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PROCEEDINGS

MR. STEPHENS: Okay, everyone. This is Rob Stephens. We're gonna get the meeting started. It is a little after 1:00, and call the meeting to order. Call the PTAC, January 16 (sic), 2017. It's a little after 1, so we'll start the meeting called to order. Josh, will you go ahead and help us with a safety briefing, sir?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Absolutely. Welcome to TxDOT Campus 200 East Riverside Drive in Austin. This is the main auditorium on the campus. If, for any reason, we should need to evacuate the building, we will just go right out the doors you came in, straight out those main doors out to the parking lot, and turn right. You'll see an apartment complex on the right side. Just walk back to there. That is where we will meet up.

Should inclement weather happen, which nobody's expecting, and we need to shelter in place, this is the room to do it in, so just stay here. Restrooms are in the lobby. And also, in both this hallway and that hallway, there's a good cafeteria, should you need it. Go down that hallway, all the way down to the end and you'll see it on the left.

We have a sign-in sheet by the door. Please, if you haven't signed in, please go ahead and do
that so that we know how many people were here. We also
have comment sheets, and if you'd like to speak during
the meeting, the way to do that is just fill one of
those out. They're right over there by the door with
the sign-in sheets, and hand it to me.

   You can speak after an agenda item or you
can speak during the public comment section at the end.
And I'll make sure that our Chair, Mr. Stephens, gets
those and knows who to call out.

   MR. STEPHENS:  Outstanding.

   MR. RIBAKOVE:  I believe that's everything
   we need.

   MR. STEPHENS:  Thank you, Josh. Thank you,
   very much. Okay. What we'll do is move to agenda item
   number 3, which is an introduction of all current Public
   Transportation Advisory Committee members. What I'd
   like to do is let everyone know we have two new members
   that have been appointed by the Speaker's House. We
   have Jim Cline who joins us, our ED --
   (Telephone sounds)

   MR. STEPHENS:  -- from DCTA --
   (Telephone sounds)

   MR. STEPHENS:  -- represents -- good -- good
   afternoon. Someone else join us? Sorry. Jim Cline --
   (Telephone sounds)
MR. STEPHENS: -- joins us as one of our new members. He's an ED from DCTA representing the general public. Joseph Kopser, who's a local entrepreneur here in Austin, joins us and the user group. PTAC's a nine member group, and we've been a little short over the past year or two. We have seven active members now of the nine, so welcome.

What I'd like to do a little bit here is Christina and Michelle, you guys on -- on line, would you -- I'd like for you to introduce yourself and maybe say a little something, whatever you're comfortable with, just to introduce yourself to the group.

MS. CRAIN: Michelle, go ahead.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. It would help if I took myself off mute.

MR. GLEASON: That's so unlike you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Eric.

MR. GLEASON: You're welcome.

MS. BLOOMER: My name is Michelle Bloomer.

I've been on PTAC now probably, I believe, nine years, a few years as Chair. And I spent 12 years at the North Central Texas Council of Government before transitioning on to the operations side, and have worked in operations in Tarrant County, Collin County, and now in Denton County.
MR. STEPHENS: Thank you.

MS. CRAIN: Hi. I'm Christina Melton Crain.

I've been on PTAC, I think it's either four or five years. I'm the representative from the Lieutenant Governor. I am an attorney from Dallas. I founded and run a statewide nonprofit called Unlocking Doors that works with offenders coming out of incarceration.

MR. STEPHENS: Awesome. Thank you, Michelle. Thank you, Christina. I'd like to give the folks here a chance. Jim, will you please introduce yourself to the...

MR. CLINE: Thank you. My name is Jim Cline. I'm a civil engineer of Fort Worth. Done work both in -- both consulting and in -- over 20 years of city business, and now in the transit business with the Denton County Transportation Board. So I'm really glad to be here.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Jim.

MR. SALAZAR: My name is J.R. Salazar. I'm the General Manager of Central Texas Rural Transit District. I have no idea how long I've been on PTAC but it's been a long time.

MR. STEPHENS: And we thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Yeah.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, J.R.
MR. GLEASON: I think you and Michelle.

MR. SALAZAR: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Probably about the same time.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. McBETH: I'm John McBeth. I'm the President and CEO of Brazos Transit District. I've been on PTAC this time for two years and the first time for two years, so I've been on here two times with a -- about a 15-year interim in between.

MR. STEPHENS: And I'm Rob Stephens. I'm the General Manager currently in Midland/Odessa Transit District. Been in the industry for just a little over 25 years. Been on PTAC for about six and chairing it for the past year, and glad to be here. Very glad to be here.

And I think that rounds out all the introductions for -- for the committee members. Thank you, guys, for participating both on the phone and here in person. Your time is very valuable, and thank you for doing -- doing this with us today.

We'll move to number 4, approval of minutes. Has everyone had a chance to review those? Everyone had a chance to --

MR. McBETH: Move approval.

MR. SALAZAR: Second.
MR. STEPHENS: Second? Got a moved approval. Any discussion? No discussion. All in favor please say, "Aye."

("Aye" spoken in unison)

MS. CRAIN: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: Awesome. Thank you, guys.

All opposed, same sign. Hearing none, motion passes.

Thank you. Next agenda item, number 5, will be TxDOT's Public Transportation Division Director report, PTAC, regarding transportation matters. Mr. Eric Gleason.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Eric Gleason with the Public Transportation Division at TxDOT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome, Jim.

MR. CLINE: Thank you.

MR. GLEASON: Hope we are able to use your expertise and help you feel as though your time is productive spent with the Committee.

MR. CLINE: Glad to be here.

MR. GLEASON: Looking forward to a pretty busy next eight to nine months. So real quickly, we had a -- one of our two annual meetings yesterday with transit districts that we provide grant funding to. Many folks stayed over. I'm glad to see it to attend the meeting today. I appreciate that very much.
Successful meeting yesterday.

We had one panel topic on some driver training approaches in -- in the -- in the valley that I think triggered a lot of interest amongst members who were here yesterday, and we are encouraging the Transit Association to take the initiative to organize a proposal to us to extend that training on a more statewide basis since it seemed to be so well received.

Want to note three things for the Committee. So we have apportionments. The -- the feds have released the apportionments -- partial year apportionments through April 28th, 2017. And so we are moving at the -- in -- in the division toward February award of rural program formula funds.

