Reduction Programs*, including

background information; a summary of the types of trip reduction programs and services that have been funded by the Air District; an overview of how the Air District and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission partner to support trip reduction in the region; and an update on a new pilot trip reduction incentive program that will be offered by the Air District early next year.

NOTED PRESENT: Chairperson Haggerty and Directors Miley and Mitchoff were noted present at 9:43 a.m.

Committee Comments:

The Committee and staff discussed the project cost effectiveness trend resulting from improved fleet technology; how the cost effectiveness calculations are performed; the changing nature of projects which are cost effective; under what conditions a shuttle must have zero emissions in order to be cost effective; committee member desire to redirect funding from shuttles that are seemingly duplicative of existing bus service to projects that serve the last mile; if congestion relief is adequately weighted as a factor in the project analysis process; whether and how matching funds and operational factors both impact cost effectiveness calculations; whether corporate shuttles are eligible for funding; and the existence and number of Google shuttles seemingly in operation in Mountain View.

Public Comments: No requests received.

Committee Action: None; receive and file.

**5. CONSIDERATION OF FISCAL YEAR ENDING (FYE) 2016
TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) REGIONAL FUND
SHUTTLE AND RIDESHARE PROJECTS**

Ms. Schkolnick introduced Kenneth Mak, Air Quality Specialist in the Strategic Incentives Division, who gave the staff presentation *FYE 2016 TFCA Regional Fund Shuttle and Regional Rideshare Program*, including program background, the results of the solicitation, a summary of the projects that are eligible for award; and recommendations.

Committee Comments:

The Committee and staff discussed a clarification of service within Community Air Risk Evaluation program areas.

Public Comments: No requests received.

Committee Action:

Director Canepa made a motion, seconded by Director Avalos, to recommend the Board of Directors (Board):

1. Approve the proposed awards for the seven TFCA projects listed in Attachment A to the staff memorandum; and

2. Authorize the Executive Officer/Air Pollution Control Officer to enter into agreements for the recommended TFCA projects in Attachment A to the staff memorandum.

Committee Comments (continued):

The Committee and staff discussed whether the proposed shuttles are providing last mile service; how the cost effectiveness calculations generated the current recommendations; why no projects in Los Altos Hills are included; which counties the recommended projects operate from and the general nature of those services; the hours of operation for recommended shuttles; the scale of emissions reductions listed on slide 6, *Projects Recommended for Award (FYE 2016)*, and the impact of cost effectiveness calculations when considered alone with related variables.

Committee Action (continued):

The motion carried by the following vote of the Committee:

AYES: Avalos, Canepa, Haggerty, Hudson, Kim, Miley, Mitchoff and Pepper.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Bates.

6. TFCA COUNTY PROGRAM MANAGER (CPM) FUND POLICIES FOR FYE 2017 AND MODIFICATION TO FYE 2016 CPM FUND POLICIES

Ms. Schkolnick introduced Linda Hui, Administrative Analyst of the Strategic Incentives Division, who gave the staff presentation *TFCA CPM Fund Policies for FYE 2017*, including program background; a review of the proposed revisions and the process to solicit and incorporate public input; a request to modify a prior year policy to align its requirements with those of the Regional Fund; and recommendations.

Committee Comments:

The Committee and staff discussed the nexus for the recommendation relative to cost effectiveness.

Public Comments: No requests received.

Committee Action:

Director Hudson made a motion, seconded by Director Mitchoff, to recommend the Board:

1. Approve the proposed FYE 2017 TFCA CPM Fund Policies; and
2. Approve a proposed change to FYE 2016 TFCA CPM Fund Policy #28 to increase the cost-effectiveness limit to \$175,000/ton of emissions reduced for shuttle projects to align it with the FYE 2015 TFCA Regional Fund cost-effectiveness limit.

Committee Comments (continued):

The Committee and staff discussed the environmental review process as it relates to these projects; that nature of the disagreement in the community about the appropriateness of requiring environmental review for bike projects; committee member desire to amend the environmental review language; how many bike plans are likely to trigger an environmental review; possible unintended consequences of deleting language; what prevents later bike project extension requests and how they would be handled by staff, if received; and the lifecycle of the average bike lane project.

Committee Action (continued):

Director Hudson made an amended motion, seconded by Director Mitchoff, to recommend the Board:

1. Approve the proposed FYE 2017 TFCA CPM Fund Policies in Attachment A to the staff memorandum, as amended to delete the following language relative to Policy 29, *Bicycle Projects*, on page 7, first paragraph, that reads, “Projects must also have a completed and approved environmental plan. If a project is exempt from preparing an environmental plan as determined by the public agency or lead agency, then that project has met this requirement.”; and
2. Approve a proposed change to FYE 2016 TFCA CPM Fund Policy #28 to increase the cost-effectiveness limit to \$175,000/ton of emissions reduced for shuttle projects to align it with the FYE 2015 TFCA Regional Fund cost-effectiveness limit.

The motion carried by the following vote of the Committee:

AYES: Avalos, Canepa, Haggerty, Hudson, Kim, Miley, Mitchoff and Pepper.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Bates.

7. **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS:** None.
8. **TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING:** At the call of the Chairperson.
9. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 10:49 a.m.

151 Sean Gallagher
Sean Gallagher
Clerk of the Boards