## Transcript of the Testimony of TxDot PTAC Meeting

Date:

September 18, 2018

Case:

**TXDot PTAC Meeting** 

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018

	MEETING, PUBLIC 09-18-2018
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	TRANSCRIPTION OF
9	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
10	PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
11	PUBLIC MEETING
12	TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2018
13	10:00 A.M.
14	200 EAST RIVERSIDE DRIVE, ROOM 2B.1
15	AUSTIN, TEXAS 78704
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	REPORTED BY: PAIGE S. WATTS, TEXAS CSR NO. 8311  MEETING, PUBLIC 09-18-2018

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT AND PARTICIPATING:
4	John McBeth, Chair
5	Jim Cline, Vice-Chair
6	Ken Fickes
7	J.R. Salazar
8	Marc Whyte
9	Dietrich Von Biedenfeld
10	
11	TxDOT PRESENT AND PARTICIPATING:
12	Eric Gleason, PTN Director
13	Josh Ribakove, PTN Communications Manager
14	Kelly Kirkland, PTN Business Operations Manager
15	Mark Sprick, Program Specialist
16	Theo Kosub, Strategic Programs Development Manager
17	
18	
19	OTHER SPEAKERS:
20	Eric Backes, Executive Director of TTA
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	MEETING, PUBLIC 09-18-2018

## 1 MEETING AGENDA ITEM 2. 1 Call to Order. 3 2 Safety Briefing. 4 Introduction of Public Transportation Advisory 3 Committee (PTAC) members and comments from PTAC 5 members. 6 Approval of minutes from May 8, 2018 meeting(Action) 4 7 5 TxDOT's Public Transportation Division Director's 8 report to PTAC regarding public transportation matters. 9 Discussion of Federal Transit Administration 6 (TTA)-required Transit Asset Management plans. 10 (Action) 11 7 Discussion of performance trends noted in the 2017 12 Texas Transit Statistics Report. (Action) 13 Discussion of FY19 work program topics including, but not limited to: 14 \* Implementation strategies in anticipation funding included in TxDOT's 2020/2021 Legislative 15 Appropriations Request \* Administrative rule revisions in response to FTA 16 Public Transportation Safety Program final rule (672,673)17 \* Review of Intercity Bus Program priorities and practices 18 (Action) Public Comment - Public comment will only be 19 accepted in person. The public is invited to attend the meeting in person or listen by phone 20 at a listen-in toll-free number: 1-855-437-3563 [US] with attendee access code: 598 304 40. 21 The meeting transcript will be placed on the Internet following 22 the meeting. 23 Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting. 24 Adjourn. (Action) 11 25

1 MR. MCBETH: Well, it's 10:00 o'clock. 2 The meeting is supposed to start at 10:00 o'clock. John McBeth. I'm the Chair of the Public Transportation 3 Advisory Committee, and I'll call the meeting to order. And, Josh, if you would, the safety 5 briefing. 6 7 MR. RIBAKOVE: Sure. Welcome to 200 East Riverside Drive. We're in Room 2B-1. If there's a 8 9 medical emergency, please call 9-1-1. This is, again, 10 200 East Riverside Drive, 78704. There is an AED unit. It's downstairs on Level 1 in the main lobby at the 11 security booth. First aid kits are marked and located 12 13 on each floor. 14 In case of a fire or any need to evacuate 15 the building, fire extinguishers are also marked and located on each floor. The one on this floor is right 16 17 out in the little hallway by the restrooms next to the 18 elevator. We'll evacuate the building if we need to by 19 walking down the stairs and exiting the front door of the building. Then, we'll turn left and gather near the 2.0 21 sidewalks and fenceline of the parking lot facing 2.2 Riverside Drive. 23 We're not expecting it; but in case of 24 tornado or inclement weather, stay inside and move away 25 from exterior walls and windows; and we proceed down the

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

stairs and into the large auditorium, which the entrance is right by the guard's desk there. When we get down there, that's a large and windowless room; and that's the safest place in the building should we have that.

In case of active shooter or a bomb threat, follow instructions from the public address system and on-site security personnel. Thanks for your time and have a safe and productive meeting.

MR. MCBETH: Great. One less housekeeping thing, if everybody would please put your phones on silent and if your tablet or laptop is set up for audible alerts, put that on silent also.

As is our custom, we have people who are listening in on one of these monitors up here. And Christina Crain, a member, I don't know if she's online yet; but she is here. So when you're going to make comments, please preface your comments with your name so that we all know who is speaking.

And with that, we'll move to the introduction of Public Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting, committee members. And let's start with our new members Dietrich Von Beidenfeld.

MR. VON BIEDENFELD: Okay. I'm Dietrich Von Beidenfeld. I live in West Columbia, Texas. The first capitol of the Republic of Texas. I cannot see

1 Alaska from my house, but I can see the first Capitol or 2 the replica. It's very nice if you'd like to visit. 3 MR. MCBETH: Marc? Marc Whyte. I'm from San 4 MR. WHYTE: 5 Antonio. I'm looking forward to helping out and being part of a good discussion and moving things forward. 6 7 MR. SALAZAR: My name's J.R. Salazar. I'm the General Manager of Central Texas Rural Transit 8 9 It's a medium-to-large-sized rural transit District. district. We have about 11 counties, 11,000 square 10 11 miles. 12 MR. FICKES: Ken Fickes, Harris County 13 Transit Services. We handle everything east of Beltway 8 outside the metro service area and we have 14 15 countywide event response. MR. CLINE: I'm Jim Cline from 16 17 Carrollton, Texas, representing the general public. 18 MR. MCBETH: And I'm John McBeth. 19 the General Manager and CEO of Brazos Transit District. We serve 16 counties in central and far east Texas, both 2.0 21 small urban and rural. 2.2 J.R. is our longest-lived member of the 23 Public Transportation Advisory Committee. 24 MR. SALAZAR: That's what I was going for. 25

```
1
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Yeah, you've outlasted --
 2
    you've outlasted them all. Just so everybody knows
 3
    that; and we'll move on then to approval of the minutes,
    Agenda Item No. 8 of May 8, 2018.
 4
 5
                   MR. CLINE: So moved.
                                 John, I don't know if
 6
                   MR. GLEASON:
 7
    Christina is on or not.
 8
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Christina, are you on?
 9
                   MR. GLEASON: Not yet, okay.
                   MR. MCBETH: I didn't think so.
10
                               I'll second.
11
                   MR. FICKES:
12
                               We have a motion from Jim,
                   MR. MCBETH:
    and a second from Ken. Is there any discussion?
13
                   Hearing none, I'll call for a vote. All
14
15
    those in favor, signify by saying aye.
16
                   (Chorus of ayes)
17
                   MR. MCBETH: All opposed by nay.
18
    ayes and no nays, the minutes are approved.
19
                   And, Josh, I'm signing those as I speak.
2.0
    I will leave them right -- I'll give them to Kelly for
21
    safekeeping.
2.2
                   Item No. 5, the TxDOT Public
23
    Transportation Division Director's report to PTAC
24
    regarding public transportation matters, Mr. Gleason.
25
                                 Thank you. I'm Eric
                   MR. GLEASON:
```

```
1
    Gleason, TxDOT Director of Public Transportation.
                                                        For
 2
    my Director's report, I have a number of items. It's
    been a while since the committee has met. We weren't
 3
    able to pull a meeting together as we typically do in
 4
    July, in conjunction with our semiannual business
 5
    meeting. So May was the last time that the committee
 6
    convened and since then, just to bring you up to speed
    on some items, so May and June -- as they typically
 9
    are -- were big meetings for us with the commission.
10
                   You-all have in your packet a press
    release announcing $82 million of federal and state
11
    funding, which were awarded between those two meetings
12
13
    for a variety of different programs and program
14
    purposes; but that was a watershed moment for us in the
15
    last year.
16
                   MR. RIBAKOVE: Eric, may I clarify?
17
    That's not in the packet.
18
                   MR. GLEASON: I thought it was. Okay.
                                                            Ι
19
    thought I read something that said it was. My bad.
20
                   So, secondly, we also in May I believe
21
    reported to the committee that we were expecting our
2.2
    State safety oversight certification shortly from
23
    Federal Transit Administration. We did get that in July
24
    finally, and that is a certification that was required
25
    for the Department to carry out its functions as the
```

1 State safety of oversight agency for rail fixed guideway 2 public transportation systems in Texas. And so it's not necessarily a topic that the committee has dealt with in 3 the past, and I don't necessarily see that on the -- on 4 an upcoming agenda for you; but it is significant to the 5 State if for no other reason than if we do not get 6 certified, then the Federal Transit Administration is precluded from distributing any transit funding 8 9 whatsoever to the State of Texas. So that was a big 10 deal for everybody, whether folks realized it or not. The third item I will mention is that 11 also in this timeframe, there was a congressional 12 13 appropriation in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey. 14 There was a congressional appropriation into the Federal 15 Transit Administration emergency relief fund. This is 16 the 5324 program that only gets the money put into it 17 when it is congressionally appropriated for a specific 18 emergency related purpose. It has only been used one 19 time previously, and that was after Super Storm Sandy. 20 So Congress did appropriate funds for 21 Maria and Harvey and Irma, I believe, were the three 2.2 hurricanes, if I got those names right. 23 MR. FICKES: You got them right. 24 MR. GLEASON: And so as a part of that, 25 the State received two pots of funding, most of which

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 went directly to transit recipients to repair damage 2 caused by Hurricane Harvey. There was a relatively small amount of funding -- \$6.7 million -- which is a 3 part of the program, but it is under a subprogram called 4 5 "Resiliency Project Funding." And Resiliency Project Funding are -- is intended to address areas of risk and 6 vulnerability in transit operations to reduce the risk of damage from a future event. So not to help you recover or not to help anyone recover from the damage of 10 Hurricane Harvey, but to better prepare for the next 11 storm.

The way this program is intended to work is a bit different than what we're used to from a standpoint of project selection and under the Resiliency Program for 5324, TxDOT is responsible for putting out a call for projects in the emergency declaration area of the state and for coming up with a recommended list of projects that gets forwarded to FTA for final approval.