And then following our more traditional annual timetable, looking at the May and June time frame for 5310 awards, regional coordination planning awards. And then assuming appropriations finishes up on time, then the legislature will be looking at state awards in June as we typically do. So getting into the -- the season of the year when we do a lot of work with the Commission and others on funding awards.

The other thing that I will mention is that you'll recall probably 12 months ago or so that was the conclusion of a conversation that this Committee that
had gone on for some time about next steps for the regional coordination planning efforts around the state.

And we got some real clear direction, and I think positive and helpful direction from the Committee that -- triggering a shift following this -- this current significant update of all the coordination plans statewide, which should be concluded by the end of February.

The Committee wanted us to shift gears a bit and shift out of funding planning and shift into funding implementation projects, things that we could directly attach outcomes to -- outcomes of the coordination effort rather than simply funding an ongoing planning effort.

What we are finding -- so having made that move and having moved to a point where early next month we will be publishing a -- a call for funding proposals to take that next step, we are hearing back from more than just a few of the lead agencies that since we are no longer funding the planning effort, that they will be relinquishing their roles as lead agencies because they can't afford to continue the effort.

So I don't want to draw any conclusions about what that means for it yet, but I wanted the Committee to be aware. And we may be interested in
1 bringing back to you at a later meeting sort of the lay
2 of the land, if you will, and consider whether or not to
3 revisit that issue, seeking some guidance on perhaps
4 what to do next with that. So that's out there.
5
6 And then the only other thing I'll mention
7 is with respect to our 5310 program, seniors and
8 individuals with disabilities, we are doing it a bit
differently this year. We -- we have a different
9 approach to our public workshops, working closely with
10 our Public Involvement section of the Department.
11
12 And rather than as we've traditionally done,
13 asking local stakeholders to score project proposals,
14 we're gonna take all the proposals that come in
15 statewide and score them internally. So that was -- I
16 think will get us past what was becoming kind of a
difficult point in the -- in the process. So with that,
17 Mr. Chair, I'll turn it back to you.
18
19 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, very much, for
20 that report, Eric. Okay. And that is a (sic) action
21 item, so I -- is there a --
22
23 MR. GLEASON: It's a possible action item.
24
25 MR. STEPHENS: Possible action --
MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

MR. GLEASON: And Jim, for you in particularly, all these include action on these just in case the Committee wishes to do something. So it's not -- unless it's part of the main -- you know, if it's clear that we need action, it's there as an option for you.

MR. STEPHENS: Well, I actually looked at the wrong one. I looked -- I skipped down to number 6. 5 isn't an action item, that's just a report.

MR. GLEASON: I just did that, yeah.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: That's not an action item.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Cool. Well, thank you.

MR. McBETH: Can I ask you a question, Eric --

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

MR. McBETH: -- about the 5310 program?

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MR. McBETH: This is John McBeth. You said that you're going to begin scoring inhouse, you're -- you're -- you're going to have a new process for doing them. Are you going to continue to depend as much as we
have in the past couple of years on the independent
living centers that we've been dealing with? Or is it
gonna be more just...

MR. GLEASON: We --

MR. McBETH: ...everyone that comes forward.

MR. GLEASON: We've not indicated any sort of a different emphasis, so we'll just see what comes forward. We -- you know, we are -- one area we should've narrowed a bit, we've clarified in the area of mobility management, we are more clear about making sure that we're looking at those activities that fall under that umbrella, only those activities that are directly related to connecting people with rides.

MR. McBETH: Good.

MR. GLEASON: And moving away from some of the more difficult to associate with service and rides than not. So trying to focus that a bit.

MR. McBETH: Okay. Answered my question.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MR. McBETH: Thanks.

MR. STEPHENS: Any -- any questions or comments? J.R.

MR. SALAZAR: More of a comment than a question. I -- I -- I understand that the scoring process can be lengthy at times now that we're kind of
doing it -- doing it inhouse. And I heard Kari kind of lay out the timeline yesterday -- yesterday. But I think that that process is now gonna be a lot more streamlined and a lot better way of doing things than we've done in the past. That's just my comment.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Appreciate that.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah. Thank you, J.R. Okay.

Any more comments? If there's no more comments or questions for Director Eric Gleason, we'll move to item number 6. It is an update on the Transit Needs Assessment work. Mr. Gleas -- oh, okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. GLEASON: If I may, Mr. Chair.

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: This is --

MR. STEPHENS: Please.

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric again. Preface this a bit. So those of you who were at the operator's meeting yesterday heard this presentation that Michael's about to give. I don't think it's any different, is it, Michael?

MR. WALK: No.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. WALK: It's the same thing.

MR. GLEASON: And I think what we would like
to hear from the Committee today, having heard this, and
I can certainly fill in some of the comments that came
forward during the meeting yesterday. But we are
looking to confirm that the description of work that
Michael's going to provide is -- is where it needs to
be.

I would like to hear some thoughts from the
Committee about, you know, what's some sort of next
level look at needs could be, because if there are
particular ideas around that that mean that we should
collect additional data now, we can do that in this
effort and not have to go back afterwards and try and
get something more.

So that's kind of where we're -- Michael
will describe to you something that sounds like a scope
that is set in stone. It is not. That's only the
result of us asking them to do that, to take it all the
way through to the level of task detail so that y'all
could get something to get your hands around and -- and
-- and react to. So we're open to suggestions from the
Committee on changes to the scope, additions to the
scope, things like that. That's it, Michael.

MR. WALK: Okay. Thank you, Eric. This is
Michael Walk. I'm with Texas A&M Transportation
Institute. I'm an Associate Research Scientist there.
Glad to be here to talk about this sort of next generation in the Texas Transit Needs Assessment.

For those of you that are following along on the phone, I will be telling you when I'm changing slides. I'm describing what's on the slide, so hopefully you'll be able to follow my pagination as we go along.

So the -- if you go to the sec -- third slide, actually, there's a two -- there's a map, on the third slide, of Texas, a red map on the left and a completely -- red and green map on the left and a green map on the right. This graphic was from the last time TTI performed a Texas Transit Needs Assessment about a year ago.

We presented the results of that to the PTAC Committee as well as the Texas transit districts. And that needs assessment was done in order to start the conversation about how to couch the needs for -- for Texas public transportation. Those slides are just an example of previous work.

If you go to the next slide, titled "Agenda," the whole purpose of this Needs Assessment 2.0 is we're gonna talk about that first. I'm also gonna talk to you about how we're going to -- or how we're proposing to approach this needs assessment like Eric
pointed out.

