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ITEM

1. Call to Order:

2. Safety Briefing.

3. Approval of minutes from March 27, 2018

4. TxDOT'S Public Transportation Division Director's report to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) regarding public transportation matters

5. Discussion of Texas A&M's Texas Transportation Institute's current Texas transit needs assessment to consider a recommendation for TxDOT's Legislative Appropriations Request. (Action)

6. Discussion on status of efforts and potential updates to PTAC Work Plan based on PTAC's guiding principles and comments made at the January 22, 2015 meeting. (Action)

7. Public Comment – Public comment will only be accepted in person. The public is invited to attend the meeting in person or listen by phone at a listen-in toll-free number: 1-855-437-3563 (US) with attendee access code: 598 304 40. The meeting transcript will be placed on the Internet following the meeting.

8. Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting. (Action)

9. Adjourn. (Action)
MR. MCBETH: Good morning, all. This is the May 8th meeting of the Public Transportation Advisory Committee. I'll ask each of you to please put your phone on silent so we don't have any music or interruptions during the discussions we're going to have today.

I'm John McBeth. I'm the Chairman. We have a quorum with Michelle on the phone, and I'll go ahead and call the meeting to order. And we, as always, will start with our safety briefing from Josh.

MR. RIBACOVE: Welcome to 200 East Riverside. We're in Room 2B.1. For medical emergencies, please call 9-1-1. As I said, we're located at 200 East Riverside Drive, 78704.

The AEV Unit is located on Level 1 in the main lobby in the Security Booth. First aid kits are located on each floor.

In case of a fire or other need to evacuate the building, fire extinguishers are marked and located on each floor. We will evacuate by walking down the stairs and exiting the front door of this building, turn left and gather near the sidewalks and fence line of the parking lot facing Riverside Drive.

In case of tornado or inclement weather, stay inside, move away from exterior walls and windows.
We'll proceed downstairs to the large auditorium. Or we can also move to the restrooms right here by the elevators as shelter areas.

In case of an active shooter or bomb threat, follow instructions from the public address system and on-site security personnel.

Thanks for your time. Have a safe and productive meeting.

MR. MCBETH: Thank you. Item No. 3 is approval of minutes from the March 27, 2018 meeting. It's an action item.

MR. CLINE: I move approval.

MR. FICKES: Second.

MR. MCBETH: We have a motion for approval and a second from Mr. Fickes. All those in favor say so by -- signify by saying aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. MCBETH: All opposed by no?

Hearing all ayes and no noes, the minutes are adopted.

No. 4, TxDOT's Public Transportation Division Director Report to the PTAC regarding public transportation matters. Mr. Gleason?

MR. GLEASON: Good morning. This is Eric Gleason, Director of Public Transportation for TxDOT. I
have five items in my report for the committee this morning.

The first is that as of this morning, FY '18, full apportionment is (inaudible); you probably know that. What you may not know is that we're seeing increases in every program from last year. We are looking at the smaller program; 207 has gone up -- percentage wise -- up just over 7 percent. But a large portion of that is due to Galveston being included in that program now. So when you take Galveston out, it's about a two and a half percent increase in 5307; small urban funding, one and a half percent in smaller than 5310 funding; 3.3 percent up in 5310 rural funding. The rural formula is up 3 percent.

The big new is in the bus and bus facility program where they for whatever -- we had no idea this was happening -- they doubled the rural amount for everyone. So everyone is still getting the same amount. But rather than having 1.75 million a year, we're now getting 3.5 million. So no idea that was coming. It's still way low for Texas. Rhode Island is still up there at about 25 or $28 per capita and we're still trying to break, I think, 50 cents per capita here in Texas. But nevertheless let's not look a gift horse in the mouth. That's certainly good news.
MR. MCBETH: Rising tides float everybody --

MR. GLEASON: That's right --

MR. MCBETH: -- that's what we were told --

MR. CLINE: And then the small urban bus and bus facilities is just shy of 5 million now, up almost 42 percent. So it is under bus and bus facilities so --

MR. MCBETH: Yeah.

MR. CLINE: -- at least from a percentage increase standpoint.

MR. MCBETH: This is John. We're finally getting our money back that they took away years ago and gave to the major metropolitan areas. We prevailed -- our argument finally prevailed and we're finally getting not all of it back, but we sure did get a big chunk of it back.

MR. GLEASON: So we have you to thank for the increase --

(Laughter)

MR. MCBETH: Oh, I think probably more Community Transportation Association of America and the Bus Coalition who was a big ally in this.

MR. GLEASON: We literally follow people
into restrooms crying and whining --

MR. CLINE: We're getting pretty good at that --

(Laughter)

MR. MCBETH: -- crying and whining.

MR. CLINE: We'll just leave it at that...

MR. GLEASON: -- not sure that needs to be on the record.

The second item to mention -- the second item to mention, the May and June Commission meeting is coming up. We are -- I think two things of note there. The coordinated call, which many of you participated in, we are going to move out with a first allotment of funding for projects from funding we already have in hand at the May meeting.

Those are -- you know, most of the money associated with the awards in May are going to be from the 530 state planning and research program, RTAC program. And we're also going to be doing the Seagram (phonetic) Placement Award. You may recall that for the first time in this coordinated call, we included funding for fleet replacement. So we will be making those recommendations to the Commission in May as well.

Leaving then for the June meeting the Rural Discretionary and Intercity Bus program awards.
And we're still fleshing those out.