So and in this instance, unlike any other project call that we have done as a Department, this is a call that Houston Metro would respond to, as well, for example. So, you know, our job with this program is to develop a recommended project list, to forward that to FTA for their final approval and depending on the projects that are selected and the recipient of those

1 projects, direct and designated recipients will find 2 directly their take of that funding. If there is a rural program provider that is selected for funding, 3 then that would come down through the commission as it 5 typically does. So from a schedule standpoint, we are 6 looking at putting something out by the end of this month, which will be a call for projects. There's an 8 application that will be attached to it with information 10 that FTA is requesting as a part of their determination of what they'll approve. So we will include an 11 application in it based on that. We're looking at about 12 13 30 days to respond, and then this doesn't require commission action; but we would like to be in a position 14 as a State DOT to forward our recommended list of 15 16 projects to FTA in late November or early December. 17 So I'm going to stop at that because I 18 see a couple members whose areas were impacted by Harvey 19 that have quizzical looks on their brows. 20 questions? 21 Yeah. We -- this is Ken MR. FICKES: 2.2 We received notification that we received a Fickes. 23 direct allocation for Resiliency Funds and --24 MR. GLEASON: You did. 25 MR. FICKES: -- so did Metro.

```
1
    this -- does that fall under this, what you're talking
 2
    about or are we still on the side with that?
                                 So there are -- within the
 3
                   MR. GLEASON:
 4
    emergency relief program --
 5
                                Right.
                   MR. FICKES:
 6
                   MR. GLEASON: -- the majority of funding
    was for recovery.
 8
                                Right.
                   MR. FICKES:
 9
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Damage recovery.
10
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Right.
                                 Resiliency Funding, there's
11
                   MR. GLEASON:
    6.7 million for Texas and you -- Houston Metro said that
12
13
    they had gotten some money?
14
                   MR. FICKES: We got some. They got some.
15
                   MR. GLEASON: You didn't get Resiliency
16
    Funding.
17
                   MR. FICKES: That's what I understood.
18
    It could be used for resiliency.
19
                   MR. GLEASON: Let's circle back.
20
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Okay.
21
                   MR. GLEASON: Because that was not my
22
    understanding, Ken.
23
                   MR. FICKES: All right.
24
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                  If you got money, it was
25
    for damage -- damages which FTA had certified.
```

1 MR. FICKES: Okay. 2 MR. GLEASON: And this is a separate pot 3 of funding that has not yet been allocated. people -- let's circle back on that, and let's make 5 sure. 6 MR. FICKES: So --7 MR. GLEASON: Because Houston Metro will talk about it as if it's theirs. 8 9 MR. FICKES: Right. 10 MR. GLEASON: But that's just been the 11 conversation. 12 MR. FICKES: We've talked to our grant 13 people, and that's what I understood; but I'll 14 double-check that because I could be wrong. It was a 15 very small conversation. 16 Okay, good. All right. MR. GLEASON: 17 John, you were another -- I don't know if 18 you've heard of this program or not. 19 MR. MCBETH: Yeah, we got -- this is John 2.0 McBeth. We got our -- we went through the hurdles with 21 Federal Transit Administration and got all our stuff 2.2 done. 23 MR. GLEASON: You got your recovery 24 funding, correct? 25 MR. MCBETH: We got our recovery funding.

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 14

1 We haven't heard anything about Resiliency Funding. 2 MR. GLEASON: Okay. MR. MCBETH: But all of our stuff has 3 been directed. 4 5 MR. GLEASON: Okay. 6 We spent all of our money. MR. MCBETH: 7 This will be -- you know, MR. GLEASON: so in case, you know, the next time they let the water out of Lake Conroe on you, if you needed some kind of 10 bunker to, you know, shield the water. 11 MR. MCBETH: Or a generator? 12 MR. GLEASON: Yeah, something like that. 13 That would be --MR. MCBETH: Generator would be on real 14 15 high stilts, at least six and a half feet above the 16 water. 17 MR. GLEASON: There you go. 18 Also during this timeframe since you met 19 last, there was a notice of funding opportunity put out 2.0 by FTA, 5339, bus and bus facility funding. I've forgotten the amount that's available. I think it's 21 22 360 million roughly that is available nationwide for bus 23 and bus facility programs, and no less than 10 percent of it will be allocated to rural areas. 24 25 So the Department prepared a rural fleet

1 replacement application. We submitted a request for 2 \$16 million of 5339 discretionary funding and we will add to that 10 million of flex funding -- money that has 3 been flexed over to our program for fleet replacement 4 from the highway side -- for a combined total of 5 \$26 million. Now, if we are successful in getting all 6 16, that will allow us to replace about 350 vehicles. 8 Again, it's going to depend on the 9 average price of the replacement fleet; and it's 10 intended to address not only the current need for replacement, but the anticipated need over the next two 11 years. Our history with these opportunities seems to be 12 13 that we get successful about once every three years, and so we're thinking and hoping that we are due. 14 15 been since 2015 since the Department got TIGER funding 16 for this purpose. And so without really any reason, 17 other than just optimism on my part, I'm thinking that 18 we are due some level of award with this. 19 We did suggest to them that if 16 million wasn't possible, that another cut at it would be 2.0 21 10 million, which actually would represent the need 2.2 through one additional year of fleet replacement funding and that we would match any amount they gave us up to 23 10 million with the flex funding. So if they gave us 24

6 million, we'll put 6 million of flex funding. If they

```
1
    give us 16, we'll put 10 million in, which is our
    maximum on that.
                   We have been told that they want to make
 3
    an award later this fall, which is relatively quick from
 4
    a turnaround standpoint; but that's what the information
 5
    we have from the 5339 program back in D.C. So hopefully
 6
    we'll get some good news on that before we meet next.
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                This is John.
                                               Eric, is this
 8
 9
    combination of -- with the fleet, is it a combination of
10
    small urban and rural?
                   MR. GLEASON: Just rural.
11
12
                   MR. MCBETH: Just rural.
13
                                 Just rural.
                   MR. GLEASON:
14
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Whoa.
                   MR. GLEASON: Three years, though.
15
                                                        So
    it's anticipated to keep us in pretty good --
16
17
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                No kidding.
18
                   MR. GLEASON: -- state of repair through
19
    2021, right?
                  Is that right? Okay, yeah.
20
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Wow.
                                      Thanks.
21
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Don't thank me yet.
22
                   MR. CLINE:
                               If you had -- are you -- this
23
    is Jim Cline. Are you preserving the 10 million for
24
    matching funds for future grants if you don't get all of
25
    the 16 or if you get less than 10?
```

1 MR. GLEASON: We've -- it's -- what we've 2 tried to do with the flex funding is leverage it and with additional federal funding so we can do more. 3 the event that we are unsuccessful, the other program we now have in place is a routine fleet replacement program 5 where every other year, we include these funds as part 6 of a call for project proposals and ask that agencies look at their other funding sources -- 5339, 5307, 9 5311 -- to bring to the table for that. 10 We are more than willing to take development credits that we have and put those on the 11 12 table for match purposes. So we're not looking for 13 folks to necessarily come up with local money to support this, but we are asking them to look at their budgets 14 15 and to make determinations within their budgets with 16 money they get to allocate for this program. 17 MR. CLINE: Thank you. 18 MR. GLEASON: Any questions on that? 19 MR. MCBETH: I have one general question. 2.0 This is John again. Since we've been investing in fleet for several years now, could we -- at maybe the next 21 22 meeting -- get a report on where we are on fleet for the rural program and for the small urban program, if 23 24 possible? How many -- how many buses have we bought? Have we made a dent in that number that the rural fleet 25

1 was all about to fall apart and die? Just a general 2 number. Are we making a dent in that? 3 MR. GLEASON: Sure. So in your mind, how far -- are you thinking maybe start with Recovery Act 4 5 funding. 6 MR. MCBETH: Yeah, uh-huh. Yeah, yeah. MR. GLEASON: Okay. MR. MCBETH: Back that far. 8 9 That was the first start MR. GLEASON: 10 of --Yeah. I'd just like to see 11 MR. MCBETH: 12 if we're actually -- are we making a dent in that huge 13 mountain? 14 MR. GLEASON: You're going to hear later 15 on today with a significant subset of the rural program 16 that is included in our asset management plan. You'll 17 hear that, generally, we're in a pretty good position. 18 MR. MCBETH: Yeah. 19 MR. GLEASON: As everyone knows, though, 2.0 when you -- you know, every time you get a big slug of 21 money like we got with TIGER most recently, then it 22 comes due four or five years down the road when that big slug of investment is beyond its useful life and needs 23 24 to be replaced. 25 MR. MCBETH: Yeah.

```
1
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 So, and that's what we're
 2
    trying to get ahead of with this discretionary --
 3
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Right.
                                        That's another part
    of my question is: Are people actually conforming and
 4
 5
    beginning to replace their equipment before it all falls
           Are we making progress on that particular side
 6
    apart?
 7
    of it?
 8
                   MR. GLEASON: We can -- why don't we try
 9
    and put something together --
10
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Yeah.
11
                   MR. GLEASON: -- for the committee on
    that for the next meeting.
12
13
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Okav.
14
                                 That's fine.
                   MR. GLEASON:
15
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Great, thanks.
16
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 The Department has also
17
    sent over to the State legislature its 2020-2021
18
    Legislative Appropriations Request. It included in that
19
    request the committee's request for an additional
2.0
    $41 million a year to support expanded coverage and
21
    expand service in the state. That was included as an
2.2
    exceptional item in the Appropriations Request. Meaning
    that it would require additional funding from outside of
23
24
    the Department's regular sources of funding in order to
25
    us -- for us to be able to use it. So we're looking for
```

2.0

1 general revenue funding or whatever.

It's a large number. You know, I think it's -- well, I know it's a larger number than this committee and this Department has ever included before as a statement of need. It is perhaps our best informed number that we've had on this topic. And so the extent to which we'll be successful with the request, I think, you know, I think everyone would recognize it's a very, very steep slope we'd have to climb to get there; but it is a statement of need. It is a defensible statement of need; and we'll talk a little bit later about, you know, in Agenda Topic 8, we'll talk a little bit later about what we might need to do if that money were to be found, what are some of the things we would need to consider from an implementation standpoint.

So other than the exceptional item request, everything in the baseline is as it is today. So there are no changes to the amount allocated to transit state grant funding amounts. It remains as it was in the previous biennium.

Coming up in September at commission, we have a one-minute order. It's got three projects in it.