You know, this is at a pretty high -- actually, it's a pretty detailed presentation. I'll try to go as fast as I can to get to the main point of conversation which is now that we've heard about one way of approaching this, what other feedback do we get from PTAC to help fine tune that change or alter -- alter the scope.

And so hopefully as you're hearing the details during the presentation today, some things will strike you that maybe you think need to go in a different direction or you think might be critical issues to address.

I'll also talk about the timeline of the project today to give you an idea of, you know, from start to finish how long we think this much work would take. I think we do kind of have a hard deadline of before September hopefully this project being able to be done. So whatever is done needs to be done in September -- by September.

So if you go to the next slide, "Purpose and Benefits of the Needs Assessment." So this just highlights why we're even approaching this needs assessment on behalf of TxDOT. You know, a needs assessment is an important component of any ask for
resources. Doesn't matter what you're asking for. If you don't have a reason why, it's hard to justify that.

So a needs assessment is a great way to compare where you are to where you want to be and what's needed to get there. So this needs assessment is planning to do the same thing.

But the previous needs assessment we did where I showed you the maps of Texas, you know, we -- we treated all transit districts as if service was operated everywhere in the same way. And that, of course, was a weakness based on the timeline and the way that we initially went about the project.

And so this version of the needs assessment we want to actually produce a geo-spatially fine tuned needs assessment. That is, actually use real geography, real transit coverage area as the needs assessment, rather than just transit district boundaries.

And so this needs assessment 2.0 will produce that geographic analysis of where a service is and isn't operating at 12-hour weekday service span. And so we're focusing on 12-hour a weekday service for this needs assessment.

The next slide, "Why 12-hour Weekday Service" just gives an example. You know, this is a threshold that was used in the last needs assessment.
We're gonna con -- we're planning to continue using this threshold.

It's not the golden standard for everybody in all of the world. It's a reasonable standard of service as defined by the Transit Capacity & Quality of Service Manual. And so that's what we're proposing here and that's something that certainly can be talked about.

The -- the one benefit of 12-hour weekday service is that you can at least talk about meeting most work trip demands for those folks that work a -- a typical eight-hour, eight-and-a-half-hour day job.

You really need twelve hours of service to kind of cover the variation typical work hours and give people actual time to get to and from work. So when you add all that up, 12 hours of service is a reasonable standard to have. So that's why we're proposing that here for this needs assessment.

If you continue to the next slide -- actually, we're gonna go ahead and go one more slide, since that's kind of a repeat and I've already covered those, to the slide that's entitled "Step 1." So I'm gonna get into four different steps of the needs assessment. Step 1 is to create this service shape file geo database.

Basically speaking, we need to map every
transit service that's supplied by state funded transit districts, and that means fixed route, demand responsive, flexible transit, commuter buses, local buses, trollies, et cetera. All of those, we need to map where they are and also we're going to be collecting information about when they operate.

And the next slide gives you an idea of what this shape files (sic) might look like. It is a -- you'll see a map of Fort Bend County on this slide. And so this is an example of what would be in that database. We'd actually be collecting where the demand responsive coverage area is, where the fixed route transit is, where the flexible transit is.

And a note about fixed route, I do have in a handout this idea of collecting bus stops. That should really be corrected -- that was our initial thought but the timeline just wouldn't allow that much information.

So we are going to be looking at fixed route as just segments of open and closed door in order to analyze where service is actually accessible, right. We can't just draw a line on the map and all of that is guaranteed accessible. It's not necessarily the case, particularly for commuter type or long haul service.

So for fixed routes we won't be doing bus stops, we'll be doing service segments of open and
closed door service. So gives you an idea. We'll actually be creating maps of all these things.

The next slide entitled "Example Data for the Database," gives you -- gave you an idea of what -- what we'd be storing on the data sides. So associated with every shape on the map, right, every fixed route there'd be a days of service, hours of service associated with every piece of information on the map. So then we can analyze where service is not operating on which days at 12-hour weekday spans.

Go to the next slide. There's a series of slides here that I'm going to go pretty quickly through. It's just talking about how we would create this geo database. And so the next slide entitled "Create Database Structure," looks like it has a little table on it, that's the first step.

You know, we got to create what data we have to collect, to Eric's point earlier, about if there's something beyond even this scope that would be worthwhile data to collect that's -- you know, that's relevant, we could do that at this time and add that to the database structure, now, even if we don't perform detailed analysis on that data item. So something that was just for thought. So we have to create the structure of the database.
Next slide, "Update Existing Service Shape Files." Basically we have some of this data already. That map I showed you of Fort Bend County was collected when we did the profiles. And so we have a lot of that information.

So our first step will not be just to ask you for it all again. We're gonna inventory what we already have and verify -- if we already have information, verify with you the trans -- with -- with the transit districts as to whether that information is accurate. And we'll make updates to any existing information.

Next slide, "Data Collection Protocol." The reality is TTI will have to use several different staff members to perform this -- this mapping exercise. And so we're gonna create a data collection protocol that's simple and straightforward so that various people can work with various transit districts in Texas, in order to everybody's following the same standards of procedures so that, you know, the data coming in will result in good analysis coming out.

Next slide, "Collect service Shape File Data." Really kind of already talked about that. We're putting all that information into the geo database. And the next slide is "Mapping the Data."
So we don't want to just collect all this information and run our analysis and give you the -- the golden number. We want to -- we'll -- we will be confirming back with transit districts in Texas does this represent accurately what service is actually going on in your area. So that'll be the last step of this geo database.

Okay. Step 2. Next slide, "Step 2 Gap Analysis." Very simply, where is -- where in state funded transit districts is there not 12-hour weekday service. That's what the gap analysis will identify, what places do not have coverage with 12-hour weekday service.

We might identify places that simply don't have Friday service or don't have -- you know, Fridays at eight hours instead of ten. So that's what the gap analysis will do, identify all those locations and hours of service that are sort of missing from the threshold.

Step 3, next slide, "Cost Estimate." Of course, you know this is a needs assessment, so we want to be able to tie that, the identified gaps, to a cost. How much would it cost to actually expand service to be 100 percent 12-hour weekday service in Texas. There's a two-step process.