And then the other thing in June, of course, will be the FY '19 state funding so we can have those funds under contract by the September of the fiscal year.

Just an FYI for the committee, we do have a first-ever sort of subrecipient satisfaction survey out. We've sent it to 78 transit directors, general managers, CEOs and other directors of non-profits that we provide funding to. We've only gotten responses from 21. So we're looking to boost that response rate over the next week or so. If you haven't had a chance to respond to that, please do. And if you have, please ignore the note I'll probably send out later today looking for additional information.

And as I'm sitting here talking, Ken, I want to make sure you got one of those. I don't know if you did or not. We don't provide you with the funding, so you probably didn't --

MR. FICKES: I didn't get that.

MR. GLEASON: All right. The fourth item is our July semi-annual meeting is on July 11th. And later on in the agenda when we talk about the next meeting of the Committee, we'll probably talk about whether the Committee wants to meet around that
timeframe in July.

And then finally, we mentioned last time I believe we were in the process of wrapping up our application to FTA for the state safety oversight certification. We have submitted that. We submitted it on the 5th of April I believe.

And we had a minor question or two from FTA so far on it, so we can only believe that it is proceeding through their review and assessment and that certification imminent.

So that concludes my report, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

MR. CLINE: There are three states that didn't -- Oklahoma and -- that wasn't on track to get their state safety oversight certification.

MR. GLEASON: Were not on track? Yes, there are now only three states that, my understanding, are still lacking any legislative enforcement authorities that they need to implement the program, which is a significant improvement over the past three or four months. So some pretty big states moved past that. I think New York and Illinois were the two big ones that weren't there yet several months ago, and I think they are no longer on that list. I think we're down to like Oklahoma, Tennessee and some other
relatively small state.

So they're pretty busy back in D.C. with everyone's applications. So I think we'll just have to wait until they get to ours. But, hopefully, that will be coming shortly.

MR. CLINE: Just one other question if I could --

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. CLINE: -- on those funding increases.

MR. GLEASON: If you could identify --

MR. CLINE: Oh, I'm sorry, Jim Cline. And my question is on these funding increases. It would be interesting to know how that relates to some of the gap funding. The gaps that we're gonna talk about a bit later and --

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. CLINE: -- how it will impact that.

MR. GLEASON: Sure. Okay.

MR. MCBETH: Any other questions for Eric?

(No response)

MR. MCBETH: Thank you very much. We'll move on to Item No. 5, discussion of the Texas A&M's Texas Transportation Institute current Texas trends and needs assessment to consider recommendation of TxDOT's legislative appropriations request. This also is an
action item, and I'll let Eric start this off.

MR. GLEASON: All right. Thank you. So you have in front of you in your packet a final version of A&M's needs assessment. There are some relatively minor changes to this presentation packet from your last meeting. Mr. Chairman, if the Committee wants, Kelly can walk people through the highlights of those small changes, but I can assure you that there are no truly substantive changes to it. So I can finish here and then if you want Kelly to walk you through those things, she is able to do that.

From our standpoint, today's conversation -- the Committee needs to conclude at the end of it whether or not it desires to send to the Commission a recommendation for an increase in funding to include in the 2021 legislative appropriation request. I think what -- in terms of what that action by the Committee today needs to look like, what we've done in the past is that the Committee ends up directing the Chair and perhaps another individual to work with staff to write a letter to the Commission that includes the following points of recommendation. So that's what -- that's where you'll need to get to at the end of this conversation if that's what you wanted to do.

Now, when we talked last, we were -- I
think everyone was trying to absorb the relatively large amounts of increases that were identified independent of the span in coverage improvement you wanted to take, the relatively large amounts of funding increases. So I think -- again, this is largely a Committee conversation. We don't have an additional presentation as staff.

There are a couple of different ways I think that the Committee can come at this number if they wish. I think the first step would be to pick a span of coverage improvement that the Committee felt was appropriate to request for this upcoming biennium. And then you can also consider as a part of that conversation, you know, how much -- of that overall increase that's been identified, how much of that is a reasonable amount for the state to shoulder, and how much of it might be reasonable some others could provide.

And so with that, Mr. Chairman, I will turn it over to your capable hands and allow you to facilitate this conversation.

MR. MCBETH: Great. Probably the -- of this report, this is the first comprehensive report that we have gotten that justifies almost a hundred percent of the need for rural and smaller urban transportation
in the state. There's a lot -- there's a whole lot of meat in this report. But you can summarize it pretty much all on Page 21 with this chart, which we went over at the last PTAC meeting. And basically the estimated total annual cost to fill all the gaps in millions of dollars. The current FY '16 operating costs of $208.5 million, and TTI had gave us four scenarios to cover these -- these gaps.

One of them was going to a 12-hour weekday service, which would -- the cost to span that gap would be $14 million statewide. That would require basically $3 million worth of new vehicles. And that issue might have just gotten solved by Congress with the new -- we don't know, I guess, so something staff could look at.

And then 3 million or -- $6 million coverage gap of operating cost. And that would be all the systems in the state going to a minimum of 12 hours of weekday service.

MR. GLEASON: Mr. Chair, if I may, the $3 million is asked for fleet -- is annualized replacement cost.

MR. MCBETH: Right.

MR. GLEASON: I think the one-time expense is closer to about 8 million.

