Exceedance Level indicates daily maximum eight-hour average ozone concentration. Exceedance Levels are based on Air Quality Index (AQI) thresholds established by the EPA for the revised ozone standard of 70 ppb.

Exceedance Days

Ozone Season (Year)


Exceedance Levels

Orange (71-75 ppb)
Orange (76-85 ppb)
Red (86-105 ppb)
Purple (106+ ppb)

*Not a full year of data, current as of 7/13/2016
Source: TCEQ, [http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/cgi-bin/compliance/monops/8hr_monthly.pl](http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/cgi-bin/compliance/monops/8hr_monthly.pl)
ppb = parts per billion
Design Value (ppb)

- Attainment Goal - According to the US EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards, attainment is reached when, at each monitor, the Design Value (three-year average of the annual fourth-highest daily maximum eight-hour average ozone concentration) is less than or equal to 70 parts per billion (ppb).

- Data not certified by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
- Not a full year of data, current as of 7/13/2016.

1997 Standard < 85 ppb (Revoked)

2008 Standard ≤ 75 ppb1 (by 2017)

2015 Revised Standard ≤ 70 ppb (TBD; Moderate by 2024)

Source: NCTCOG TR Dept
Proposed Resolution to the Texas Transportation Commission Requesting Changes to the Draft Unified Transportation Program

Regional Transportation Council
July 14, 2016
Two Primary RTC Instructions to NCTCOG Staff

1) Protect Regional Toll Revenue Funds From Being Swept

2) Insist on Formula Allocation, Supporting Historic TxDOT/RTC Partnership Ensuring Funding Equity
Draft 2017 Unified Transportation Program

10-year Funding Document
– $66 Billion Overall
– $38 Billion is “Additional Funding”

Allocates Funding to 12 Categories

Includes New State and Federal Funding Sources

Creates New Strategic Programs – Congestion, Connectivity, Strategic Priorities
## Proposed Additional Funding Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Areas and Objectives</th>
<th>10 Year Additional Funding ($ Billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety / Preserve Existing Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bridges</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Sector</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Discretionary</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion / Urban Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MPO Partnerships</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connectivity Corridor Congestion</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Congestion Initiative</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Connectivity Corridors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interstates (Existing and Future), Trunk System, Border, Super 2-Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Strategic Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Transportation, June 29, 2016
# Proposed Additional Funding Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Areas and Objectives</th>
<th>10 Year Additional Funding ($ Billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety / Preserve Existing Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bridges</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Sector</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Discretionary</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion / Urban Mobility</strong></td>
<td>$ 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MPO Partnerships</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connectivity Corridor Congestion</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Congestion Initiative</td>
<td>5.0 (Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Connectivity Corridors</strong></td>
<td>$ 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Interstates (Existing and Future), Trunk System, Border, Super 2-Lane</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Strategic Priorities</strong></td>
<td>$ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Transportation, June 29, 2016
Policy Principles: Benefits to Metropolitan Project Selection

Funding Equity
Consensus of Public, TxDOT Districts and MPOs
Performance Based Selection Using Local Measures
Leverage Funds
Context Sensitive Design
Multimodal Considerations
Multi-year Transparent Process
Respond to Air Quality Needs
Build Systems and “Last Mile,” Not Just Projects
Resolution Section 1

Category 12: Discretionary Funding of the Commission

RTC Supports Urban Funding Allocation, Requests:

- Supports Governor Abbott/Commissioner Bugg Congestion Relief Program
- $5 Billion to Congestion Relief
- Fair Share Allocation to Regions
- Flexibility to Meet State Needs
Minute Order # 109370: Texas Metropolitan Mobility Plan (August 28, 2003)

“It is therefore ordered that the commission accepts this report and encourages partnerships with local entities in the eight metropolitan areas to implement the long range mobility plan.”

“…enabling a philosophical change in the way we as a state will attack congestion.”

“…will increase local control and decision-making authority.”

“…recommends that TxDOT shift from funding projects one at a time to a regional distribution of a predictable amount of funding.”

“…the plan makes it explicit that the distributed TxDOT funds would not be reduced for those areas that develop gap funding initiatives.”