We have to account for inflation, so we're
going to project transit inflation, not just general CPI, using a method we used before, using transit cost data and looking at how we anticipate those transit costs will project into the future. Using that inflation into the future of the 2021 biennium, we'll then estimate the cost for adding service hours or coverage area in each transit district.

Last, Step 4, "Outcomes Analysis" and the report. One thing that we also wanted to include in this gap -- I'm sorry, in this needs assessment is the benefit of the investment, right. What is the outcome of providing 12-hour weekday service. And what other type of service we agree that this needs to be by, in terms of access to jobs, or health care, or opportunity. Or is there an economic impact we can quantify.

So TTI's going to look around the nation and industry for ways to quantify the benefits of expanded transit service, and we'll usably find in that search in order to produce an outcomes analysis for this needs assessment. And, of course we'll document all of our work, and I'm sure we'll be presenting it back here in another -- other places in the future.

So last slide, "Summary." Well that's not really the last slide. Getting close. I already told you what the need assessment's gonna be, so I'm gonna
talk to you about the timeline. So if you can jump to the -- two more slides, the heading of the slide is "Timeline."

As you can see on this slide, the project is between January and September of this year, is our -- is the timeline we're using. Looks like the handout doesn't match my -- just for the record, I don't -- the handout doesn't appear to match the updated timeline. So I don't know how that happened, but should be January through September, is the actual timeline.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. WALK: So, just very quickly, January we're gonna get things started. Meeting here is one of those items in January. If you go to the -- I'm not sure if your slides will follow mine now, but February 2017 we'll start the geo database.

The next slide is about the gap analysis. So we'll be starting the gap -- we'll finish the geo database and start the gap analysis by June of 2017. So that date is June of 2017. Then, by July of 2017, we'll be doing a cost estimate and the outcomes analysis. So that's one difference between -- if you -- if you're looking at the slides on the handout, the August 2017 slide should be July 2017. That'll include both cost estimate and outcomes analysis.
And then the -- if you skip one slide and go right to the final report and presentation, that date will be September 2017. My contact information is provided on the last slide, if there's any questions for me. And I'll turn it back to Eric. Thank you for your attention.

MR. GLEASON: Thanks, Michael. Mr. Chair.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. Thank you, Michael, for that presentation. Members, the Committee, you guys have questions or comments? J.R.

MR. SALAZAR: I have one. In your proposal, I didn't catch yesterday but I caught it today, you talked about three pilot projects, the three pilot districts. Have they -- those been identified yet?

MR. WALK: Not yet.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MR. WALK: We want to try to pick at least a rural district, an urban only district, and a mixed district that provides multiple modes and multiple types of services.

MR. STEPHENS: Jim?

MR. CLINE: One suggestion I'd have is on -- I really like the idea of, you know, looking for the benefits, what -- not only going to 12 hours would do. But I think there's -- you know, there's so much
turbulence right now in D.C. I would imagine it'd be really good to -- you know, there's kind of two goals, I would think is -- one is we need to sustain what we've got and add more to it.

So I think there's a case to be -- it -- if there's an offset to a funding drop, right -- so as you talk about the benefits to sustainment, it also says what is a great reason to keep the funding where it is and in fact there's even a better one to increase it. So -- but I think that's a less than trivial risk, the -- and this could be a target.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Jim. Anyone else? Christina or Michelle, you guys on the phone have any questions or comments?

MS. CRAIN: I don't.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. No, no questions.

MR. McBETH: I have one comment. And going -- what Jim said, Step 4, Outcomes Analysis of the report, most important there is estimating and communicating the benefit. We do a lot of work with the legislature. And one of the things we encounter with the White Paper and the large urban area issue and the -- and the rural funding issue was, well, what's in it for me. Prove it, you know.
What -- what are you doing. I mean, how's that gonna -- how does that affect my constituency.

What's the value of it. What's the economic value, your buses as opposed to Uber, or a taxi cab, or just walking to town to buy what they want to.

So I think -- I think we have to -- we really have to hit it really hard there because we give that -- we -- we get asked that question. Liz has probably been asked that question 25 or 30 times just this week alone, and it's only Thursday.

It's the first question out of anybody's mouth, why should we pay for this. What are we -- what's the state of Texas gonna get out of it. I think we're in a -- we are in a -- an era of what's in it for me. And if there's nothing in it for me, I'm not really gonna do anything about it.

Second comment, on the third slide there's a number there that says to get everybody to 12 hours, gonna take 8.7 million dollars. I assume that's 8.7 million dollars a year first. And is -- in coming up with what it's gonna cost to do this, are you gonna -- because that one's based upon what transit costs are.

Are you going to use something more refined other than just what we know transit costs are? I know you're gonna add inflation to it, but are there gonna be
other factors? Because those are the things we always
get asked when we say, well, for every -- every dollar
state money we spend, we're generating another four or
five dollars for local economies. Like, well, where do
you get that number. Prove it. So --

MR. WALK: Okay.

MR. McBETH: I know TTI, y'all were
instrumental.

MR. WALK: Mm-hm.

MR. McBETH: And I make no bones or have no
doubt about it, you were instrumental in the success of
the White Paper and the creation of the -- of the
dealing with large urban pop. You were instrumental in
that. It wouldn't have happened without those numbers,
'cause no one can -- no one questioned us about those
numbers. They questioned us about our rural numbers.

And -- and, like I said, we didn't have a
real good reason, we just thought just because. But
those numbers were critical to what we did. I think
they'll be critical at this needs assessment. If y'all
can give us the same kind of really strong concrete
numbers, it'd be very helpful.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, very much, Mr.
McBeth. Jim, you have something?

MR. CLINE: Just -- just one other, if I can
add something to some of what John said. We're seeing a
lot of push on the mobility on demand of the Ubers and
Lyfts of the world. There's some positives and there's
some negatives, and it may be something to the
nationwide transit's getting -- you know, having to
address that.

And the -- the -- the 31:58 (indiscernible)
take has been, okay, this is coming. We better put our
arms around it and embrace it, not try to ignore it or
fight it. There's lot of challenges with federal
funding, Title 6, all those things that happen with
that. But it's -- it's out there.

So I think, if anything, just as a --
something to recognize that, hey, this is something we
ought to at least know exists. It's something we ought
to consider. I think that would give credibility, too,
from the very -- you know, those that are saying we want
more of a business approach and use these options say,
well, hey, we're looking at these things. There's
issues.

MR. STEPHENS: Very --

MR. CLINE: Continual. So I think give more
-- I think more lift to the end product.

