Subcommittee Suggestions

- **Pursue Cost Effective Options**
  - Offer enough flexibility to offer more incentives for newer zero or near zero emission certified technologies.

- **TCEQ should take how a vehicle or equipment is used into consideration**
  - To determine appropriateness of engine and fuel usage.

- **Allow TERP to fund area and stationary technologies for more flexibility:** AMEC (Bonnet or Sock on a Stick) technology. Would allow more flexibility for capturing smoke stack emissions from ocean going vessels, tankers, etc.
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- **Treat TERP as an implementation program for new or near-stage technology that:**
  - Has already been certified as zero or near zero emission but is still quite cost prohibitive because the technology is so new or
  - Is of the type of project that does not quite fit within the definitions of the traditional TERP projects such as the marine bonnet technology.

- **TCEQ should consider adopting the use of US DOEs AFLEET Program when appropriate for on-road vehicles to take into account the actual uses of the vehicles.**
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- Do not punish sub-programs that lost funds due to transfer. Economic timing sometimes prohibited participation and programs should not be permanently defunded as a result.

- TERP funds should be spent based on the greatest good for overall air quality whether or not the purchase of those engines contributed to the TERP funds.
  - Typically, these types of projects fall within the locomotive and marine sectors.