Commissioner Ric Williamson: “The more you choose local sources of funds, whether that’s local taxes or local tolls, the more money will be invested in your community; you will not be penalized for being aggressive with local funding.”
Resolution Section 2

Category 4: Connectivity (Congestion) Program
Selected by TxDOT Headquarters, No Formula
RTC Supports “Connectivity” Emphasis,
Requests:

• Program Contradicts Minute Order #109370
• TxDOT Assigns “Mini-Cap” for Connectivity in Each Applicable Region in Category 2
• Region Creates “System” Meeting Connectivity and Congestion Relief Goals
Resolution Section 3

If Section 2 is Approved, then Section 3 is met

If Not, Adequately Fund Urban Congestion Relief
Category 2 Funding Tests

State Category 2 “Freeways” $12.5 B
Federal Category 7 “Thoroughfares” $4.2 B
Ratio = 3:1

LBJ Phase 3 Test ➞ 100% of East ($240 M/year) ➞ 3.3 years + $500 M tolls

Western Subregion Test ➞ 100% of West ➞ $112M/year
# Importance of Formula Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization (District)</th>
<th>Additional Category 2 Funding Distributed Over 10 Years of UTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene (ABL)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo (AMA)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Area – CAMPO (AUS)</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont – SETRPC (BMT)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville (PHR)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan-College Station (BRY)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi (CRP)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas/Ft. Worth – NCTCOG (DAL/FTW/PAR)</td>
<td>31.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso (ELP)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen-San Benito (PHR)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo County (PHR)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area – HGAC (BMT/HOU)</td>
<td>24.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killeen-Temple (BWD/WAC)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Transportation, June 29, 2016
## TxDOT As A Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Year 1 Allocation</th>
<th>Legislative Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Capacity</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Connectivity</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sector</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline

Draft UTP Issued by TxDOT  
Public Involvement  
TxDOT Public Meeting*  
Commission Adoption of UTP

*Public Meeting Details:  
July 21, 2016 | 4:00 p.m.  
Attend at TxDOT Fort Worth or Dallas District Offices  
Join Via WebEx and Comment Online:  
www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/get-involved/unified-transportation-program.html
POTENTIAL FISCAL YEAR 2013 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) FUNDS LAPSE
POTENTIAL FY 2013 TAP FUNDING AT RISK OF LAPSING

• Federal regulations state that apportioned funds are available for use for the year of apportionment plus three (3) years.

• Any apportioned amounts that remain unobligated at the end of that period shall lapse.

• TAP funds apportioned in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 must be utilized by the end of federal FY 2016 (September 30, 2016).

• Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Austin recently notified Dallas-Fort Worth region that Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)-selected TAP funds are potentially at risk of lapsing.
## SUMMARY OF FY 2013 TAP FUNDING AT RISK OF LAPSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Match*</th>
<th>Total as of 7/1/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013 DFW MPO TAP Funds</td>
<td>$8M</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligated to Date</td>
<td>$5.1M</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
<td>$6.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated to Obligate by End of FY 2016</td>
<td>$.8M</td>
<td>$.2M</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds At Risk of Expiration</td>
<td>$2.1M</td>
<td>$.5M</td>
<td>$2.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes a 20% match to federal funds, though match percentage varies.
# TAP FUNDING TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>TAP apportionments were established at the federal level (midway through FY 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>TxDOT established MPO allocations and applied FY 2013 allocations to FY 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
<td>TAP Call for Projects workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13, 2014</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Council (RTC) announced TAP Call for Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30, 2014</td>
<td>Applications were due for 2014-2015 TAP Call for Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014 to August</td>
<td>MPO reviewed applications, scored, and recommended projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>RTC approved 23 projects to received $28.4M in federal TAP funding for FY 2014 – FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015 TIP</td>
<td>Selected projects were added to the TIP and implementing agencies began the contracting/agreement process with TxDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACTORS LEADING TO DELAY OF OBLIGATIONS

• Six (6) month delay in federal apportionment.
• Delayed allocation of DFW MPO funds until FY 2014.
• The State did not have a TAP template agreement ready for local agency use until late in FY 2015/early FY 2016.
• Local governments were ready to move ahead as soon as the TIP modifications were approved, but agreements were held up pending finalization of the template agreement.
ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE

• NCTCOG and TxDOT staff coordinated regarding impacted projects and next course of action.