MR. STEPHENS: Very, very, very good, Jim.

Thank you for all the input. I have to agree with both
Jim and McBeth. I think we need to -- this is Rob. I believe we need to pay close attention to how we craft communicating the benefit, that we really send a strong message about what the value of transit has and -- and -- and also what Jim talks about.

There may be time on the Committee that we can work toward that and where we embrace that new technology and that change. And as a committee, we can work on that throughout the years.

You know, what does the future of transit look like, and maybe take in comments, suggestions, and maybe borrow some work from TTI if that's -- that's probably a different scope of work that maybe too large for this thing, but it may be something we can work on as a committee.

MR. CLINE: There's a lot of people that are doing it. Lot of --

MR. STEPHENS: Oh, yeah.
MR. CLINE: -- people answering all those questions that I think --

MR. STEPHENS: I agree with you --
MR. CLINE: Lyft.
MR. STEPHENS: -- Jim, 100 percent. Let's embrace that and move forward and -- and figure out how we work in this new environment --
MR. CLINE: It's part of our environment.

MR. STEPHENS: -- where technology's at.

Yep. Yes, sir. Very good. Any other comments, anyone?

Yes, sir, Mr. Eric Gleason.

MR. GLEASON: This is -- this is Eric. If I could ask the Committee for some guidance. We know from the map that Michael showed that we do have some areas of the state that already meet that minimum threshold. We know from what John has said, you know, the first question they get asked is what's in it for me.

So I'm wondering if we wouldn't be wise to identify one or two additional thresholds that we could evaluate as a part of this study that would say if you're an area that already has this, then your next step is what, 14-hour, Monday through Friday service?

Is it eight-hour Saturday service.

What -- what would be a next level investment that we could try and capture in the data we're collecting that would respond to the folks who already have that 12-hour investment. And because we know a successful package is one that has more in it for more people, we could quantify that.

MR. McBeth: This is -- this is John.

Because we already meet that criteria, and actually exceed it in --
MR. GLEASON: I'll have you in mind.

MR. McBETH: -- in our -- in our commute -- in our commuter operation and in -- and in some of our other fixed route operations. The biggest demand that we have coming to us, and it's never ending, and it's from always local elected officials and the Chamber of Commerce; people that are in positions of power and they run the informal network in their communities is -- is Saturday service. They don't really want Sunday service but everyone wants Saturday service.

And within two weeks of November, two weeks of Thanksgiving Day, they want it 15, 16 hours a day, all the way through the first of the year. And you -- you get hammered on it all the time. It's the only time that -- and we've actually tried to do it and we didn't carry that many people.

That's the only time that people will not criticize you for running around with an empty bus. It's like we still have it on Sunday. So, you know, Saturday service, that would definitely be the -- that'd be the one thing --

MR. STEPHENS: Next step.

MR. McBETH: -- that we would love to do if we had the funding to do it, but --

MR. GLEASON: What are we looking at? We
looking at eight hours? Twelve hours?

MR. McBETH: Eight. Eight hours.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. McBETH: It would be a split. It'd be a split shift of getting employees to work in the morning.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah, (indiscernible).

MR. McBETH: And then, since stores don't open till ten usually, having service from ten until six, something like that, be able to take the employees home. That's -- that's what they're looking for, 'cause these -- a lot of these businesses hire so many seasonal employees.

MR. STEPHENS: This may be more of a technical question. I -- this is Rob Stephens. I agree with you, Mr. McBeth. Thank you. We get that same question all the time. This may be more of a technical question than anything else. I mean, would it be easier if we offered maybe a small menu of -- of -- of -- and it may be too difficult to do that.

But say example, to add an additional route, just a 12-hour route. Or would that -- would that be the equivalent of Saturday service? 'Cause Saturday service would mean all routes, I guess all -- but let's say you wanted to just add an additional route or you want to add some additional hours, I don't know, how
could you plug in maybe a menu. That may be too
difficult to do.

MR. GLEASON: So -- this is Eric. I think
-- I think we ought to keep in mind what we want the
product to be and how it might be used. And we got in
to this yesterday a bit during the operator's discussion
because a lot of good comments, and in a lot of ways
what they meant to me was the -- what would happen
actually locally.

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: If you got money, what would
the local decisions look like.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Would it be a different kind
of service rather --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- than a bus. You had public
involvement going on, would you end up with something
else. All we're -- I -- this work initially was
conceived to support a discussion here about how do we
justify and ask for additional funding --

MR. STEPHENS: Got ya.

MR. GLEASON: -- at the state level. And so
we're trying to, I think, come up with outcomes that can
be summarized at that level, statewide --
MR. STEPHENS: Got ya.

MR. GLEASON: -- in the simplest of ways, you know. And, you know, here's the map, you know. And green is good and red is bad, and this is the current situation. Look, over here, for 10 million dollars, all the red goes away, or, you know -- and there's something very simple that we can communicate what's going on here.

So -- and where I'm going with that, Mr. Chair, is I don't -- I don't know if we can hang on to that simplicity and that ability to effectively communicate at one level the impact of an investment statewide if we go down the road of one route, two routes, this route, that route. 'Cause that's -- then we're into a process that has to go ask locally what they want to do.

MR. STEPHENS: Right. That's -- agreed.

MR. GLEASON: And I think that's not where we started this thought process. If that's where the Committee feels we need to go, then that's a different piece of work than what you just heard here today.

MR. STEPHENS: No, I agree. I agree with that.

MR. McBETH: Yeah, your -- your -- this is John again. Your -- your default really actually -- if
you were going to establish Saturday service, your
default really, in order to comply with ADA and to do
what the local community wants, you really have to --
you really have to operate -- if you've got a fixed
route, you've got to operate all fixed routes which
means you've got to operate all the ADA paratransit;
maybe not as many ADA paratransits, but you got to
operate some of them so that you've got comparable
service.

So I think we just default to the highest --
as I'm well-known for, default to the highest amount of
funding possible.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you can justify.