MR. MCBETH: Yeah.
MR. GLEASON: But what we wanted to do was get a sense of an on-going annual increase that would sustain the whole.

MR. MCBETH: And I think what you -- what you could do is look at -- you can look at Page 19 and get the estimate of that.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. MCBETH: And you can look at Page 20, which shows you the one-time cost for vehicles and the 12 hours is $18.3 million. And it's 18.3 all the way down, regardless of the scenario. The total is $23 million, which would -- with this upcoming legislative session with them all saying we don't have any money; we don't have any money; we don't have any money, the easy thing to do would be to go forward with the $23 million thing and say we need $23 million we would like to have to support that. That would be an easy thing to do, but it might not be the correct thing to do as far as public policy for transit in Texas.

The 14-hour weekday service is considerably more expensive at $41 million, and then we go to the 12-hour weekday with eight hours Saturdays, it's $36 million total. And if we go to the 14-hour weekday, 8 hours on Saturday, it's $54 million.

The additional Saturday service,
regardless if it's 14 hours or 12 hours, it's very expensive. But that's a matter that we need to discuss as a Committee to decide which direction do we want to go with this. Do we want to ask for the least amount of money with the possibility that we would get that, or do we want to ask for what we as the appointed body think would be best for Texas?

And then in that discussion -- and Eric and I have talked about that -- in that discussion of Saturday service, we need to talk about how much of that Saturday service is borne by the state and the federal grants, and how much is going to be borne by the local communities that get that Saturday service?

But from my point of view, if a local community wants Saturday service, then they should be responsible for paying for a large portion of that Saturday service since our federal and state funds are already stretched to the max just to provide the daily service that we provide.

So with that I'll open up to comments about -- what I would like to see happen today is we decide out of these scenarios, do we want any of them, or do we want one of them as a preference? And then ask Eric and his staff to work with us in developing a letter as we've done in the past and submit that to the
Commission saying the PTAC has reviewed the report that TTI did, and our recommendation would be to go for these scenarios -- one of these scenarios and say that we would support that and then let the Commission, as they normally do in their LAR, make a determination what they think is not just reasonable, but what is possible.

I mean, we can ask for anything from the Legislature, but as we well know they can also tell us, "Get out of here. No." So I think that's what we -- that's what I'd like to accomplish today is decide on where we want to go with these, and then ask Eric and his staff to help us to draft a letter we can send to the Commission saying what our wish list would be for an LAR.

And like I said the last time and again today, this report is the most comprehensive report we've ever seen for public transportation in Texas. I don't know what we paid these guys for it, but we certainly got our money's worth. We can easily adopt this report as the PTAC's work plan, because it is full of very meaty issues that we can spend the next 10 years trying to address some of these issues.

So anyway with that I'll open it up to anybody's comments or questions.

J.R.?
MR. SALAZAR: My only comment is you mentioned whether we needed to choose one of these four or do something different. I think we should stay focused on all the work of TTI, and I think we need to choose one of these four. Now, which one of the four it is, I'm not sure. But I think we should stick with the hard work that TTI has done.

MR. MCBETH: Jim?

MR. CLINE: I wanted to step back and kind of wear the general public hat. That was the source of my appointment, and kind of step back first and say what is the immediate need from the public perspective? And I was looking at the numbers in terms of when you looked at the trip purposes, and I think this was actually very telling. This is Slide No. 3. It's that -- why do people want to do this? Why do people use our services, and the services that are funded by the state and use those funds? And it was either 70 or 72 percent were work, shopping or health related.

So we said: What are people from -- the vast majority of the people using the service for? Probably weekday kind of -- weekday timeframes as a priority. And then if you said, Well, okay, what would that -- then you say between 12 and 14 use it for work and shopping probably want to try to aim for 14. So to
me I was saying it seems like we should have -- and,
J.R., I would agree with you. I think at the end of the
day the long-term vision is what's laid out here for the
14 and Saturday. That's the long-term plan. But what
do we -- what should this body recommend priority for
funding? And it seems to me like it's a minimum of
either 12 -- I really like the 14 because that gets us
actually in grand total of operating dollars much closer
to the ultimate, which I think the 14 and 8 makes -- you
know, if we said, hey, what's the target, right, down
the road? But if we could aim to that because I think
the pitch for the service if we come back and say -- if
we say we're really aiming to make sure this is a
lifeline for a lot of the people out there, either be it
to work, to the doctor or even to the grocery store.
Right?

And so if we said we're providing that
lifeline for a big portion of the state. we really need
to have better coverage or span of time and we're gonna
make sure we get the weekday right, and the long-term
vision is going to add Saturday to that. It seems like
based on the capital dollars -- the capital dollars are
the same, right, no matter what we do. And then the --
then the question comes in, what do we do with
operating?
And so I would think, John, that if we came back and said, wow, the immediate goal would be to get to the 14-day (sic) weekday, and the ultimate goal is to get to the 14 plus Saturday. And I don't necessarily disagree with you on the who should fund Saturday. But if we step back and said start with what -- with the end in mind, okay, that's the end state of what we want to see, and then step back and say, Okay. Now how do we get there? It sounds to me like we could get there very effectively.

And again, I think the pitch to the Commission and the Legislature is this isn't like an optional deal. I mean, this is people that in order to get basic life needs and, you know, that kind of service, that that's what's needed for the state of Texas. And it's not like an optional. It's not a pleasure deal. This is a got to have it.