Just real quickly, the Beaumont MPO allocated CMAC funding in southeast Texas for rural fleet replacement and I should mention that because of that action by the

24

25

1 Beaumont MPO, the Southeast Texas Regional Planning 2 Commission is the only rural agency which is not included in our discretionary fleet application because 3 the allocation by the MPO dealt with their needs. 4 that is the only rural transit district that is not 5 included. 6 7 There is an award to the Lower Grande Valley Development Council. It is our final award 8 9 coming out of the Springs Coordinated Call, and it's for 10 an intercity cross Valley bus service that all four 11 agencies down there are partnering to keep in place. And finally, we are -- there's about \$60,000 to go to --12 it's actually going to Project Amistad in the El Paso 13 area, but it's for use on the upcoming TTA Southwest 14 Transit Association Conference in El Paso the first week 15 16 of March. 17 So we are funding a significant amount of 18 training; and as a part of that, there were -- we were 19 able to secure, I think, two-thirds of the seats available in the training that TxDOT is purchasing for 2.0 21 the conference. Two-thirds of those seats are set aside 2.2 for Texas properties and I think Kristen will hold those

folks from the other states can take part in training if

seats for Texas up until about 30 days before, and then

she has our permission to release those seats so that

1 Texas doesn't want to; but that was -- we're willing to 2 pay for it, as long as we got that kind of an 3 arrangement to make sure that Texas properties could get the training. So we'll be sponsoring training there; 5 and we'll be sponsoring the TTA Rodeo, as well. 6 So that's it for September. We have a leadership seminar. Version 6 is scheduled to start on October 28th. We have a full class of 25. Everyone 8 9 from Texas. It's actually one of our easier classes to 10 fill. I was talking to Kristen about the possibility that if we did not have 25 from Texas, that she could 11 open it up to some of the surrounding states, as long as 12 13 they paid the entire amount of the expenses, of course. 14 So didn't need to go there. We got 25 from Texas. So we're happy. 15 16 MR. FICKES: That's good. 17 MR. GLEASON: So that ought to be in 18 October; and then the second session, which 19 traditionally falls in January, that's actually going to 2.0 be moved to the end of February to be just before the Transit Conference in El Paso. So folks can go to that, 21 22 and then just stay for the conference if they want. And finally -- I know I'm taking a lot of 23 24 time on this, Mr. Chair; but a lot of things going on. Finally --25

1 MR. MCBETH: We've got all the time in 2 the world. 3 MR. GLEASON: -- just to let the 4 committee know that the Department, we did conduct a 5 very short customer satisfaction survey where we sent a four-or-five question survey out to 75 agencies that we 6 provide funding to. We heard back from 57 of them. So that's a pretty good response rate. And we were asking 8 9 them questions about some basic attributes of customer 10 satisfaction, how satisfied they were with what we did, 11 and did they have any recommended areas of improvement. 12 So, overall, very happy with the results. 13 Very satisfied/satisfied, 93 percent of the respondents. Two areas were identified for us to make improvement on. 14 15 One was response time. You know, that whole interaction 16 between agencies and ourselves when assistance is 17 And then finally, knowledge. And I think what needed. 18 knowledge -- knowledge is a reflection of two things, I 19 think. We work with a lot of different programs and 20 sometimes field staff are not as up to speed on the 21 specifics as possible and so sometimes they've got to go 2.2 back to Austin to get the question and that can take 23 some time. 24 We are also experiencing a fairly high

degree of turnover in our staff -- succession, turnover,

```
1
    if you will. Folks are retiring. Folks with lots of
 2
    knowledge are retiring and we're bringing new people on
    and a combination of either in the field or in Austin
 3
    here, we're just having to get up to speed from a
 4
    knowledge standpoint. So, but we will focus on those
 5
    two things to try and do a better job. That concludes
 6
    my report.
 8
                                A bunch a good news.
                   MR. MCBETH:
 9
                   MR. GLEASON: Yes.
10
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Thank you very much.
    Outstanding. Particularly, I would note the commission
11
    in their Legislative Appropriate Request, requesting the
12
13
    $41 million that this committee recommended; and for our
14
    new members, that was a year's worth of work. It was
15
    more than fully vetted by the people in this room.
16
                   Whether we get it, it's always a
17
    crapshoot with this legislature. We don't know, but
18
    that's the largest amount of money that we've ever asked
19
    for.
          That's $82 million a biennium.
                                          That's a big, old
2.0
    chunk of money; and if we get it, we'll change the shape
21
    of transit in Texas. It's pretty amazing.
2.2
    basically, we'll double what we're currently getting in
    our base budget. We'll double it.
23
                   MR. GLEASON: Little bit more than double
24
25
    it.
```

```
1
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Yeah, yeah.
                                             So
 2
   congratulations to this group of people. This was hard
    fought -- hard fought little battle; but outstanding
 3
   news, as is all the other stuff you've talked about.
 4
                   Okay. With that being that, we'll move
 5
6
   on to Item No. 6.
 7
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 The real briefing,
   Mr. Chair, I will introduce this and then turn it over
9
   to Theo Kosub --
10
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Okay.
                   MR. GLEASON: -- who's been doing this
11
   work for us. Y'all may recall that -- well, not all of
12
   you; but those of you in transit will know that the
13
   Federal Transit Administration is requiring recipients
14
15
   of 5307 and 5311 funding to have asset management plans
16
    in place by October 1st of this year. And so we are
17
   nearing the endgame on that effort; and we have, I
18
   think, briefly spoken to the committee about this
19
   before. But Theo is here today to quickly walk you
    through and briefly walk you through our plan.
20
21
                   And so with that, Theo.
2.2
                   MR. KOSUB:
                               Good morning, Mr. Chair,
23
   members of the committee. I'm Theo Kosub. I'm the
24
   Division's Strategic Program Coordinator. Like Eric
25
   said, I'm going to talk to you about our transit asset
```

2.0

1 management plan today. Well -- oh, all right.
2 Technical difficulty.

So first, what is the purpose of a transit asset management plan? It's to maintain a state of good repair for the State's public transportation assets. The transit asset management rule came out in October of 2016. So we're working to meet the deadline of October 1st, 2018, to have our asset management plan in place.

Right here, you will see these are the main elements you would find within the transit asset management plan. You have to have an inventory of your assets. What's out there? A condition assessment of those assets for a rolling -- asset that's in rolling stock, that might be how many miles does it have on it, how old is it, what condition is it in. For a facility, you know, how are its various components functioning.

The useful life benchmark is really about how that asset's age or miles relate to its standard. For facilities, you have the transit economic requirements model that basically is a scale that helps you evaluate your facility. For rolling stock and equipment, a useful life benchmark is going to be that age and mileage. And once you have those useful life benchmarks, you have something by which you can measure

1 your assets. So once you've done that, the investment 2 prioritization is really: How will you replace those assets over the course of the next few years and 3 maintain a state of good repair? 5 So developing our asset management plan has been a collaborative process. We have 37 entities 6 who are participating, and we started this process in March of this year. We held a webinar to inform potential participants, and they were given the 10 opportunity to opt out or opt in. Two rurals have opted 11 to do their own plan: Fort Bend County and PTS. All of our open-door service, 5311 -- oh, excuse me, 5310 12 13 providers are in our plan. 14 There are several asset categories of 15 which y'all are probably familiar. Rolling stock, that's your revenue vehicles. Facilities, this is your 16 17 admin, maintenance, passenger facilities. And then this 18 last category can be a little bit misleading. 19 equipment, but it's referring to assets that are above \$50,000 in value. If it's a piece of equipment, like, a 20 21 very advanced security system or an expensive lift; but, 22 generally, this is going to be your support and maintenance vehicles. 23 24 MR. GLEASON: So let's -- Theo, let's stop right there, if we can, Theo. Let's -- I want to 25

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 make sure folks understand the plan participants and 2 what's going on here. The first thing some of you may notice is we have -- we currently have 36 rural transit 3 districts in the state, but only 25 of those 36 are in 4 this plan. And, in fact, there's a -- you know, some of 5 those folks are urban transit districts, as well. 6 so in that case if you're an urban transit district and you also provide rural transit service and this is --9 there's some confusion here. But here in Texas, you're 10 doing your own plan and it's to include the rural element of your service and that is how we understood 11 the direction in the FTA rule. 12

Subsequent to that, they have come out with some information that seems to be not so black and white about that and you'll see that we have one small urban district as a part of our plan and it's an imperfect world. That's all I have to say. But the main thing I think here and I want folks to recognize it, as a State, we needed to offer rural transit systems the option of what is called a "group plan." And that is where we do a plan that has multiple sub-recipients as a part of it.

And so that is why you see that this plan includes 25 of 27 standalone rural transit systems. So of our 36, 27 of them are just rural transit operations;

```
1
    and of those 27, 25 chose to be in it. So this -- as we
 2
    go through this today, one of the odd things about this
    plan, is this plan doesn't represent the entire need of
    our rural systems. It is a subset. And we may move
    over time toward making a decision that we will be
 5
    inclusive of everyone in our asset management plan.
 6
    It's just that this first one out of the gate to the
    meet the basic requirements of the rule, is not.
                   So let's go onto the next slide.
                   MR. CLINE:
10
                               This is Jim Cline. Just
11
    your -- the obligation is actually on the entity
    receiving the funds, not on TxDOT, right, to have a
12
13
    transit asset management program?
14
                   MR. GLEASON: Well, TxDOT is the
15
    designated recipient for the rural program. There has
16
    to be an asset management plan for all agencies.
17
    think from a compliance standpoint, we will need to
18
    ensure that everyone has one.
                                   That the feds will look
19
    to us from a compliance standpoint to -- even if they're
2.0
    not part of our group plan --
21
                               They still have --
                   MR. CLINE:
2.2
                   MR. GLEASON: -- it's going to be our
23
    responsibility to make sure that everyone has one.
24
                   Did I say that right?
25
                               That's correct.
                   MR. KOSUB:
```

```
1
                   MR. FICKES: This is Ken.
                                              So you're
 2
    just -- your plan is just for rural. So if you're small
    urban, it's something different?
 3
                   MR. GLEASON: They're doing their own.
 4
 5
                                They're doing their own.
                   MR. FICKES:
 6
    Okay. All right.
 7
                   MR. GLEASON: As direct recipients.
 8
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Got it.
 9
                   MR. GLEASON: With one exception, and
10
    that's just the weirdness. I mean, I think I'm still --
11
    I think there was some subsequent guidance that FTA put
    out, as often happens, which, you know, was a little
12
13
    different than what the rules say. And one of our small
14
    urbans -- voracious readers as they are -- called us and
15
    said, "Hey," and we looked at it and it was, like, okay.
    So they're in there.
16
17
                   But the initial direction everyone in
18
    this state received, is that you -- if you are an urban
19
    transit district getting 5307 funding, then, yes, you do
2.0
    your own. If you are also a rural transit district,
21
    then you will include your rural transit district needs
2.2
    in that plan.
23
                   MR. FICKES: All right.
                   MR. KOSUB: So let's talk a little bit
24
    about targets here. When you're developing a transit
25
```

that here.