MR. McBETH: That you can justify, yes. You
have to justify it. That's the -- that's -- you know,
we're -- we're -- we're concluding a $400,000 planning
study right now. And I know one of the things they're
gonna come forward with is what they've been told by all
of the community leaders, which is we -- we -- we would
rather have Saturday service than have service on
Wednesdays or Thursdays. We'd rather have Saturday
service. Why don't you do that instead of doing it on
Wednesday. People got to go to dialysis.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. McBETH: You got to go to dialysis. So.
MR. GLEASON: So -- and just so we have --
so we have Saturday service. And if I -- this is Eric.
If we could ask -- if I could ask the Committee for,
what would be a next step, say on weekdays. So we got
12 hours. What would be a next increment in weekday.
Actually, when you start putting the workday together
with travel on either end of it, six to six or five to
-- that's really -- my experience tells me you really,
really want to be running 14 --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- and not 12 because that
really does capture --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- the full extent of
someone's --

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: So what's that -- so if we're
doing 12, which is good 'cause it's based in some
objective capacity, you know --

40:51: Amendment.

MR. GLEASON: -- accepted national standard,
what -- what would be a next increment. I'm just
looking for one more. Is it 14? 16?

MR. McBETH: Four -- four -- 14.
MR. SALAZAR: 14.

MR. McBETH: 14.

MR. GLEASON: We have -- we have --


MR. McBETH: Yeah, 14. We -- our -- ours do operate 14 hours, so --

MR. GLEASON: Yeah. 12 is kind of --

MR. McBETH: We have very -- we have had in, our planning study, people say well, we -- we wish you would run until 10:00 at night because we want to go listen to a concert or do this. But so few people --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. McBETH: -- and we can't run a -- can't run a seven fixed route bus system for just eight people to go see the opera.

MR. GLEASON: Well, my experience tells me that after 7 at night on weekdays that your next best investment actually is the weekend. Because weekdays, after --

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: -- 7 --

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: -- you're gonna run up five days a week, it's really expensive 'cause it -- it really drops off, and Saturday comes before that. So
why don't we -- Michael, we can talk up after this, make sure we're asking and collecting the right data. But if that is -- that's the kind of stuff they're looking for --

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: -- Mr. Chair.

MR. STEPHENS: Agreed, agreed. Any other comments, Jim? Were you gonna say something earlier?

MR. CLINE: No, I was -- I -- I was -- I looked at the map and it's a question with the analysis. There was coverage all over the state. It's just there' either -- so it's some transit needs 12 and this would make it - exceeds 14 or something like that.

MR. GLEASON: That actually is not covered all over the state. Every district has coverage, which is what that's based on. That -- that -- that's at a district level. We have counties...

MR. CLINE: (Indiscernible) --

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MR. CLINE: What I thought is if there was a -- if we showed a map where there was no service at all, some service, the 12-hour threshold and then something that exceeds that 14, that would be...

MR. WALK: And -- and, yeah. And this is Michael Walk, just to clarify with the previous map, in
that analysis which was done for -- you know, we just
looked at every mode that a district operated and
whether that mode as a whole, regardless of route
specificities, right, operated a 12-hour weekday.

And, you know, if all you had was one fixed
route that operated 12-hour weekday service in your
district, that was it, we -- you passed, even if it only
served a very small portion of your district. That's
why we -- that's why this iteration is geo -- you know,
like, we're actually mapping all the routes and all
that. It's a much more complicated analysis than.

MR. GLEASON: Our numbers are getting
better.

MR. WALK: -- our first take.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. So if I think we're at
the spot where we've concluded kind of discussing this,
I think we're at a spot where we probably need a motion.
Do we want to include for direction for Eric and his
staff to -- to add that -- that next threshold, the next
step for weekday service to 14 hours and then Saturday
service for those that -- that haven't met the
threshold; is that right?

MR. McBETH: So moved.

MR. STEPHENS: So moved? Okay. I have a
motion.
MS. CRAIN: Second.

MR. STEPHENS: Second from Christina. Any discussion?

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Discussion -- no discussion. All those in favor --

MR. GLEASON: Thought Christina said yes.

MR. STEPHENS: Chris -- Chris --

MS. CRAIN: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: Aye?

MS. BLOOMER: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: She's ready to go.

MR. McBETH: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All those -- okay.


All right. Then we'll move to item number 7 and we have review discussion of areas of Texas Administrative Code under consideration for 2017 rulemaking efforts. And I'll look to Mr. Eric Gleason, Director of Public Transit.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. So this is -- this is Eric. And I mentioned this at the operator's meeting yesterday and now for the Committee. Looking ahead, we see the need to do a -- I would say a significant amount
of rulemaking over the next seven to nine months. And, you know, we will rely heavily on this Committee for direction during that -- that process.

What I thought I would do today is just highlight the areas of the Administrative Code that we think we may need to get into, a very brief description of why I think that, and then talk briefly about a schedule over the next seven to nine months of how we see that playing out.

I don't anticipate a significant discussion today beyond sort of this program or that program, and not really delving into details. And so I'll leave the Committee with kind of a roadmap of where I think we go from here. And what I'm looking for is a general concurrence from the Committee that that -- that makes sense. Obviously, you'll have a chance to revisit it as we --

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: -- move forward. So the areas of the Administrative Code that I believe we'll need to do some rulemaking around, first and foremost, assuming that the appropriations request for the Department is approved, as it was submitted, and the additional funding is included for the large urbanized areas, we will want to go in to, at a minimum, end of the state
formula of the Administrative Code and adjust it to reflect that new group of urban transit districts and funding.

And so that's the state formula end of things. I suspect very much, although it's not necessarily -- it doesn't necessarily follow, but I suspect very much because the federal role formula, a large part of -- I mean, it -- that portion of the state side is the same. The state rural and the federal rural get distributed in the same way.

And so if, in our conversations in the state formula, we trigger changes that impact the rural state funding, we'll probably want to visit those changes on the federal side as well. So state rural, federal -- state urban and rural, state -- and rural, federal.

And then also on the federal side, I want to entertain the idea of looking at the 5339 program, the bus and bus facility program. Specifically I'm interested in -- in revisiting with the Committee the formula that we use to allocate those funds.

You may recall the current Administrative Code we used the relative condition of everyone's fleet to distribute funds that actually can be used for any eligible capital program purpose.

And I want -- I'm interested, if the
Committee is, in exploring at least one other distribution option, such as revenue miles which, you know, little more objective, little easier to calculate, little more transparent than relative fleet condition, which can get a little funky when we actually figure it out. So that for 5339.

And then the other program we need to go into is 5310. Now, this Committee spent a lot of time with the 5310 based on the map 21 authorization language. Subsequent to that time, FTA released more specific program guidelines which actually are different than what we have in our rules.