We've had a really good look in a -- not in the state-funded piece but in the -- in the transit authority perspective is that -- and particularly the more conservative environment, that pitches real well. It's saying we're taking care of our elderly. We're taking care of the folks that really need it, the disabled, and folks that really need the service to get to work. And it's a hard case not to accept.
So, anyway, I'm going on with it, but it seems like if we took that approach, put a stake in the ground and say this is where we ultimately want to end up, we're gonna focus our efforts on getting to 14 days (sic) and then have the Saturday -- 14 hours for standing coverage and then try and get to the Saturday. And then whether that's funded federally or by locals, it's really not a question at this point. I think if we said, Wow, what we really want to do is pitch this.

MR. GLEASON: That would be a pretty easy case.

MR. CLINE: It seems to me it would be a pretty easy case to make from the lifeline perspective. So I'll give it back to you, John.

MR. MCBETH: This is John. I think the 14 is a good sell from the point of view that it adds an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon. And it opens up more jobs. It allows you to take more people to work to do jobs that they can't get to now because we don't -- we start too late and they've got to find another way to get to work. And we shut down too early and they've got to find another way to get home, which normally involves spending the little money that they made to pay for their transportation there and back. So I think 14 is a very logical number -- 14-hour
weekday service is a very logical number to go for.

   Michelle, what are -- what do you think?

   MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I'm fine with Jim's proposal. I would agree, I think going to a 14-hour weekday first and then adding Saturday, like we're pitching it as a lifeline, not employment -- most lifeline services are Monday through Friday. Saturday is when you get into employment, church and things like that.

   (Telephone interruption)

   THE REPORTER: I apologize. I thought I turned it off.

   MR. RIBAKOVE: For housekeeping purposes, just so everybody knows, Christina Crain is also on the phone with us. And there are speakerphones up front and a sign-in sheet, which I neglected to notice. Please put your name on the sign-in sheet.

   MR. FICKES: Okay. This is Ken, and we operate a program called Rides, which is basically 24/7. And we use taxis and share ride providers for that. And it's a -- it's more than a lifeline. It's lifestyle in some cases, but a lot of it's lifeline. They operate a fixed route and it's where the towns pay, the cities pay all the match. And we run a 12-hour time slot plus Saturdays. We added Saturdays about two years ago.
It's incredible. The ridership on Saturdays is almost as much as it is during the week on a regular day. So it's shopping, going to work. It's like Jim said; it's still a lifeline service on Saturdays, but I think that 14 hours is certainly a good jump forward.

MR. MCBETH: Christina?

MS. CRAIN: Yes. So it sounds good to me. I'm fine with it.

MR. CLINE: Can I ask a -- this is Jim. Eric, have you gotten any feedback from the -- from the budget perspective what's in the realm of the possible?

MR. GLEASON: Yes. It is -- I would say without a doubt this would be considered as an exceptional item request; in other words, something that would be included in the LAR sent over, not how it was funded from -- from existing department revenues.

One of the things that is happening, as you know this program -- as you may know, this program -- the funding -- the state funds for public transportation comes from what is known as the non-dedicated portion of the highway fund. In other words, the revenues coming in are not dedicated as the gas tax is dedicated to the construction of roads. We have other sources of revenues for the highway fund, and
some of them are non-dedicated. That non-dedicated portion of the overall fund is actually decreasing, and it has to do with the commitments of -- the statutory commitments around the TERP program, which is an environmental quality program about the Department's contribution. So I don't fully understand it completely.

But the message I think from the Committee is that that overall amount of non-dedicated funding in the department budget is not growing. In fact, it's shrinking somewhat. So I think the prospects of new funding from that element of the program are not promising.

So with that, though, the Department has historically been open to including as exceptional items these kinds of requests.

I guess just to circle back one more time, what I'm hearing the Committee talk about I think is that the -- the weekday element is actually something that you would ask entirely for from the state. And that it would be the Saturday element that you would consider other sources of funding in making up that amount. I think that's what I'm hearing. But I do want to be sure I'm hearing that correctly.

We sent out some information to you
yesterday -- which I don't know if you-all had a chance to look at it; John has it -- that gives you a breakdown of where urban and rural get their monies from. And you can see in that highlighted line that state and federal funding make up anywhere from 42 percent on the urban side to, I think, about 65 percent on the rural side. And we sent that out as information to the -- thought about it in the context of what is the right number to ask from the state.

Now, we had not thought of a Saturday-weekday split in that conversation. That does seem to be the way the Committee is going. I just want to confirm that.

MR. CLINE: Could I -- John, this is Jim Cline. I would say the priority would be the weekday. And then -- but the long-term vision is to add in Saturday.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, I understand that. The question is -- if I may, Mr. Chairman -- is that that weekday element, that 14-hour weekday element, which is a $41 -- a $41 million increase, if I've got my numbers right, is that an amount to be included in an exception item request with the expectation that that is all state funding to fill that amount, or is -- the other way is that, okay, we have what currently -- the feds cover a
certain amount of the program. State covers another amount, and then local covers a third amount. Do we want to move forward with some sense of a balancing of amounts to get there? I just throw that out as something for the Committee to consider. It may not feel as though we have as much control over the others...

MR. CLINE: This is Jim, Eric. When you -- from the transportation Commission's perspective in items of the absolutes dollar value we're asking for, this is a pretty small amount of money. It's big compared to what we're getting now. But in terms of what's committed to some of the projects, you know, particularly highway projects in an urban area --

MR. GLEASON: Oh, sure, absolutely.