25

1 asset management plan, there are three asset categories 2 that you have to set performance targets for. first one, that rolling stock there, if you have 100 3 buses, you would hope -- your target would be that 15 or 4 fewer would be past their useful life benchmark for age 5 6 or mileage. 7 For facilities, it's a little bit different. They use the TERM scale. It's an FTA 8 9 quidance that helps people to evaluate the condition of 10 their facility. So a three is middle of the road. worst would be one, poor. Five would be excellent, it's 11 brand new. Three would be adequate. And then, 12 13 likewise, for equipment you're looking at 15 percent or 14 less of equipment assets operating beyond their useful 15 life. Difference being, you know, rolling stock you 16 tend to put on a lot more mileage. For some of the 17 equipment, you may have maintenance or service vehicles 18 that typically don't have as many mileage or are -- they 19 might be older with less mileage. 20 This is to a question earlier. If you're a -- perhaps you're an urban or you're an NTA, there's 21 22 an additional target. You would have to do infrastructure, which would be rail; but that doesn't 23 24 apply to any of our rural providers. So you won't see

```
1
                   Our targets were based on historic use
 2
   and disposal patterns that we've witnessed over the past
    few years -- well, really more than that -- the past
 3
   decade or so. And that's based on our public
 4
 5
    transportation management system, data that we obtained
   from that.
                Typically, TxDOT gets -- sees a lot more
 6
   mileage from their rural units. They look at 40 to
    50 percent more mileage than, say, an Altoona bus
 8
 9
   testing standard, based on what we've seen. So TxDOT
10
    set a useful benchmark life that corresponds to about 40
   to 50 percent more life for light-duty vehicle types.
11
                   In terms of these targets, you may think,
12
13
   well, 15 percent. What happens if we don't meet that?
14
   What happens if we exceed it?
15
                   Well, initially, there are no penalties
16
    for not meeting your targets; and there's no reward for
17
   meeting your targets. So they're not hard with
18
   penalties. So what did we learn from our asset
19
   management plan?
20
                   Well, as Eric said earlier, there are
21
   about 1,120 vehicles in this TAM plan. So that's
2.2
   roughly two-thirds of our total rural fleet. Compared
   to those targets we saw earlier, our rolling stock is in
23
24
   pretty good shape. It's at 88 percent. So we're
25
   obtaining that 15 percent target right now.
```

1 facilities, we have a vast majority of them who are 2 rated adequate, which would be 3.0 or higher on the TERM scale; but we did see that facilities, although they are 3 above that TERM scale, some are right around three. 4 So 5 we made need some future focus on facility investment. Equipment, we're a little bit below our 6 Equipment represents a much smaller fraction of target. the assets within this plan. We covered about 81 pieces 8 9 of equipment within this plan. Most of which of those 10 support and maintenance vehicles. For facilities, we actually had 53 total facility assets. And if you're 11 12 curious, about 5310 providers. They're also covered 13 under this plan. We had about 55 total vehicles in that 14 plan. As far as vehicle types, light-duty and medium 15 cutaways were the most common, followed closely by minivans. 16 17 Now, the most important part: How much 18 will it cost to maintain a state of good repair? 19 We estimate that it will -- through 2022, it will cost about 39.1 million; but as I mentioned 2.0 21 earlier, that's only two-thirds of the fleet. So that's 2.2 not the whole picture. In terms of next steps, we will -- this plan covers a four-year horizon; but by 23 24 September of 2022, we will do this again. Take some 25 lessons from our effort this time, and that will be our

1 next update.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

2 So with that, I'm happy to answer any 3 questions y'all may have.

4 If I may, Mr. Chair. MR. GLEASON: So the FTA, if I understand this correctly, we need to have 5 a plan and it needs to speak to the elements that Theo 6 has gone over. FTA will confirm that we have a plan that meets the elements of the rule requirement. 8 9 don't see themselves as approving these plans. 10 that's -- you know, it's kind of an interesting approach on their part. They seem to be taking the same approach 11 with safety and everything else, as well. 12

I think they're in a position of recognizing that they're -- you know, everything would tell them that there's not enough money in the federal program to bring everything to a state of good repair and so they're kind of just finessing that whole issue by saying, you know, "You guys put together what you think makes sense. We'll review it to make sure it's complete, but we're not necessarily going to challenge the specifics of it." That's my interpretation of what We'll see. they mean.

Jim.

24 MR. CLINE: Eric, if this is for two-thirds of the fleet and presuming the other third

1 has a plan and they use this information to make capital 2 investment decisions, right? Some money's flowing down from TxDOT. How are you going to overcome the challenge 3 of normalizing these results if they're really 5 different? 6 Like, say, someone comes in and says, "I have a 5 percent" -- or instead of, you know, less than or equal to 15 is 5 percent. So you have an agency that now has a greater need than someone else, although it's 10 the same -- maybe the same mileage and the same years. 11 MR. GLEASON: So I think we're going to have to see what we get, and see what other agencies 12 13 This is -- as Theo said, this is based on have done. 14 history and not -- and it's also got in it a level of 15 history that includes funding, if you will. Reasonable 16 funding expectations for this program. So as long as 17 agencies sort of stay with that general practical 18 approach, I'm not anticipating being too far off; but I 19 don't know. 20 You know, we're going to have to get copies of everyone's and understand where they're at; 21 2.2 and we may find ourselves a year from now in a position of updating this plan just because we know a lot more. 23 24 I think everyone is just trying to meet the basic

requirements, and then we'll see what we have.

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 36

```
1
                   MR. CLINE:
                               Thank you.
 2
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Motion for -- Ken.
 3
                   MR. FICKES:
                               I was just going to say I'll
 4
    make a motion to approve.
 5
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Do we need a motion?
 6
                   MR. GLEASON: We do not.
 7
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Oh, okay.
 8
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                So --
 9
                   MR. FICKES:
                                It's an action on the
10
    agenda.
                   MR. GLEASON: We put action -- just as a
11
    reminder and not to bring it up, that is on there in
12
13
    case the committee desires to take action.
14
                   MR. FICKES: Oh, okay.
15
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 It is not necessarily a
16
    requirement. If you wish to take action on this, you
17
    may.
18
                   MR. FICKES: I leave it up to the
19
    Chairman.
20
                   MR. MCBETH: I see no reason to take
21
    action.
2.2
                   Okay. Let's move on to the fun issue.
23
                   MR. GLEASON: All right. This is mine.
24
                   MR. MCBETH: Agenda Item No. 7 and
25
    Eric --
```

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 37

```
1
                   MR. GLEASON: Performance.
 2
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                -- this is yours.
 3
                   MR. GLEASON: Yeah.
                                        Nobody else
 4
   volunteered.
 5
                                I don't see any hands in the
                   MR. MCBETH:
6
   air.
 7
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Yeah.
                                        So, now, first
   things first. We sent out an updated version of this
8
   yesterday, and I don't -- if everyone was able to
10
   download that or look at it, there was a significant
    change; and I'll highlight that when I get to it.
11
12
                   All right, performance trends. So this
13
    is -- you know, every year, as background, the
14
   Department prepares for the State legislature a required
15
   report which summarizes performance data collected from
16
   every trend system in the state for the previous fiscal
17
   year. So, for example, this spring we submitted a final
18
   report to the Legislature summarizing FY '17 transit
19
   data from not only the systems that we provide funding
   to, but from the MTAs, as well.
20
21
                   This is an enormous data collection
2.2
   effort on our part and it has a history of continuous
23
    improvement associated with it and it can prove to be
24
   difficult to get everybody in in an accurate fashion.
25
   What we've done for you here, is we've done a couple
```

sort of broad slices or broad swipes of that data. For some key conclusions coming from the report, we have an annual snapshot which we'll compare '16 to '17 and identify changes. We took a five-year look from '13 to '17; and then we also, for the first time, prepared for every system we provide funding to, sort of a quick system at a glance.

Now, we're only choosing to highlight for you those things which seemed significant and in some cases, we have explanations for the change that we've highlighted and in other cases, we don't. So let's kind of walk through this. And we've got ridership. So beginning with our '16 versus '17, we see a relatively small uptick in ridership on the rural side. So whether or not an additional 20,000 is anything, you know, to signify that we're, you know, trending upward generally, we'll have to find out; but that was a trend, a positive trend.

Seniors and individuals with disabilities, we see a pretty sharp decrease. This is a program that can show swings from year to year, depending on the recipients of funding; and I'm not sure to what extent we are able to explain this drop today for you. It's something that we will be researching and be able to provide the committee with a better

2.2

1 explanation at a further date.

program has seen an uptick in safety incidents. Again, it seems a relatively significant increase. We are researching the triggers for that, but it is some cause for concern. Metropolitan areas are showing a slight decrease in safety and, you know, those two -- in my mind -- they're counterintuitive. My expectation would be that with the increasing congestion and complexity of the metropolitan operating environment, that that is where you would see a tendency for these incidents to be on the rise and not so much in the smaller urban areas of the state. So it's relatively counterintuitive to me that we would have this going on, and we're certainly going to explore that a little further.

The next slide then gets into a five-year look and this is where, at least from my standpoint, we find things that are perhaps more significant and I'm actually looking at the old presentation here. So I'm going to look at the slide. The first packet we provided to you and actually the information we provided to the transit districts at our annual -- at our semiannual meeting in July, showed a rural decrease in ridership of 26 percent. The packet that you have today shows it at 10 percent and we believe that the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 10 percent number is a more accurate reflection of a 2 trend that the committee can focus on as meaningful and you'll see a box on the side there. We had to exclude 3 four rural transit districts from the calculation. 5 of those were based on what we know now to be inaccurate reporting, significant inaccurate reporting. One of 6 those -- Galveston, no surprise to anyone -- for census impacts, it's just too difficult to understand the 8 9 changes in ridership in the Galveston area as it transitioned out of an urbanized area and into a rural 10 area. So that data was not reliable. 11

And then the fourth example we have, which the transit folks will recognize, is we had one entity in this timeframe that was operating at significantly inflated level of service. Well beyond their means to sustain. And that, of course, resulted in a pretty significant ridership increase. So when they concluded they couldn't sustain it and they reeled everything in, we saw a pretty significant drop.