• NCTCOG staff began researching projects with unobligated TAP funds.
  ▪ Contacted agencies that had TAP funds programmed in FY 2015 or FY 2016 to see if the projects could be obligated prior to the September 30, 2016 deadline.

• Approximately $5.9M in TAP funds are anticipated to, or have been obligated to date.

• None of the remaining projects are ready for construction yet.
IMPORTANCE OF TIMELY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

• Accurate and realistic estimates for beginning and end dates for all phases is very important.
  ▪ This information is required all for projects added to the TIP/STIP.

• Delayed projects impact financial constraints, TxDOT’s letting capacity, and funding availability.

• Three (3) projects that were previously programmed with TAP funds in FY 2015 or FY 2016 were delayed to FY 2017 or FY 2018 at the request of the implementing agencies.
  ▪ Represents $2.1M in unobligated federal TAP funds.

• Agreement template was made available in December 2015, but few agencies have executed their agreements since that time.
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS BEING SOUGHT BY NCTCOG STAFF

• Requested FHWA to extend the obligation deadline six (6) months as funds were not apportioned until six (6) months into FY 2013.

• Asked TxDOT to manage obligations statewide vs. managing them at the individual MPO level given the delay in allocating FY 2013 funding by one (1) year and the delay in finalizing an agreement template.
  • TxDOT advised that the funds were sub-allocated by area and specific to the project location; therefore, funds cannot be transferred to or traded with another area.
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS BEING SOUGHT BY NCTCOG STAFF (continued)

• Continue to work with local agencies to advance TAP project implementation to avoid a lapse this year and in future fiscal years.

• Request RTC approval of a letter to the Texas Transportation Commission.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Ken Bunkley
Principal Transportation Planner
Ph: (817) 695-9288
kbunkley@nctcog.org

Christie J. Gotti
Senior Program Manager
Ph: (817) 608-2338
cgotti@nctcog.org

Rylea Roderick
Transportation Planner II
Ph: (817) 608-2353
rroderick@nctcog.org
Transportation Rulemaking Update

Regional Transportation Council
July 14, 2016
Amanda Wilson, AICP
North Central Texas Council of Governments
Overview

**Final Rule:** Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Transportation Planning

- Effective June 27, 2016


- Comments Due August 20, 2016

**Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM):** Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform

- Comments Due August 26, 2016
Performance Management Measures NPRM

Subpart A: General Information, Target Establishment, Reporting

Subpart E: Measures to Assess Performance of the National Highway System (NHS)

Subpart F: Measures to Assess Freight Movement on the Interstate System

Subpart G: Measures for Assessing the CMAQ Program – Traffic Congestion

Subpart H: Measures for Assessing the CMAQ Program – On-Road Mobile Source Emissions
# Performance Management Measures NPRM

## Subpart E: Measures to Assess Performance of the NHS

State DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for the following measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Area</th>
<th>Proposed Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>Percent of interstate system providing for reliable travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Percent of non-interstate NHS providing for reliable travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Travel Time</td>
<td>Percent of interstate system where peak hour travel times meet expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of non-interstate NHS where peak hour travel times meet expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Performance Measures for Reliability and Travel Time
Subpart F: Freight Movement on the Interstate System

State DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for the following measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Area</th>
<th>Proposed Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck Travel Time Reliability</td>
<td>Percent of the interstate system mileage providing for reliable truck travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage Uncongested</td>
<td>Percent of the interstate system mileage uncongested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Management Measures NPRM

#### Subparts G and H: Traffic Congestion and On-Road Mobile Source Emissions

State DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for the following measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Area</th>
<th>Proposed Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ Program – Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>Annual hours of excessive delay per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ Program – On-Road Mobile Source Emissions</td>
<td>Two- and four-year total emission reductions for each applicable criteria pollutant and precursor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft RTC Comments

Target Setting

State measures and targets may conflict with MPO measures and targets; coordination is essential for success.

MPOs may not be able to influence targets significantly in areas where the majority of project selection is handled by States.