And so those guidelines were -- you know, were pulled through into the fast stack. So we will need to go back into the 5310 rules and update them based on that most recent FTA guidance.

And it -- you know, my understanding is that will get us in a conversation on traditional versus nontraditional providers. So that's a pretty -- pretty substantive conversation for this Committee to have, 'cause that's a pretty big part of that program. So those are the -- sort of the four areas that I see rulemaking in.

Now, having said that, the Department, as a matter of practice, does not do formal rulemaking during
legislative session.

MR. McBETH: Which is wise.

MR. GLEASON: Which is wise. So --

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MR. McBETH: Very wise.

MR. GLEASON: We are in session, so what I'm proposing for your next two meetings, your March and your May meeting when we will still be in session, is that we will divide up the conversation and walk you through the current code about why it is the way it is and talk about options you might be interested in us looking at. But we will not be putting formal rules or even draft rules in front of the Committee until after the session ends.

And the schedule actually works pretty well because what I see happening is -- I would suggest the way we move forward is that your March meeting, we come in and we talk to the Committee about 5339 and 5310. We save the May meeting for the formula conversations because that's much closer to the end of the session and we'll have a much better idea on whether or not that appropriations is gonna be there.

MR. McBETH: Mm-hm. Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: And that we actually -- that's -- this May meeting could be -- it could be a
substantial one because we'll probably want to spend some time walking through the formula, why it is the way it is now, and then identify and have a conversation around the areas that you'd like to see some ideas for changes.

Then, in July, we'll do a -- we'll do a one, two again. We'll have the operator's meeting with a lot of people in the room where we can walk through in more detail the ups -- you know, the pros and cons of the options that the Committee is interested in looking at. And then the next day, we'll have a Committee meeting, and you can send us off from that meeting with what you want to see in the rules.

And then since I think we'd like to actually introduce these rules for -- for -- proposed rules for adoption at the Commission in September, we may want to look at a special meeting of the -- of the Committee before a regularly scheduled September meeting. But that -- we can talk about that later as we get closer to that.

But the idea would be we'd have final rules adopted by the Commission by December, which would put us in a position to react to FY '18 federal apportions. That -- if that schedule makes sense to the Committee today, we'll kind of massage it and prepare to come back
to your next meeting, talking about the areas of change in 5339 and 35310, and then also begin laying the groundwork for a much more substantive conversation in May about the formula.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Eric --

MR. GLEASON: So just looking for a sense from the Committee.

MR. McBETH: Makes -- makes sense to me.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, makes sense to me.

MR. McBETH: Good -- good -- good schedule.

MR. CLINE: Seems like you thought it out.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. McBETH: Good schedule.

MR. STEPHENS: Let me ask the folks. This is Rob. Christina, Michelle, you guys got a chance to hear from Eric. What's your take on his direction there? Any comments?

MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. I think it's -- it's -- it's really well thought out. I like it. I like having the roadmap that Eric set out. And, you know, whatever meetings we need to have to get this done, I think it's -- it's important that we do so. So I -- I think it's great.

MR. STEPHENS: Awesome. Thank you.

Michelle, any comment?
MS. BLOOMER: This is -- this is Michelle. My -- I think it makes perfect sense. My only question, I guess, or concern would be given past experience with the rulemaking process, is it realistic to have it all done to present to the July semiannual and then the next meeting. That would be my only concern, but if Eric thinks it is, then I'm -- I'm good to go.

MR. GLEASON: Well, let me -- this is Eric. Let me clarify what I meant. When you said all done by July, it is not all done by July. What's -- what we're ready to do in July is having heard the conversation from the Committee in May about the formula, the areas they're interested in looking at some options on.

By the time July rolls around, we'll ready to talk more completely about the pros and cons of those options, which would lead to -- to direction from the Committee as to which of those to move with. So we don't have rule language in July, if -- if that's what you meant by being done.

MS. BLOOMER: Not necessarily being done, but I guess we're -- we'll be far enough in the process that we're confident we'll have something to take to the semiannual meeting.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: I just know in previous times
there was a lot of discussion that flowed over one full
PTAC meeting.

MR. GLEASON: Right. And so we'll have to
see where we are at the May meeting. I think we'll
probably schedule a pretty good chunk of time for the
May meeting. I think we're probably looking at -- it
could be like a full-day workshop. We'll have to work
that out as that gets closer because you're right,
Michelle, we want to make sure we have enough time to
completely get through everything.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: Awesome. Thank you for your
leadership there, Eric, very much. I -- at this time
there's no more discussion or anything or any questions
for Mr. Eric Gleason, I'll entertain a motion to accept
the 2017 rulemaking efforts and the timeline represented
by Mr. Eric Gleason.

MR. CLINE: So moved.

MR. STEPHENS: So moved, Jim.

MS. CRAIN: So moved.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Have a --

MR. CLINE: Second.

MR. STEPHENS: -- motion and a second. Any
discussion -- any further discussion? Hearing none, all
in favor please say, "Aye."
("Aye" spoken in unison)

MR. STEPHENS: All opposed say --

MS. CRAIN: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: All right. Thank you, guys.

All opposed, same sign. Hearing none, motion passes.

Thank you, everyone.

Let us move to item number 8. This is the discussion, development of PTAC Work Plan based on PTAC's guiding principles and comments made at the January 22, 2015 meeting. I believe this is kind of a staple on our agenda every time we meet. Just to remind everyone, if you have a chance -- I'm sure, Jim, if you look at it, these are kind of our guiding principles that we've been operating under for sometime now.

They're fairly basic, straightforward, supporting public transportation, promoting coordinated transportation, and some goals and objectives underneath them that do a number of things that encourage the stability and improvement in public transit.

Do you guys have any -- any comments about these guiding principles, or any comments, any questions you might want to discuss about what we've been doing or how we've been doing it? Guys on the phone, Christina, Michelle, do -- have you had time to review those and you have any comments or questions or...you happy?
MS. CRAIN: Yeah, I don't have -- this is Christina. I don't have any questions right now.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Good, good, good.

Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: I just have a few technical grammatical things. I'll just share those with Josh --

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: -- off the -- off the record.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: I think I'm the one that typed these -- or typed these up, so it's probably my -- my fault.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Well, we'll blame you. We'll do that. I think everyone here's -- that'll be fine. Jim -- Jim, J.R., Mr. McBeth, you guys offer some comments at all? Okay. There's -- as -- as Eric pointed out earlier, there's an action item next to this one if needed be, but if there's no action necessary, then I'm ready to move on if you guys are.