So when we removed those four systems for those reasons, we go from a 26 percent drop to a 10 percent drop, which we think is a much more reliable indicator. Significant by itself, but it's certainly not 26 percent. Of that 10 percent, about 20 percent of it is related to the Medicaid Medical Transportation

1 | Program.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

This is a timeframe between FY '13 and 2 3 '17 where there were significant changes in the Medicaid Medical Transportation Program, with the State moving to 4 a full-risk broker program. And traditional primary 5 recipients of funding for this program moved to a 6 subcontract role in many cases, with a lot of challenges associated with that. So we have seen a falloff of that 8 9 program, but they represent about a fifth -- they 10 explain -- that explains about a fifth of this 11 10 percent. 12 When you go down to vehicle revenue

when you go down to vehicle revenue miles, again, you know, urbans are trending up in ridership and a slight increase in mileage. The rurals, we're kind of headed in the wrong direction. If ridership is decreasing and mileage is increasing, that's not a combination you want to see.

MR. MCBETH: Eric, this is John. I think -- I think a percentage of that 9 percent can easily be attributed to the Medicaid Program and I think the reason is that the brokers -- whereas when TxDOT was running the program, you tried to keep everybody that was a Medicaid rider within their rural transit district. It's not uncommon for us and for all the other rural programs that are working for the brokers,

1 to get trip requests that we honor because, otherwise, 2 we lose our contract -- in our case, from Bryan-College Station to Dallas, from Bryan-College Station to 3 Texarkana, from Bryan-College Station to San Antonio. 4 Every day we carry people into Houston and instead of 5 grouping those people, there will be one person that 6 needs to be there at 6:00 in the morning. There will be another that needs to be there at 10:00, and there will 9 be another one that needs to be there at noon. So our rider -- our mileage is 10 skyrocketing and Liz Bruches, who keeps on top of that 11 for us on the Medicaid Program, she keeps a notebook of 12 13 just how stupid it is that we're getting these requests 14 that we -- and they pay for them. I mean, they're 15 willing to pay whatever we want to charge them to carry 16 a person from Bryan-College Station. And many 17 occasions, we'll carry people from Bryan-College Station 18 to Scott and White in Temple and we will pass Carole 19 Warlick on our way over there bringing somebody to Scott 20 and White in Bryan. 21 Are you going to the speed MR. GLEASON: 2.2 limit? 23 MR. MCBETH: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. 24 You always go the speed limit on -- there is no yeah. 25 easy road between Bryan-College Station and Temple. So

1 I think that also -- a portion of that 9 percent, at 2 least in our case and I know in Carole's case and in a lot of other cases, is going to be as critical to the 3 Medicaid Program and how poorly the brokers are operating the program. 5 6 MR. SALAZAR: I agree with that; and, you know, John's right. We have to do those trips because we have to adhere to the contract. You know, we've got a hospital discharge from Lubbock to Abilene Friday, a 10 San Antonio to Abilene on that same day. So we're going to these cities to pick people up, bring them back to 11 our place. Going to my point is when we actually had 12 the contract for the Medicaid TSAP -- Transportation 13 Service Area Providers -- we didn't do those kind of 14 15 trips. 16 We didn't go to San Antonio. 17 didn't -- we tried to stay within our little service 18 area and we didn't put those miles on like we are now 19 and so I don't know really -- I really don't know what happened and why we now are getting hospital discharges 20 from all over the state and we're having to go to pick 21 22 them up and bring them home just because we have to because they tell us to. I agree with that. 23 24 that's a big reason why that 9 percent is --

MR. MCBETH: A large portion of that is

1 deadhead miles. We'll get a hospital discharge from 2 Dallas. We deadhead all the way to Dallas with an empty bus, pick that person up, and bring them home. They pay 3 They pay both ways, but it's just -- and you 4 for it. may as well be talking to a wall when you're trying to 5 explain to them how stupid what they're doing is. 6 There's better ways to do it. They could put them in an ambulance and bring them home cheaper than having us do 8 9 it, but we get nowhere. 10 MR. GLEASON: So we will look a little more closely at the mileage data and see if we can't 11 split out the Medicaid element to that, as well. 12 13 I'll bet you that it's going MR. MCBETH: to account for a minimum of a third of that. 14 15 MR. GLEASON: So even with the ridership 16 going down on the Medicaid Program, the mileage -- the 17 per trip mileage is increasing at a faster rate than --18 MR. MCBETH: Yeah, yeah. 19 MR. GLEASON: Okay, interesting. And so 20 we looked at ridership, vehicle revenue miles, and then 21 operating expense for revenue hour and we didn't see 22 anything in the operating expense for revenue hour that 23 looked out of line to us. In fact, that looked pretty 24 good, honestly, over a five-year --

MR. CLINE:

Eric, this is Jim.

The

1 ridership drop, isn't that about consistent with the 2 national averages? I mean, there's a drop across the country in bus rider -- or in ridership in general. 3 So for all systems --4 MR. GLEASON: 5 MR. FICKES: For all systems. 6 MR. GLEASON: -- yes. I haven't seen a rural program breakout nationally. You know, Texas, it's a -- there's an area of the rural program -- the western half of the state -- where, you know, the 10 population is either holding steady or even declining, even though the characteristics of that population are 11 more and more in line with the customers that these 12 13 programs serve. 14 Eastern part of the state, we've got 15 rural areas that are becoming more dense, you know, even 16 though they're still categorized as rural. So even 17 though the demand base may be going up, the 18 environment -- the operating environment versus, you 19 know, whether or not the funding is keeping pace with 20 that ridership is the challenge there. 21 So, okay. So those are the key five-year 2.2 trends that we identified with our look at the data. The next slide then just scares a bit. And at our 23 24 meeting in July, as I mentioned earlier, we provided

each provider with a profile of their system, of their

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FY '17 system, that looked at the five characteristics
that are listed up there. And this was something new,
and there's an example of that on the next slide. Let's
just go to the next slide.

There's the example that, you know, we provided. So everyone got their own. We had to be very careful we're not giving them someone else's, but -- and this triggered quite a bit of feedback and, actually, I was pleased to get this.

Mark, if we could go back to the previous slide?

The most interesting thing about this is it was Item No. 3, the compliance information, that triggered the greatest level of interest. For those of you not familiar with our program, we do a risk assessment on each of our program sub-recipients that looks at a combination of performance and what I have learned to call "inherent" risk factors.

Performance risk factors go to, you know, whether or not the agency is operating in compliance with all the rules and regulations that we come and exercise our oversight on. The inherent factors are things that the agency can't do so much about. Either they get a lot of money and then, therefore, that puts them higher on the risk. They have a new CFO. They get

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

an external audit finding that stayed with them for
three years, even though they fixed it. There's some
other elements that play into this. But in any event,
we started getting calls, "Why is my system high risk?
Why is my system high risk?"

And so this has actually been a very helpful opportunity for us to try and describe how we do our risk assessment. So that was -- that's where we got the most feedback on, honestly. We really put it together more so to focus on the performance measures and the expenditure by program area just to give folks an idea and what we did with that, is we gave folks an average, as well, to compare their performance and their expenditure by area against, just to see how they trended against that.

And so our intent will be to do this every year. It's just like a little report card, if you want; and so that's there for the committee's information.

That's our overview, and then I'm looking for feedback. Is this helpful? I think in the context of moving forward with future discussions, are there areas the committee is interested in getting into based on what you saw here, Mr. Chair? So we would entertain a discussion if the committee wishes to on that topic.

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 48

```
1
                   MR. CLINE: Can I ask one question?
 2
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Sure.
 3
                               Just, Eric, is this going to
                   MR. CLINE:
    tie back to NTD and all these same stats?
 4
 5
                   MR. GLEASON: Many of these stats are
    also reported to NTD, yes. Obviously, we don't --
 6
 7
                   MR. MCBETH: And for the new members, NTD
    is National Transit Database, which is a -- the most
 8
 9
    esoteric report. You do it on an annual basis and then
10
    there are these dwarfs that live in a basement in
    Baltimore and each one of them has 15 telephones and
11
    they spend the rest of the year calling you, asking you
12
13
    "Why is this 1,000 of 1 percent off of what you reported
14
    last year?"
15
                   MR. CLINE:
                               The only reason I ask that --
16
                   MR. GLEASON: I can't wait for the
17
    minutes for the next meeting.
                   MR. MCBETH: It's true. It's a true
18
19
    story.
20
                   MR. CLINE: Not to disagree with the
21
    esteemed Chair, my question was to make sure that if you
22
    get questioned on these results compared to NTD, they
23
    should -- just making sure they sync up or there's a
24
    good reason they don't.
25
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Correct.
```

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CLINE: And, again, the same -- you 2 know, where I was before, we ran into all kinds of issues with, you know, there's the truth and then 3 there's sometimes what happens, you know, just because 4 of the way that -- not necessarily the truth, but 5 certain things are excluded and certain things are not. 6 7 MR. GLEASON: Yes. MR. CLINE: And it gets confusing when 8 9 you try to compare the two and particularly if we have a 10 critic that comes in that is harping on -- and I went 11

through this process where somebody pulled down all the NTD data and then was slamming our numbers and trying

13 to, you know -- we've all been there, right? I mean,

it's just not putting an easy target out there for

someone to say we're not telling -- you know, look at

16 one set and another set is different numbers.

So just a thought or with a -- or some kind of caveat in this. If it's not going to match, say it won't and that's okay because this is good data. I mean, this is good information. I mean, to compare both -- I mean, so you can show performance; but just, again, that's one of the dangers is you're getting on -- just a personal note having been through that, I mean, you can just get slammed by that stuff. That -- no easy targets for the critics. That's all I suggest.

```
1
                   MR. GLEASON: Appreciate that.
 2
                   MR. MCBETH: Any other comments?
 3
                   Okay. There being none, thank you very
    much, Eric. And we're moving on to Item No. 8,
 5
    discussion on FY '19 work program.
 6
                   Did you want action on that one, on the
   performance thing?
 8
                   MR. GLEASON: I would say not needed
 9
    unless the committee is interested in pursuing any piece
10
    of this, a piece of it.
                   MR. CLINE: Would it make sense for us to
11
12
    say, "Endorse this," say --
13
                   MR. GLEASON: Yes.
14
                   MR. MCBETH: -- "Move forward as it's
15
    worded"?
16
                   MR. GLEASON: I think just leave it. I
17
    don't think we're looking for that. It's -- you know,
    the report's in. We do this every year. We probably
18
19
    should come back to --
20
                   MR. MCBETH: Come back with it. Good
21
    report.
2.2
                   Item No. 8, discussion on FY '19 work
23
    program, topics including but not limited to the
24
    following three items. All right, Eric.
25
                   MR. GLEASON: Mr. Chair and members of
```

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 the committee, so this is -- this conversation will 2 really help shape the committee's agenda for the next year or so. And it follows on a discussion we had in 3 May, I believe, where we touched on a number of 4 potential future topics for the committee to look at. 5 It is a somewhat different list than that based on some 6 things that have transpired since then; but what I want to -- what we want to use this discussion for 8 9 today, is to make sure that with these three topics or 10 any other topic that the committee is interested in, that we have a full and complete understanding of what 11 12 you'd like to see the discussion entail.