Reliability measures rely on terms such as expected travel times relative to uncongested times; States and MPOs defining expected travel times could be problematic (Request Option)
Draft RTC Comments

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Performance Measure

FHWA requested comments on whether or not to establish GHG performance measures; recommend not to establish performance measures (comprehensive air quality strategies)

On-Road Mobile Source Emissions

Reporting areas should be consistent between CMAQ congestion and on-road mobile source emissions to make reporting simpler

Support definition for on-road mobile source that it is limited to NAAQS criteria
Draft RTC Comments

Implementation
Develop a web-based user interface to maximize successful implementation

Assess Congestion with all Modes
Consider the mobility of travelers using all surface modes of transportation
Incorporate shareable transit data

Traffic Throughput Data and Volume Estimates
A Travel Demand Model should be used as a reliable estimation when available
Metropolitan Planning Area NPRM

*Metropolitan Planning Coordination*

- Clarifies definition of Metropolitan Planning Area and its use in regulations
- For areas with multiple MPOs, development of single planning documents
- Establish clear operating procedures for this coordination
- Encouragement for multiple MPOs in same Metropolitan Planning Area to consolidate, but allows for flexibility and exceptions
- Encouragement for MPOs to consolidate when MPAs are contiguous, but allows for flexibility and exceptions
Metropolitan Planning Area NPRM

MPO/State DOT Coordination

- Process for MPOs and State DOTs to employ consistent data, assumptions and other analytical materials
- Process for MPOs and State DOTs to resolve disagreements
- Documentation of processes in MPO Agreement
Draft RTC Comments

Metropolitan Planning Coordination

Support for single planning documents or consolidation of smaller MPOs for greater public understanding, planning at the correct scale and efficiency

Support flexibility for States and regions to make decisions on their boundaries

MPO/State DOT Coordination

Support documentation of coordinated data sharing, assumptions and analytical materials as well as dispute resolution
Contact Information

Amanda Wilson, AICP
Public Involvement Manager
awilson@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9284

Rebekah Hernandez
Communications Coordinator
rhernandez@nctcog.org
(817) 704-2545

www.nctcog.org/trans/legislative
High Speed Rail Industry Forum

Multimodal/Intermodal/High Speed Rail/Freight Subcommittee

July 14, 2016

Michael Morris, P.E.
Federal Initiative

FAST Act §11308

First Phase of Qualification Process

Federal RFP for Implementing a High Speed Rail Corridor

Proposed Corridors

1. Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth
2. Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth/Austin/San Antonio/Beyond
Federal Initiative

Eligible Proposers

All Sources Welcome

Proposers Must Demonstrate Ability to Assemble Multi-Disciplinary Team

Currently No Federal Funding Identified

Congress Enact Statutory Authority to Implement

Proposals Due August 31
NCTCOG Role

NCTCOG Hosted Industry Forum
  Provided DFW Information to Prospective Proposers
  Invited Potential Proposers
  Encouraged Private Sector Participation

Will Serve as Resource to Proposers
  Ensure Consistency with:
    Regional Policies
    Mobility 2040
  Provide Technical Information

Pursue Federal Funds
Forum Agenda

Welcome, Introductions, and Forum Purpose
Importance of High Speed Rail
Federal Register Requirements
Regional High Speed Rail Studies
Upcoming Requests for Proposals for Preliminary Engineering
Institutional Structures for High Speed Rail in DFW
Data Sharing
Partnership Opportunity, Questions and Answers
Teaming Opportunity
Participants

58 Total
21 Consulting Engineers
14 Local Government Representatives
7 Ancillary HSR Firms
5 Federal Elected Official Representatives
2 International HSR Firms
2 Researchers
1 DART
1 DRMC
National and State Population Change (in millions)

**Nation**
- 2015: 321.4
- 2040: 389.7
  - Increase: 68.3
  - Percentage: 21%

**Texas**
- 2015: DFW (27.3)
- 2040: 38.8
  - Increase: 11.5
  - Percentage: 42%

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division*
*Note: All numbers are rounded*
Regional Population Change
(in millions)

2015 2040

Texas
27.3 38.8
+11.5 42%

DFW
7.0 10.8
+3.8 54%

Austin
1.9 2.8
+0.9 47%

San Antonio
2.3 3.1
+0.8 35%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division /Texas State Data Center/NCTCOG Demographic Forecast
Note: All numbers are rounded
Available Data

Regional Demographics

Land-Use Forecast

DFW Regional Travel Demand Model Traffic Volume and Transit Ridership Forecasts

Transportation Networks and Trip Tables

Travel Surveys

Auto and Truck Speed Data
Meeting Information

www.nctcog.org/hsr
Contact

Kevin Feldt, AICP
Program Manager
kfeldt@nctcog.org
(817) 704-2529

Amanda Wilson
Public Involvement Manager
awilson@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9284
UPDATE ON PROPOSED VOLKSWAGEN SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