At this time, I'll move to item number 9 which is our public comment period. If -- do I have anything, Mr. Josh? No? We don't have anything for public comment, so --

MR. RIBAKOVE: I see -- I see one out in the crowd.
MR. STEPHENS: Do we? Okay. Okay. All right.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Thank you. Come up. Why don't you take a seat at the front, just so the microphones can pick you up really well. Yeah.

MR. STEPHENS: We have speaker name, Judy Telge, Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living, taking care of mobility needs for seniors. Please come forward, Judy. Thank you for coming today. What -- you have comments for the -- for the Committee?

JUDY TELGE: Yes.

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

JUDY TELGE: Thank you, very much --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

JUDY TELGE: -- Mr. Chairman and Committee members. Mr. Cline, nice to see you. I -- I come fairly frequently to make comments because the program that we operate in Corpus Christi over at Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living is sort of a nontraditional model which is very much driven by consumer direction as opposed to being a provider of transit.

So we've been very fortunate to work with TxDOT for several years. We feel like we have a really good gap filling service, especially through 5310 funds.
We feel as though those funds are -- you know, it's a great marriage between centers for independent living and that public source.

With that said, I'd like to let y'all know that with the changes that are occurring with 5310, one of the things that we participated in was where TxDOT said we want to hear directly from the users, the endusers, the recipients, the people in the communities throughout Texas about 5310 utilization.

So that was great, and we were actually allowed to have a site at Corpus Christi, which is our center, and people with disabilities and seniors are very used to going there. We had about 12 people around the table. There were other sites as well.

But what -- and I don't know what the outcome was. In terms of the numbers of people who were with disabilities and seniors, intended users actually made comments. I think Kari is in process of getting that compiled.

The one number she did have was 250 people showed up at the designated sites. Now, that's darn good. That doesn't count, though, the people that are at our place, sitting around a table on the phone, other people sending in comments, and other ways.

So I just wanted to let y'all know that I
think that's a -- that's a real good change because it is going to let you hear directly from the folks we work with on a day-to-day basis. So, thank you, Kari, TxDOT staff, whoever made that happen.

And then, just real quickly, as a nontraditional provider, I think that -- I hope that we will be -- and there are others -- that we will be engaged in the discussion about more nontraditional, particularly Uber-like transportation options that can be done under rural transit providers. I know of two.

We are one that has the TxDOT planning grant that is actually looking at an Uber-like app for the rural areas. We've just rolled that out. We're extremely excited about it. We'll be doing planning/demonstrations.

It's an important thing, we think, to be able to say can -- is this something that rural transportation can actually do successfully, and can rural transit, and we think it can, do a better job than an Uber. Can we make sure that people with disabilities are transported.

We know it's gonna be a challenge but there are things we can do. The other program, the other model that I'm aware of has also taken some Uber stuff and put it to work within the rural transit model
structure.

So I'm excited to hear y'all's say that that's going to be a discussion, that's going to be something to look at. And please, you know, give us a few minutes or whatever to also provide the input that we have. Thank you, very much.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Ms. Judy. Thank you. Always love to have you here making comments. I appreciate all the hard work you do out there at Coastal --

JUDY TELGE: Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: -- Bend. Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. Okay. No -- no other public comments? Okay. So we don't have anyone else to receive public comment. I guess can they -- we can't do it online there, right? That's not --

MR. RIBAKOVE: Right.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. So now item -- we'll move to item number 10. This is the time when we talk about discussion of proposed agenda items for next time and set a meeting date, I think. So any -- what you want to do first? You guys want to talk about meeting date or proposed items for the agenda?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Let me just -- this is Josh Ribakove. Let me just put out there that according to
our usual schedule, the next meeting would be on
Tuesday, March 28th, also at 1 in the afternoon. And I
can't tell you where that room will be because we're --
we will have moved before then.

    MR. McBETH: Yeah, cause y'all are living
under a bridge.

    JOSH RIBAKOVE: It'll be somewhere in this
campus most likely.

    MR. McBETH: They'll have y'all under Mo Pac
expressway by this.

    MR. RIBAKOVE: It'll be a beautiful place.

    MR. McBETH: It will be. Lots of traffic.

    MR. GLEASON: Lots of room.

    MR. McBETH: And lots of room, yeah. Well
lit.

    MR. STEPHENS: Everybody okay with the March
28th date?

    MR. McBETH: That works for me.

    MR. SALAZAR: I am.

    MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All right. Very good.

    MS. CRAIN: Yes.

    MR. STEPHENS: March 28th it is. So what
about agenda items? I think we've got -- after
discussion of this meeting, we've got kind of some
things we need to talk about next time, which will be --
MR. McBETH: Rules.

MR. STEPHENS: Rules, of course. Do we need to talk about the transit needs assessment work?

MR. GLEASON: If I could, Mr. Chair. This is -- this is Eric. I think my recommendation to the Committee on the needs assessment work is to let it proceed for a while and get far enough along where maybe -- there may be -- at the May meeting, perhaps we can report back on data collection and, you know, that level of participation.

But really I think it's gon take a lot of work right on up through the end of August to kind of bring it to a point where you all will be able to actually chew over the -- the conclusion. So we will look for some opportunities in May and July for updates, if you will, but I'm not sure I see anything substantive too much until it's -- it's done.

MR. STEPHENS: Very good. Jim?

MS. CRAIN: Sounds good.

MR. STEPHENS: You guys on the phone? Probably get to Jim. I'm sorry. Michelle, Christina, you got any ideas for agenda items next time?

(Ms. Crain and Ms. Bloomer indiscernibly speaking concurrently)

MR. STEPHENS: Very good. Guys? Jim?
J.R.? Mr. McBeth?

MR. McBETH: Nope, fine.

MR. STEPHENS: All right. Hearing none, I guess we'll just move on with the state of work that we've got for next time and the schedule that we're headed on.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: That being said, then we'll move to item number 11. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. McBETH: Move to adjourn.

MR. STEPHENS: Move to --

MR. SALAZAR: Second.

MR. STEPHENS: -- adjourn. J.R., second. All those in favor.

("Aye" spoken in unison)

MR. STEPHENS: All those opposed --

MS. BLOOMER: Aye.

MR. STEPHENS: All those opposed, same sign. Hearing none -- hearing none, motion passes. So we are adjourned. Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded)
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