MR. CLINE: So the reasonableness test, one would be what is the increase over what we're asking for now, what we're getting now, that's a big number. When you look at in terms of absolute numbers versus what the (inaudible) that are made on the part of the Transportation Commission, you know, I don't want to say this is just change orders, but that sometimes it's just change orders.

MR. GLEASON: So what you need to tackle though is the dedicated versus non-dedicated, which is
not -- the willingness of the Commission to spend money one way or the other because there is a box that they're in constitutionally dedicated funds where they can't do that even if they wanted to.

MR. CLINE: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And that's a very legitimate issue, I think, as a policy issue for this Committee to talk about. I think that it's important to recognize that there are some pretty bright lines in the funding environment that prevent the Committee from contributing more. Essentially what they have to do is move money around in the non-dedicated element of the budget and make decisions not to spend it there but to spend it over here.

MR. MCBETH: Well, to summarize, is it the opinion of the Committee that the 14-hour weekday service, which is $41 million, would be what we would tell the Commission that we are recommending that they go forward with on the LAR, and we would like to set a goal in the future of adding Saturday service? Is that the consensus of the Committee?

If that's the consensus, we can make this an action item and make it a motion and adopt it, and then ask Eric and the staff to assist us in drafting a letter that we would send to the Commission prior to
their meeting to adopt their LAR, which I think you said was in August?

MR. GLEASON: The final adoption is in August. The timing for something like this is now.

MR. MCBETH: Now. So if that's the consensus of the group, I would entertain a motion that we go with the 14-hour weekday service as supported by the Texas -- by the TTI report with the ultimate goal of adding weekend service -- Saturday service.

MR. CLINE: I was going to make a motion, but can we talk about it just a second?

MR. MCBETH: Sure.

MR. CLINE: Because what I was going to suggest we say as a Committee is that the long-term goal for the public transportation is in the rural and small -- urban transit districts is 14-hour weekday service and eight-hour Saturdays, knowing that we're cognizant of the budgetary limitations that we're all faced with, both the local and the state level and the federal level; that the interim step is to focus on the 14-hour weekday, and then -- and the associated capital that goes with it. Because we're talking about the 41 million in that case, but there's another 23 in capital that's hanging out there also. Is that correct?

MR. GLEASON: There's a one time --
MR. CLINE: The one time and then the annualized purchase --

MR. GLEASON: Correct. But I think you could probably make the argument that the one-time amount could be like the first year of new money to be spent on capital for several years, and then you would roll out the service of the -- I think it's probably included, and then you just have to annualize the replacement amount.

MR. SALAZAR: So if that -- I'm just --

MR. CLINE: So I'm trying to --

MR. MCBETH: Can you make that -- can you make that as a motion?

MR. CLINE: I'd like to make that as a motion; that we set a long-term vision -- this is Jim Cline -- that we set a long-term vision for 14-hour weekday service and eight-hour Saturday service for the State of Texas, recognizing the budgetary limitations of all three elements, both federal, local and state, that we -- our recommendation is to prioritize the 14-hour weekday service and recommend that the Staff prepare a request to the Transportation Commission to support the 14-hour weekday service, both capital and operating.

MR. MCBETH: Okay. We have a motion very well articulated. Do we have a second?
MR. FICKES: I'll second.

MR. MCBETH: Mr. Fickes seconds it.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. MCBETH: All those opposed, nay.

(No response)

MR. MCBETH: There being all ayes and no nays, we will -- the motion carries and we will ask Eric and his staff to prepare the letter --

MR. GLEASON: And work with you --

MR. MCBETH: -- and work with me and with Jim since he made the motion, yeah.

MR. CLINE: And I would add that I'd like -- I'd be happy to help if you -- the thought process that I would add in is that we come back in and say why did we choose the 14, and why did we choose the weekday, the lifeline service in order to get people to jobs, get them to healthcare, and get them to meet basic needs.

Now, there's a gap -- and Michelle identified it -- that the Saturday employment, people working at the malls and things like that, and those particularly entry-level jobs that are often on the weekends, but that's a gap they're gonna have, but we can tackle the vast majority of those jobs and do a
better job of it by adding an hour on either end. So I'll be happy to assist with that, John.

MR. MCBETH: Super. Thanks.

Okay. There being no more discussion, we'll move on to Agenda Item No. 6. We'll let Eric tackle this one.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you. So at your last meeting Ken asked about -- we were on the agenda item that we typically are about the program and guiding principles. And Ken asked if we could prepare a summary of work that had taken place on the Committee or with the Committee with respect to each of those. And so we provided you-all in your packet that information.

And we -- what you got in your packet you had -- you've got three items in your packet. And, you know, the third item you got was actually the principles -- the guiding principles as adopted by the Advisory Committee at the time, which was February of 2006. And I think that -- for the record, I know, Michelle, I believe you were Chair of the Committee at the time, and, J.R., you were on the Committee and I believe, Christina, you were at the time.

MS. CRAIN: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And at the time we had three active members of the Committee that were -- you know,
had a lot to do with what these principles read as and no longer was the case. So it's a good opportunity, I think, to revisit those.

Now, to help you understand more about what's been done, we summarized it in two ways. The first way we summarized it was looking back over the Committee's agendas between 2012 and '18. We broke Committee activity down into four areas of effort. One was around the rules; second, program guidance; third, legislative policies and appropriations requests; and then fourth, long-range transit planning, and provided the Committee with a bulleted list associated with each of those four groupings.