Regional Transportation Council

Chris Klaus, Senior Program Manager
Ken Kirkpatrick, Counsel for Transportation
July 14, 2016
Consolidated Federal Court Actions Against Volkswagen

January 4, 2016
US Department of Justice, on behalf of the EPA, filed suit for Environmental Claims

February 22, 2016
Consolidated Consumer Class Action

March 29, 2016
Federal Trade Commission Suit

June 28, 2016
California Suit for Environmental and Consumer Claims

1Volkswagen = Volkswagen AG, Audi AG, Volkswagen Group of America Inc., Volkswagen Group of America Chattanooga Operations LLC, Porsche AG and Porsche Cars North America Inc.
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
Texas State Court Actions Against Volkswagen

October 8, 2015

State of Texas Lawsuits for Environmental and Consumer Protection Claims

Numerous Texas Counties Have Filed Suit for Environmental Claims

Volkswagen = Volkswagen AG, Audi AG, Volkswagen Group of America Inc., Volkswagen Group of America Chattanooga Operations LLC, Porsche AG and Porsche Cars North America Inc.
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
$14.7 Billion Proposed Partial Settlement for Federal and Class Action Claims Related to 2.0 Diesel Vehicles

US DOJ/State of California: Partial Consent Decree
FTC: Partial Consent Decree
Consumer Class Action: Settlement Agreement

1) $10.033 Billion for Consumers
   Owners: Choice Between Buyback and Restitution or Approved Emissions Modifications and Restitution
   Lessees: Lease Termination and Restitution or Approved Emissions Modification and Restitution

Recall Rate of ≥85% of Affected Vehicles Must be Achieved or Additional Funds into Environmental Mitigation Fund
2) $2.7 Billion in Environmental Mitigation
   Fully Funded Over a Two-Year Period
   $380 Million Allocated to California
   $192 Million Allocated for Texas

3) $2.0 Billion Zero-Emission Vehicle Commitment
   Over a Ten-Year Period
   $800 Million to a California-specific Investment Plan
   $1.2 Billion to a National EPA-approved Investment Plan

Deceptive Trade Practices Act Suit

Attorney General Announced Settlement:
$50 Million in Civil Penalties for Violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act

Texas Clean Air Act Suits

Texas Attorney General and Individual Counties Continue to Litigate
NEXT STEPS

July 26, 2016
- Preliminary Approval Court Hearing

Fall 2016
- Anticipated Roll-out of Settlement Program (Pending Court Approval)

Ongoing
- Monitor Full Settlements, Including 3.0 Liter Diesel Engines
- Monitor Possible Criminal Lawsuits
- Monitor Texas Clean Air Act Suits
- Monitor Texas Allocations
Chris Klaus  
Senior Program Manager  
817-695-9286  
cklaus@nctcog.org

Ken Kirkpatrick  
Counsel for Transportation  
817-695-9278  
kkirkpatrick@nctcog.org
Auto Occupancy Verification Technology Procurement

Joint RTC/TxDOT Initiative

Ken Kirkpatrick, Counsel for Transportation
RTC Policies on HOV Discounts

HOV Discounts
- Tolled Managed Lane Policy: 50% during peak period for HOV 2+ (may go to HOV 3+ on or before 2018)
- Express/HOV Lane Policy: HOV 2+ free at all times

Enforcement
- Current: Manual enforcement of HOV discount with technology support
- Future: Utilize more advanced technology over time
Guiding Principles

- Technology in-vehicle, out-of-vehicle, or a combination of the two

- Occupancy verification to provide HOV discount; not enforcement mechanism

- Seamless to user and requires little to no user interaction

- Determine occupancy in front row, second row, third row (optional)

- Costs should be balanced against occupancy verification accuracy
Guiding Principles (cont.)

- Ability to disregard animals and non-human surrogates
- Expandable to address existing and future managed lane facilities (DFW and State)
- Compatible with and support integration with current toll collection system
Procurement Status

- April: Request for Proposals Issued
- May: Proposals Received
- June/July: Proposal Evaluation
- Late Summer: Anticipated Award