So we're calling this a scope of -- a proposed scope of effort. We included a one pager on three topics. First topic was if the additional funding that has been asked for as a part of the LAR as an exceptional item, if that were to become real, then there would be -- I think everyone recognized there would be significant challenges from an implementation standpoint of getting that money out the door to accomplish the purpose it was intended for. And I think the committee felt in May that there needed to be discussion of that even now, so that we understood the implications of the new funding and what it might mean for the program if it were to become available. So we

1 prepared a one pager summarizing our thoughts on that. 2 The second topic we have a one pager on is since we met last, FTA's finally coming out with 3 their final safety rule, which has been in the works for, I think, for five years is what someone has told 5 So they finally have come out with that. It does 6 have implications for recipients of 5307 and 5311 program funding. Well, just 5307 program funding, 8 9 anyone who gets it. That, we think, will translate into 10 rulemaking for this committee to help us with. And then finally, there's a one pager 11 12 that we are -- and this is not something that we 13 discussed, that I recall, at our meeting; but we do think it is time that we take a considered and 14 15 deliberate look at our intercity bus program. How the 16 money gets spent today? How well it's performing? What 17 opportunities there might be out there and given how 18 other states do the program for Texas to consider; and 19 fundamentally, whether or not we're getting out of the 20 program what we can get out of it for intercity bus 21 travel purposes? 2.2 So three topics. Three one pagers. Ι 23 would suggest we take them one at a time. 24 Mr. Chair, I'll leave it up to you. I can certainly 25 kind of walk through each one or if folks have had a

September 18, 2018
Page 53

```
1
   chance to look at them and you just want to dive in,
 2
   I'll leave it up to you.
                   MR. MCBETH: I would prefer that you go
 3
 4
   ahead and take them one --
 5
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Just a quick walk through?
 6
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Yeah, walk us through them.
 7
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 All right.
8
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                And then we can ask
9
   questions on each one when you're --
10
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 So we'll start with the
    first one. Again, keep in mind that where we want to
11
12
    leave this conversation is making sure that we've got
13
    everything that the committee feels is important to talk
   about on this topic. So we've laid out in each of
14
15
   these, there's a context, there's a purpose and scope,
16
   and then key topics for committee discussion.
17
                   First piece is on the additional
18
    41 million a year. Again, this is what's in the LAR
19
   request as an exceptional item. The 41 is compromised
20
   of two basic elements. Thirty-eight million of that 41
21
    is an ongoing operating expense associated with creating
22
    service coverage and span of operation, time of day
   operation across the entire state of 14 hours of
23
24
    service, five days a week, Monday through Friday.
25
                   So something that Dietrich and Marc --
```

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 from our previous meetings, if you were to create a map 2 today of where that level of service existed and where that coverage existed, it's in a very, very small part 3 of the state. And to turn the entire state into Monday 4 through Friday, 14-hour service, every county covered, 5 it's about \$38 million a year in ongoing additional 6 operating expense. Then, there is 3 million in there that is an annual replacement cost of the fleet, the new 9 fleet, associated with that new service.

So when you put new service out, many times you have to buy new fleet and so we want to keep that fleet in a state of good repair and it costs about 3 million a year to do that, even if you replace them once every five to seven years.

So that's how we got to 41 million. And so I want folks to take a look at how we've described the purpose and the scope, and I want to make sure that that description is consistent with the committee's expectations at this point in time. It's a bit of a difficult thing to know going into session as we are, how much of this conversation to have and to what extent any conversation in this committee over the next six to seven months, how we could characterize that conversation on behalf of the entire industry as opposed to a conversation that's been had here at the committee,

1 what does that represent and how could that be 2 represented in this timeframe during the session? Eric, just one thing that 3 MR. CLINE: struck me is the -- if this is going -- presuming that 4 5 this is achieved, this is going to be monumental for the rural -- I mean, for the programs that TxDOT does. 6 there's a second order of impact to that, which is the decisions to do service are actually done by the districts, not by Public Transportation Division. 10 the reporting back to the Legislature is going to be done by the -- you know, we're basically -- I say "we," 11 the big we, right -- making a promise to say, "If you 12 give us \$41 million, we will have 14-hour service five 13 days a week, " and how do we keep -- in two years --14 15 reporting back, showing a map that says, "You gave us 16 the money, " and map is all colored in, not -- it didn't 17 quite make it for something like -- or there's a -- it's 18 that closing -- it's closing the loop back, right? 19 We asked for money based on a certain You gave us the money, hopefully. And did we 20 need. 21 achieve that objective? And I think that would be a 22 real -- just something to keep in mind. I hope that --23 MR. FICKES: No, I understand. You're 24 talking about exception to the transit provider deciding 25 how to spend that money.

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 56

1 MR. CLINE: Right. 2 MR. FICKES: So that's --3 MR. GLEASON: So under the key topics, that first bullet point -- under key topics is what 4 5 we're trying to get at. I think, to a large extent, it's going to depend on the nature of the conversation 6 with the Legislature and the extent to which that picture that we have, is that expressed as a commitment 9 or is it expressed as a possibility? 10 The issue, historically, we do not exercise -- at the Department level, we do not exercise 11 a prescriptive approach to how transit districts choose 12 13 to spend their money. If the discussion at the 14 Legislature creates an expectation and a commitment to 15 create a specific event -- i.e. change the state to this 16 kind of coverage -- then it does seem as though we're 17 moving from, at least with these funds, from what a 18 traditional flexible format might be, which might be 19 just to allocate them out by formula and let local 20 boards make their decisions versus a more prescriptive 21 approach that says, "Got 41 million for this purpose. 2.2 Now, we're going to do the following things to make sure 23 that happens." And so it's a fundamental shift in how 24 25 this program has been managed, I think, is on the table.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And that depends on how the discussion happens with the Legislature and what their expectations are if they were to give us this money and to what extent that could be communicated following conversations that this committee has versus a more extensive conversation that would be inclusive of the entire industry.

MR. CLINE: Well, as an agency person, you're going to want to be able to dictate your -- how you control things. And if it -- if it's -- the estimate for the 41 million is based on -- we just based it on 14-hour service, and that's how we got to the number. That's reasonable. Now, we're going to let the agencies decide how to do it. That's one story versus a story that says, "No, we promised you 14 hours of service and we either delivered or failed to deliver that."

I think they're going to be coming all guns to be pointed right at Public Transportation

Division if that's the case. If that's the promise that's made.

MR. GLEASON: So our purpose today is to just make sure we've captured that. We're not trying to make a decision or have a conversation about what that means so much today, but to make sure that that issue is something that we all -- that we've captured, as we've

explained it here in this case maybe in Bullet 1; and that, yeah, we need to talk about that. And so this is the kind of stuff we're interested in hearing about that. This is the kind of stuff, but let's just kind of move through this to make sure we've hit the key issue areas. So that's the first one.

The second one then is sort of the phasing and the timing of how it happens. You know, how do we imagine this thing coming online? You know, usually you go out and spend your first couple years getting spent on capital. Making sure you've got the capital to run the service and support the service and then the service comes a little later. So what's that look like, and how do we get into that? You know, what do these agency plans look like?

Maybe the first thing we need to do is turn around and have everybody do a plan that says, you know, sure, TTI's work estimated that, you know, it would take you, you know -- Hill Country Transit District, if you take an extra \$2 million of operating money and 20 more vehicles for you to do that at the Hill Country Transit District. Well, then the Hill Country Transit District comes back and says, "Wait a minute. You know, we need 2.2 million and 22 vehicles," or "We can do it for 1.6 and we only need 18."

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

how it's managed.

1 But we need to kind of -- one step could 2 be -- step one could be go verify the amounts, and get everybody on board that way. So we kind of laid out, 3 again, what we think some of the subtopics would be 4 below each of those items in bold. And what do we do if 5 we only get a tenth of what we asked for? 6 7 So which is a very likely, if not historical, outcome is you don't get 41 million. You get five. And do we use that five in a very small 10 portion of the state to create this picture? Because if we just plug it into the formula, we're not going to get 11 anything. And we've just spent 5 million that, in 12 13 theory, was based on a longer term picture that showed a commitment. So those are -- I don't know what we do 14 15 with that right now, but I think we need to kind of walk

Then we're into, you know, this loop back, performance and accountability. How do we communicate to people that we're doing what has been expected of us with these funds? What kinds of measures? You know, is this all about putting the service out there and we're done because that's what we

our way through those conversations and talk about the

different approaches we might take with them and how we

might do it and what it might mean for this program and

1 said we'd do; or at some point, does it flip and become 2 about performance? Well, how well is that investment being used? Independent of the fact that it's a span in 3 coverage investment. If it's not being used, is that 4 the right thing to do with the money? 5 6 And then, you know, sustaining the investment. How do we lock in the additional funding? You know, we could be successful with 41 million in each 9 of the next two years and not get it the next biennium. 10 MR. MCBETH: That's exactly right. 11 MR. CLINE: That's the scary -- that is the scariest option because then you build all this 12 expectation in the public, and then you pull the rug out 13 from underneath them. 14 15 MR. GLEASON: Again, these are -- so 16 we're putting these out here as: Is this the universe 17 issues that this committee feels needs to be talked 18 about in the context of what if we got this 41 million 19 or what if we got some portion of it? What else would we need to cover? What else is on your mind? 20 21 MR. MCBETH: Well, this is John. From my 22 perspective, there has to be a requirement from the very beginning -- if we got the money -- that no one gets any 23 24 of this money until they've submitted an adequate plan

as to how they're going to spend it; what their timeline

1 is, both for getting the capital that you've got to 2 have -- because I don't think any of us have buses parked that we're not using -- as well as a requirement that we all have local communities that are not being served. What does that -- what are those local 5 communities going to do as far as coming up with cash to 6 put into the system for sustainability? 8 But I think the first thing is that you 9 have a plan, and I'm not saying give everybody \$50,000 10 to go out and hire a consultant to do their plan because that's the consultant's full employment act. I think 11 everyone is capable of doing their own plan. You know 12 13 the areas that you have, and you know why you're not 14 serving them. 15 MR. GLEASON: Right. So we can --16 MR. MCBETH: I think we're all able to do 17 So I think the plan has to be the first thing 18 before anybody gets any money at all. 19 MR. GLEASON: So, again, today we're 20 just -- I think what we're trying to do today is just 21 make sure we've got the right areas --2.2 MR. MCBETH: Yeah. MR. GLEASON: -- to be covered --23 24 MR. MCBETH: Yeah. MR. GLEASON: -- in these four bullets. 25