The final thing we did for the Committee was we actually went back to the principles, broke them out by objective, and provided the Committee with a summary -- sort of a general summary, if you will -- of activities that has occurred at the Committee with respect to each of the principles.

So, again, this is largely, we think, a Committee conversation today. I think -- just again to kind of kick this off, the Committee could choose to do -- could choose to say, do we like the concept of having guiding principles, and so let me just take a moment here.
At the time these were developed, the idea behind the guiding principles was to have the Committee establish things that were important to it to achieve for public transportation that it could reference independent of the specific topic that was in front of the Committee for discussion. And so that was the primary purpose of the guiding principles piece that was developed back in 2012. It was not supposed to be a piece that was discussion topics specific for the Committee. It was supposed to be more general than that and to allow the Committee to come back to these when it was in specific conversations to remind itself of what it was attempting to achieve on the larger scale. So that was the intent of the principles. So the Committee could decide that it liked that notion and that it was time to revisit these and update them.

The other thing the Committee could do would be to say that a more -- that a different way of moving forward would be to work with a set of general categories of topics like we provided you as a summary of the work efforts, and to talk more specifically about specific rule changes the Committee may be interested in, specific areas in programs they wish to provide guidance on and so forth, and to revise this -- so we wouldn't necessarily have guiding principles as much as
we would have something that looks like a work program. And, of course, it's always possible to do both.

So I will kind of leave it there and recognize that this might be a little -- this might be a conversation that may be difficult to get going. I don't know -- I didn't -- Michelle, I didn't warn you I was gonna do this. I don't know if you want to provide any more context for the Committee before the discussion or just let it come out during that.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I think we can just let it come out. It's been quite a few years since we did the guiding principles --

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: -- but I think you covered them very well.

MR. GLEASON: All right. I'll turn it over to you then, Mr. Chair.

MR. MCBETH: Well, I'll start by saying after the last meeting I began thinking of these guiding principles and what we had accomplished in each one of them. And when I got back I started making a list. Then the other day I got this master work from Eric. And as Michelle said, you and staff have done a masterful job in operationalizing what has occurred with the guiding principles. For a volunteer committee, this
Committee has been awfully, awfully busy when you look at this particular document and all that has been accomplished.

If nothing else was accomplished, the -- just the coordinated and combined call, that alone has made a complete difference in public transit throughout the state. And that originated with this Committee.

Then all the rule changes that we've seen and the fact that, as I told the Commission, there was a time when the word rule change was the nastiest word in the world to come out of TxDOT's mouth. But the stuff that we have changed has been adopted unanimously. It's been -- every one has been in a great mood with no negative comments. So I don't know that this Committee is for that, but I do know it's completely different than it used to be. So it's worked -- as far as where we go from here, I like breaking it down into these four categories: Rules, program guidance, legislative policy, long-range planning. And I think that could be -- like I said earlier -- the TTI report could very easily be our work plan for the next several years. There's so much meat in this report that we could go through and say, Okay, what do we need to do in order to change that, or to change that or change that.

I know the one thing everybody is very
interested in, at least over at the Legislature and, I think, at the Commission, is performance. Everything needs to be performance based. We need to make it a lot more objective. And instead of people just getting their money and spending their money, having results driven by grant money. So that's just my take on this.

J.R., you've been here a long time...

MR. SALAZAR: Well, and I was going to tell -- say to the Committee and to Tim in particular, you know, part of the guiding principles we adopted many years ago kind of fell to the side because we had so few committee members that we really weren't able to focus in on what we said we were going to do. So I appreciate you bringing up the facts that I think we need to decide. I'm okay with the guiding principles, and I'm okay with the work plan in general as well. I'm not sure which way I would prefer, but I'm okay with it either way, thinking and deciding which way we want to go with it.

MR. MCBETH: Michelle -- this is John. I'll defer to you because you're kind of the historian of the Committee.

MS. BLOOMER: Well -- this is Michelle -- Michelle has slept quite a bit since then --

(Laughter)
MS. BLOOMER: -- but I like Eric's explanation.

MR. CLINE: John, may I --

MR. MCBETH: Yeah. Sure.

MS. BLOOMER: Or maybe J.R. can provide some additional input as the former Vice-Chair?

MR. JOHNSON: Jim?

MR. CLINE: Yeah, just a couple of things. I think on the guiding principles -- I mean, our goals remain constant. I mean, those are solid -- these are solid things for this group to do. And I think it's also consistent with our mandate in the Transportation Code also on what we're supposed to do -- advise the Commission what should we do in our advising and providing advice to the staff and then the Commission. I can see us modifying the objectives --

MR. MCBETH: That's correct.

MR. CLINE: -- as time goes forward. And that could be -- the objectives could be how we frame the work plan. But in my opinion I think the two -- you know, support public transportation, promote coordinated transportation -- yeah, that's what we do. Right? I mean what we should do and some specific -- I think some of the objectives that are -- particularly the tasks that I would be very open to discussion with the staff
on those things, and particularly on an annual basis
where we really -- maybe a biennial basis I would think
would be -- based on the Legislature -- that if we sat
down and said, "Hey, in the next two years we want to
look back and say we checked these off. And, you know,
it's like asking for this money when we make the
legislative request, you know, we can fast forward that.
And I betcha we get some; we don't get all. So it's
gonna be a continuing process. How do we get to that
end goal and then the steps it takes to make that
happen. Because it's local funding; it's federal
funding; it's state funding. How do we match those up?
And there's gonna be local decisions, too. Different agencies want -- they're gonna want different things.

You know, Ken brought up a little earlier
that Saturday service really is a big deal. I think
there's some innovative pieces that can come in here
with -- the ride share. How do you get that to where we
can use federal money for that? I mean, I can tell you
that that's not just rural and urban transit districts.
That's nationwide. That could be a game changer for how
we spend our money. And how do we get the innovation
and how do we do some different things; Eric, you and I talked about even on driverless vehicles. That's not --

based on the events of yesterday, that's not that far
Anyway, I'd like to see us modify the objectives and some of the specific tasks. That would be a way to do it in the same format, because I don't think -- the template is not bad. And then do that on an every-other-year basis and then we have a really nice plan to be able to also go back to the Commission and say -- have the Chair go and report and say not only is that our recommendation, but we've started -- this is a plan that we've executed. And I think that's a -- that tells a great story for the staff, tells a great story for the Committee, and it tells a great story for support of public transportation.

MR. MCBETH: This is John. That's -- those are all good points. Could we -- could staff --

MR. GLEASON: Could we -- could staff --

(Laughter)

MR. MCBETH: Now, I'm not -- I'm using the imperial "we" --

(Laughter)

MR. MCBETH: Could staff, in light of the adoption of -- the adoption of the 14-hour day thing we just did that we're gonna send to the Commission, could staff develop under each of these guiding principles -- could staff develop objectives and tasks that would
implement that in the event that we got it so that we could say, if this funding is forthcoming, we at PTAC have adopted objectives and tasks that we will work with everybody statewide to make sure that we get every penny's worth out of the money that we're given. Is that something that staff could -- I mean, y'all certainly have ideas because you've seen so many things come up because of all the people that you're dealing with out here, so you certainly have ideas of things that -- new rule changes we need or changes to the administrative code or things like that. So I'm just wondering if we could, as Jim said, keep the template, but change the objectives of the task -- or at least change the tasks so that it dovetails with getting the money we want. Could that be done?

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. CLINE: This is Jim. One of the other things that would happen -- and this is the reality -- that if it comes back less than 41, how do we do that in a very efficient manner?

MR. MCBETH: Exactly. Exactly.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, we can do that.

MR. MCBETH: I think that falls under strategically leverage, all available resources to maximize service provided throughout the state. So if
we get that money, what are the tasks that we're going
to have to accomplish in order to make sure we meet that
objective.

    MR. GLEASON: I don't know if you can
repeat what you just said, but I can put it in writing.

Can you just --

    MR. MCBETH: I can shoot for that.

    MR. GLEASON: Thank you.

    MR. MCBETH: The only issue -- and I gripe
about this a lot -- this is John again -- and I will
continue to gripe about it. The only issue I have is
the one thing in here where we're talking about
sustainability. And I just don't see that public
transit -- I mean, we can play a role in sustainability,
but I don't think we can make our communities
sustainable. That's what councils and mayors and that's
what -- I'm coming from the point of view of having
operated in the most planned community in the world, The
Woodlands, since 1986. Everything there is sustainable.
But transit plays such a teeny weeny little part of
that. There's so many other things. So I don't -- I
think we can leave it in here. I just don't know that
there's -- I don't know that there's tasks that we can
do that we can point to and say, Well, we made that
community more sustainable.
I think what we could do -- and I'm glad Ken brought it up -- is we really need to look at ride sharing because that is something that we're struggling with right now in my system because it does not lend itself to the FTA rules, background checks, drug screening, all that kind of stuff. It just doesn't lend itself to that. And that's where the conversations that we've had with all the ride sharing people have always ended. They're not going to change their business model just because the FTA says we want random drug tests. They're not gonna do that no matter how much money you think you can give them, that's -- to them they're not changing that. They'll do like they did in Austin and they'll leave. They'll just leave.

MR. GLEASON: So there is a lot of effort around the transportation network companies and models that are beginning to be developed by public agencies that do incorporate that as an option. We can certainly look at some of the background information. It has to do with offering -- really quickly, it's one of the menu of options that is available, some of which are consistent with federal guidelines that you put together as a package that takes advantage of -- it's not as straightforward as --

MR. MCBETH: Yeah, it's not. And I think
also autonomous vehicles, that is something that is moving in quantum leaps right now. We have our own little committee that's looking at that right now.

MR. FICKES: This is Ken. I was going to say about the shared ride issues, we've had shared ride taxis for years. We've never -- the two primary shared ride people -- Lyft and Uber -- and one of their big issues is drug and alcohol testing. Well, there's a carve-out in the rules saying the consumer has a choice amongst providers that you're not required to do that. It's amazing how many people in the FTA circle don't know that, but they have a carve-out for it. So that's something that we should be looking at.

Other contract clauses that are required by FTA didn't seem to be a big hurdle for some of them. Maybe there's work to be done there.

MR. CLINE: We've seen -- this is Jim. We've seen, you know, the -- rely on using the transportation network company rather than sending one of our vehicles can be 10 to 1. It's huge. It is off the rails. And if we -- here's what I really like about the -- well, we agreed to do this -- the idea of a 14-hour span of service -- is if you look at how you optimize your use of local dollars, which may be able to pay for some. And I've seen it done with discounts
where -- in geofencing, and there's some really -- I'd be happy to share that.