1 And that's an example, I think, of a discussion we could 2 have at the next or future meeting about that specifically, the idea of doing a plan. So, you know, 3 we've got four areas here. We've got flexible versus 4 prescriptive investment and the implications of that for 5 our program. We've got phasing and timing, measuring 6 performance and accountability, and sustaining the investment. Is that going to cover what needs to be 8 talked about at this point in time over the next eight 9 10 to ten months? MR. MCBETH: 11 Yeah. 12 MR. GLEASON: Okay. 13 I think it does. MR. MCBETH: 14 MR. GLEASON: Okay. 15 MR. CLINE: Yes. 16 MR. GLEASON: We can come back to these 17 if thoughts occur to this committee later on. 18 So next is the safety rule, which has 19 come out. I'm going to turn this over to Mark Sprick to 20 walk you through real quickly here on what we think this 21 effort entails. 2.2 So, Mark. 23 Thank you, Eric. MR. SPRICK: 24 So I am Mark Sprick with TXDOT's Public Transportation Division. FTA came out with their new 25

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

safety rules a couple of months ago now. As Eric
mentioned earlier, this has been about a five-year
progress to get from proposed or draft rules all the way
to this point.

We have some good news with this for this committee. The final rules, as published, they dropped the requirement for standalone rural agencies and 5310 agencies to develop a safety rule plan. I always like to lead with a little good news.

MR. GLEASON: They deferred it.

MR. SPRICK: They deferred it, yeah.

That's the phrase they used. So maybe the next administration will pick it up.

So what we produced here -- or what I produced here is a little one pager on sort of summarizing what that involves now for us. As you can see at the very bottom of the page, we're proposing that we're going to be coming to you early next calendar year with some revisions needed to the current TAC rules and the public transportation part of the TAC.

Five years ago when FTA put out the draft rules, we went ahead and stuck a little provision in there to the best that we knew at the time. It's going to require some changing now. We also are thinking you might want to consider discussing funding of this

2.2

effort. There was no money attached to the requirement to develop these safety plans for either us or the urban agencies. So that might be something to talk about, as well, and we'll share with you information that FTA generously provided about what funding we could use and it's basically the funding we're already using.

MR. GLEASON: For another purpose.

MR. SPRICK: For another purpose. So thank you very much.

So a little background. This all came out July 19th, and they gave the States and the urban providers who receive 5307 funds essentially two years to get to a final plan that we all have to approve. So by July 20th, 2020, these plans are due to FTA. The way they broke it out for who gets to write the plan is they divided it into small and large urban providers and, of course, it's not the definition you're used to based on the area of population. Instead, they defined small and urban as basically a breaking point between 100 revenue vehicles in peak service. If you have 100 or more, you're a large; and fewer than 100, you're a small.

If you're a large, you have to write and adopt and give to FTA your own plan. The caveat with that is -- and I'll start off with the good news that standalones don't have to do a safety plan; but if

you're an urban provider and you have a rural program,
your safety plan has to cover both, both your 5307
funded and other funded urban program and your rural
program. Again, thank you FTA.

If you're a small agency with fewer than 100 buses in peak revenue service, you get a choice. You can develop your own. So it's kind of like the TAM plan option. You can develop your own or you can allow TxDOT to develop one for you. You will have to have an accountable executive sign it and approve it and then you'll have to implement it and live with it, but we here at TxDOT will work with you to write it and get it drafted.

The goods news on that is FTA has already published a fillable template. So there's some things out there. And I failed to mention at the beginning, Theo is going to be helping us with this as soon as he's done with the TAM plan next week; and we'll be putting out some information and guidance to get everyone kind of oriented and primed. So we could be here at PTN developing up to, what we consider at this point, 35 individual safety plans across the state, depending on who decides to do their own and who decides to ask us to do it.

Besides the accountable executive

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 requirement, there's some new requirements around safety 2 management system; and we'll, I'm sure, have to develop some information and training and briefing materials on 3 what SMS is. In a nutshell, I've got it here. 4 basically bringing everyone in the agency together to 5 talk safety, look at safety data and incidents, analyze 6 safety, determine targets and other benchmarks, and then to document what you're doing about it. It's a pretty comprehensive requirement that I anticipate will require 10 a fair amount of documentation.

Additionally, the FTA has published their own national safety plan; and I think fortunately for us, this is based mostly on the National Transit

Database, things that we report already. But you can see here they've listed four measures that all of our safety plans for bus have to address in one way or another. I think there's flexibility on what those specific numbers are, just like we had in the TAM plan; but they're going to have to be in each agency safety plan, I think, to make that connection up to the national goals and objectives. These aren't too controversial or new; but they are going to have to be specific, and they could vary by agency. They will vary by agency, I'm sure.

And so at the end of two years, we're all

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 going to have a document for each agency that receives 2 5307 funds. We're going to have to develop rules to address and manage that; and then I'm sure just like 3 TAM, as we go along, FTA is going to be coming back to 4 us with additional feedback and guidance. The word I 5 got so far through the ASTA working group on this is 6 that they're going to do it just like TAM plan. They'll accept it. They'll check you off; and then as you get 8 9 your state management reviews or your urban triennial 10 review is every three years, that will be one of the things they look at and give you feedback on it. 11 this will be evolving, I'm sure. 12

That, in a nutshell, is the bus safety plan rule effort. And, again, if there's anything about this in the next year that you would like for us to bring back and talk about with you, I'm certainly willing to add it to our key topic's list.

Eric, anything you want to add to that?

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think the committee has a choice here. I think the committee can choose to say this is not a significant opportunity for us to advise the commission of matters of transit policy and division, we don't need to be part of the rulemaking effort, just go ahead and do what you think is best; or you could say we want to be part of rulemaking and bring

```
1
    us a presentation on, say, sources of funding and
 2
    where -- you know, where we think some of the tradeoffs
 3
    or choices might need to be made to fund this program
    versus other opportunities.
 4
                   So I think the committee has a -- they
 5
 6
    could either back off of this one entirely, or just
    focus your efforts if you want.
 8
                   Ken.
 9
                   MR. FICKES: This is Ken. Ouick
10
    question.
               So you're going -- you need to amend the TAC,
11
    right?
12
                   MR. GLEASON: Yes.
                                       All likelihood, yes.
13
                   MR. FICKES: Will that amendment affect
14
    agencies that are on their own way -- on their own plan?
15
    In other words, will there be a conflict in the rules if
    TAC -- if you have a TAC requirement, is that going to
16
17
    affect a non-TxDOT recipient?
18
                   MR. GLEASON: I think the TAC rule
19
    revisions are more than likely to be more sort of
20
    process-type revisions --
21
                                Right.
                   MR. FICKES:
2.2
                   MR. GLEASON: -- and not prescriptive,
23
    you know, you must do that or you must do this because
24
    the purpose of the TAC is to tell everyone how we're
25
    planning to administer the program.
```

1 MR. FICKES: Yeah. We have a plan. 2 We've had it for a number of years, as I was telling 3 Kelly earlier this morning. When we have incident, like a hurricane or whatever, we become part of emergency 4 5 management. So it's -- that encompasses part of that. So I have issues with having to go to somebody else now 6 and, oh, we have to comply with that. So I just wanted to make sure that's not going to happen. 8 9 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. 10 MR. FICKES: Okay. 11 MR. GLEASON: So that may be, you know, one reason the committee wants to see what we're 12 13 thinking about doing on the rules. 14 MR. FICKES: Okay. 15 MR. GLEASON: You know, it's just to make sure we're, you know, not going off the reservation on 16 17 you somewhere. 18 MR. FICKES: That's the only question I 19 have. 20 MR. CLINE: Eric, the question I have is 21 to kind of flip that around. In order to get the 22 funding and the Administrative Code changes done, would it be helpful to have the endorsement of the PTAC to 23 24 carry those items forward? It seems like it would help. 25 That's up to you. That's a question that I have from

1 the staff is that --2 MR. GLEASON: So my take on this, is that the rules are going to be fairly methodical. 3 The rules are probably not going to be all that much of a leap of, 4 you know, imagination in what they're going to entail. 5 I think the conversation around where the fundings come, 6 may be worth a conversation at the committee because I think, you know, we're going to have to go into the 5304 9 program or whatever it is and, you know, carve out 10 funding for this effort. And so it's probably worth a discussion. The rules, we can do a perfunctory review 11 for you; but it may not be such a big deal and certainly 12 13 not like we're opening up the formula in that. MR. MCBETH: Well, this is John. I would 14 15 like -- I would like to see us reserve the right for the 16 committee to review whatever you come up with, the 17 rules --18 MR. GLEASON: Okay. 19 MR. MCBETH: -- particularly the funding. 20 That's what I'm really interested in. Reserve the right 21 to review it and endorse it. 2.2 MR. GLEASON: Okay. 23 MR. MCBETH: Not approve it, but just 24 endorse it. And I think Jim's right. The commission is

accustomed to hearing from us.

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Page 71

1 MR. GLEASON: They are. 2 MR. MCBETH: That we look at it, and we're all for it. 3 4 MR. CLINE: And that may be very perfunctory for the rule piece, and more advisory for 5 the funding piece. 6 7 MR. GLEASON: Okay. All right, that's helpful. 8 9 MR. MCBETH: Okay. 10 MR. GLEASON: The final topic we have for you today is a review of the intercity bus program 11 policies and practices. So real quickly, as most of you 12 13 may know, the rural program funding that comes down to 14 us from FTA has a required 15 percent that's set aside. 15 So 15 percent of what we get as a state is set aside for -- to enhance intercity bus services. You know, 16 what -- that is about \$6.2 million right now. That's 17 18 what that represents. 19 And we -- historically, we've used our 20 coordinated call process. That's a process we do every 21 other year where we bundle up discretionary funding 22 opportunities from multiple transit grant programs. bundle it all up into one call and get proposals back on 23 24 all those programs, as opposed to doing separate calls 25 for each of them. We use that process to identify both

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1 | service and capital investments for these funds.