That would be a good topic, Eric, for some innovations, and I'd be happy to share with the group some of the things that we've seen. That -- because it is so -- the ROI is so high, it may better to spend local dollars to do some of those things, not use federal for it, leverage your federal money for something else so we bring a comprehensive look at how the funding is being utilized for use of federal money where it needs to be used, state money where it needs to be used, and local money where it needs to be used. And then look at things like TDCs and -- there's some really interesting things from a funding perspective I think we can do to get much more -- if you get to that 14-hour service and, you know, we've seen that having the TNC's backstop with Lyft service or agency service for the disabled -- and because that's basic. They don't -- the real question was the TNCs, I think, at the end of the day is not getting drug and alcohol testing; it's going to be about how they deal with disabled folks.

MR. FICKES: Exactly.

MR. CLINE: And if -- and that's the space that we are gonna be the very best at, taking care of those people with special needs. That's what -- I
believe that's what the transit, you know, providers --
that's a space we'll own. And if we could go and do
things to do the general service -- and some of our
disabled folks, maybe a blind person, could use Uber,
Lyft -- and there's a bunch of other companies. There's
just not two; there's a bunch -- that they may choose
because it's so much more convenient and it's so much
faster that we may be able to really leverage our money
where it needs to be, which would be really cool.

So, anyway, I'm just -- I'm talking a lot
today but --

MR. GLEASON: I think what we -- if I may,
we can circle back to getting some direction from the
Committee on how you want to move forward. What I've
heard is if -- and you can tell me; I'm paraphrasing
this -- the concept of having at the goal level
principles pretty much like what they are here is
something the Committee is fine with; that that next
level of detail, whether we call it an objective or
whether we just call it a work program, that would be a
more specific focus on -- that would translate to work
effort here at the Committee. And one of those items,
if not all of those items, would be related to, you
know, how would the state implement additional funding
were it to become available to achieve the goal of
14-hour weekdays coverage as the study identifies, and then move into Saturdays.

I will say there's bound to be, and there are going to be, other topics of policy significance that Committee will need to talk about, and we'll work to weave those into that. And I'm thinking we'll put together for discussion purposes a document for the next meeting that we'll take this conversation (inaudible).

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, could -- could you keep your voice up?

MR. GLEASON: Sure. We will put together a document for this Committee at your next meeting that will take this conversation to the next step. I don't know if we need a specific action at this point from you-all. I think it's well understood what you're looking for.

Other potential topics are going to include the Asset Management Plan requirement that is before us that FTA has where we have -- well, we will bring a discussion to this Committee at your next meeting that will kind of outline where we are on that. I think there's likely to be some fairly substantial policy discussions associated with that plan and how to fund it that I would like some feedback from this Committee on.
We've talked about performance, and I think that's clearly an area we can come back to you with. There are in fact some trends out there that we look at in our annual statistics report we put together that is somewhat troubling, if you will. I think we -- we'd like some feedback from the Committee, some advice and direction on how to address those.

We may want to look at, you know, the use of inner city bus funding in this state. Several years ago we had some work done -- "we" meaning the Division had some work done -- around looking at how other states approach their inner city bus program, which I think is still relevant and still up to date enough to engage the Committee in that conversation as well. And that potentially represents funding that could be used to accomplish some of -- well, they're rolling something -- I tried to identify that.

(Laughter)

So anything else on this topic for us? We will -- I don't -- I don't know how polished it will be by your next meeting, but we will definitely bring something that will be food for thought.

MR. MCBETH: It will be a start.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MR. MCBETH: It will be a start. Great.
Thanks. Great discussion.

Item No. 7, public comments, do we have any public comment parties?

MR. RIBAKOVE: I received no public sign-in cards.

MR. MCBETH: Okay. We received no public comment cards. Is there anybody in the public that would like to address the Public Transportation Advisory Committee?

Seeing none, we will move on to Agenda Item No. 8, propose and discuss agenda items for next date, the next TPAC meeting. I think we've already got the agenda laid out right now for staff. What would be the date be?

MR. RIBAKOVE: It's the PTAC tradition to have the meeting the day after the semi-annual operators -- that would be the transit operators meeting people in town. And the date of that would be Thursday the 12th of July.

MR. FICKES: This is Ken. Isn't the operators meeting earlier this time than usual?

MR. GLEASON: It's the 11th. That is earlier.

MR. FICKES: I just looked at my calendar and I'm gonna be out of town -- I'm gonna be out of the
state for a wedding. So I won't be around at that time.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I will be out of the country -- I will be back July 15th.

MR. MCBETH: Well, that's two people that's not a good date for. So do we want to consider another date?

MR. GLEASON: We will. Maybe the next week?

MR. MCBETH: That would work.

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, how long are you out of town --

MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. I will be on vacation that week.

MR. GLEASON: We will send some dates out.

MR. MCBETH: Okay. Great. And that moves us to adjournment. We'll need a motion and a second unless y'all just want to hang around...

MS. BLOOMER: So move.

MR. FICKES: Second. This is Ken. Second.

MR. MCBETH: All in favor by saying aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Eye.

MR. MCBETH: All opposed?

(No response)

MR. MCBETH: The motion carries and we are
adjourned. Thank y'all. Great work.

(Proceedings concluded at 11:07 a.m.)
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