You know, we think it's time to ask ourselves, you know: Is the way we do this program resulting in the highest and best use of these funds for Texas?

And we want to engage the committee in that conversation. We'd like some feedback and advice from the committee on that. We are proposing to do that in a number of different steps. We would put in front of you everything we know about the current investment and how well it's doing, what it's being used for, what kind of performance it's showing. We would -- we did some work back in 2015 where we had a consultant go out and look at other states and the models they used for how they did their intercity bus program. We think that will be an interesting conversation in case it becomes apparent that maybe, you know, our sort of step-back approach, we let the proposals come to us, we review them and pick the best one as opposed to saying, "We want to do this connection." That's sort of the other end of the spectrum. You know, how prescriptive or how proactive are we as a program in terms of what we get? So following on that review of what other states do, what's the best option for Texas and then

what's the implementation strategy. Recognizing that

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

depending on what the decision could be, that too could result in a rulemaking process at the commission, for the commission to look at a significant change to our program.

Pursuing this conversation is going to be of interest to the intercity bus industry, and so we will -- part of our effort between now and the next time we talk about this, will be to engage them in this topic, letting them know that we plan on talking about this. And for those of you who have been around long enough, this can be a pretty sensitive issue for them; but I do think it's something we need to talk about.

MR. MCBETH: Well, this is John. I mean, pretty much everybody knows my opinion of the intercity bus thing. It's a minefield. The intercity bus guys — the few of them that participate in this program — they refer to it as their money. It's really not their money. It's the rural transit system's money. I would like to see this topic completely vetted, and it would be the first time it's ever been done in Texas.

It is a minefield because you're talking about removing money that the private sector is using, and I'm not saying they're misusing it; but there's so few of them using it, it's not being spread across the whole state of Texas. It's not being spread not even

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 equally. It's just certain intercity bus people doing 2 certain -- subsidizing certain routes. 3 MR. GLEASON: Correct. MR. MCBETH: And I understand what 4 5 they're doing; but I also know that rural transit systems serve the whole state and we do a lot of 6 intercity transportation and we could be doing the same thing, using some of this 6.2 million. So I would like 8 9 to see this as a topic added to our work plan to do 10 something about intercity bus, and you may decide to keep it the way it is. It's only \$6.2 million; but 11 still, that's 15 percent of the rural appropriation for 12 13 the State of Texas. So --14 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I agree with 15 John. I think what we've all seen for several years is 16 the intercity routes being cut. Especially in the west 17 Texas area back where we're from, we used to have that. 18 Now, they've cut those routes; and I'm all for looking

MR. FICKES: I support both these gentlemen. This is Ken. I would like to know about the, you know, connectivity. What kind of connectivity does it create? Because sometimes there's -- you put a price on that and sometimes there's a lot of people that

at the intercity bus program and seeing what we need to

do to adjust any allocation for them, if anything.

1 get from A to B. So I would like to make sure we cover 2 that when we do that. Also, how much money is left on 3 the table every two years? MR. GLEASON: What's that? 4 5 MR. FICKES: How much money is left on 6 the table every two years? Is it all allocated, or is it not? 8 MR. GLEASON: Our current approach, about 9 80 percent of the funding is wrapped up in ongoing 10 operating contracts. 11 MR. FICKES: Okay. 12 Now, historically, the MR. GLEASON: 13 program -- and this is meaning going back five, six, ten 14 years -- there was a higher element of capital 15 investment associated with the program. We found ourselves, we were doing a lot of ongoing renovation 16 17 work in Houston and San Antonio and Dallas that seemed 18 to have a never ending use to it. While the notion is 19 that rural program/rural services connect into those 20 terminals, and so that's where they make the connection 21 to the national bus network. So we've kind of moved away from that 2.2 23 heavy capital orientation, that way, to more of an 24 operating orientation. Leaving only about 20 percent of 25 it for capital and that is an element of it that

```
1
    typically will be used in the context of building a
 2
    multimodal transit center, if you will, that has a share
    of it being used by intercity bus services. So we can
 3
    help fund facility investments that rural transit
    providers are making if there's an intercity bus service
 5
 6
    element to it.
 7
                                Is it capital cost of
                   MR. FICKES:
    contracting or is it 80/20 capital or is there operating
 8
 9
    expenses involved?
10
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 It's operating.
                                                   It's
11
    operating expenses. We are not -- to my knowledge,
    we're not associated -- our funds are not associated
12
13
    with the capital costs of contracting.
14
                   MR. FICKES: So what's the ratio in
    the --
15
16
                   MR. GLEASON: 50/50.
17
                   MR. FICKES:
                                50/50 just like what was
18
    said.
19
                   MR. GLEASON: Over time, the FTA has
20
    allowed some pretty creative opportunities, though, in
21
    terms of unsubsidized elements of the intercity bus
2.2
    carrier operation to be used as match in these
23
    arrangements in order to facilitate some of these -- you
24
    know, hanging onto some of these key rural area
25
    connections. So there are some nuances to the way this
```

program -- advantages and very specific opportunities
that are part of this discussion.

Okay. So those are the three areas that we're proposing to engage the committee in over the next several years -- not several years -- next several months, next year or so. From our standpoint, we'd like to get going on the intercity bus discussion sooner rather than later. We think the safety one will map out its own timetable; but, you know, we see perhaps proposed rules sometime after the first of the new calendar year.

The implementation of the 41 million, the timing of that conversation is one we're not so sure about when the committee might want to do that and to what extent you want to do that now versus, you know, toward the end of the session when you may have an idea of which way it's going. So I'll leave that up to y'all on that one, and that's one of the areas we do need to hear back from you on today is the timing of that.

I don't -- I don't feel as though, as the Director, that I could commit to moving all three at the same time together with the same level of detail.

That's probably more than we could bite off as staff, so.

MR. MCBETH: Yeah, this is John. I

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 The easiest piece of this is the safety piece, 2 which is going to -- it's going to basically follow its The intercity bus is something we could do 3 own path. something about, I think, via just a couple of meetings, 4 if you report to us, you know, what's going on with it, 5 what are they spending, how much of the state -- you 6 know, based upon the 41 million exercise we did to get everybody up to five days a week, 14 hours a day, we 9 need to apply that same thing to intercity bus. How can 10 we spread that across the state?

I know it's only \$6.2 million, but I think it could be spent better. So I think that's the easiest piece and I'd like for us to have that at least on the next couple of agendas so that we can talk about and decide what direction we want to go. We -- I know that they will -- the couple of companies that use it, they will show up because they -- this is, from their perspective, their money; and it's a national thing, not just a Texas thing. Nationally that's the way it is; and I assume their Executive Vice President for Greyhound, I think he will probably show up, too.

We've dealt with this at the Community
Transportation Association of America numerous times,
and they don't like anybody to even question it. So my
attitude is we should. We should be questioning it.

25

1 It's public money, and we should be spending it. And, 2 you know, I'm a strong believer of the private sector. I use them a lot, but this one is just one that we need 3 to get it under control. So that would be my 4 perspective. And then the 41 million, I think that's 5 something we begin to address closer to the session when 6 we know where we're going to go. MR. GLEASON: Closer to the end of the 8 9 session? 10 MR. MCBETH: No. Closer to the 11 beginning. I mean --12 MR. GLEASON: Well, the session begins in 13 January. MR. MCBETH: -- we know it's going to 14 15 be -- yeah. We know it's -- we know in January it's 16 going to be on their radar screen. I think we look at 17 it for the first three or four months just to see if 18 it's dead on arrival. I hate to do a lot of planning 19 for something that I know is dead and just right now 20 what my people are telling me is anybody asking for any 21 new money, it's dead on arrival with the session that's 22 coming up, so. 23 Just if I could, just throw MR. CLINE:

one thought out there. Comparing the interstate -- or

the intercity program to this, that's an eight-fold

1 difference in potential, right? I mean, shift in -- I 2 mean, that could be huge. I mean, the magnitude is so 3 much greater with this. Is there anything in -- that could help 4 the story for asking for the 41 million? 5 In other words, you're going to be asked the question: What are 6 you going to do if you get it? What are you going to do if you get less? 8 9 Would it be better to have some input on 10 those things or better to -- for y'all to audible that and then come back and say, "Okay, here's where it's 11 kind of heading. This is what we ought to do, " or like 12 you said, "It's dead on arrival," you know? 13 14 MR. GLEASON: So the dynamic behind an 15 exceptional item request is it gets stripped out of our 16 appropriations request on arrival. 17 MR. CLINE: Yeah. 18 MR. GLEASON: And then it is up to a 19 discussion during the session to bring it back to life. 20 I'm paraphrasing, but that's -- so it doesn't 21 necessarily follow that the Department will be asked on it, unless it is picked up and brought back to the 22 forefront of discussion by another entity. I think I'm 23 24 saying that pretty much right.

Yeah.

MR. MCBETH:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. GLEASON: So, you know, in the past there's not been that much discussion on exceptional 2 items that has actually gotten to, say, a committee 3 where the Department has been asked to speak on it. So whether or not we get that far -- you know, I think 5 maybe if we can get into the session a bit, we'll have a 6 read on -- John, as you described -- on where it's going. 8 What I'm trying to figure out in my own 10 mind for the committee and what I'd like to hear back on is we normally meet every other month. So our normal 11 schedule will have us meeting sometime in November, 12 13 early December. We always struggle a bit with the 14 holidays. And then the next meeting is January, which is when the session starts. 15 16 MR. MCBETH: It starts. 17 MR. GLEASON: So, you know, I don't

MR. GLEASON: So, you know, I don't know -- my preference would be to spend November, January, and March focused on intercity bus and perhaps the safety rules or what it looks like and to pick up this conversation a little bit later; but just only because, you know, I think we'll have a better picture on whether it's necessary or not.

I think at this point all we could respond to is these are the areas that would need to be

fleshed out and -- but so I would leave it up to the committee. But one approach would have us picking the implementation issues up March, April, May timeframe and not before because we're going to spend our time before that more focused on intercity bus.

MR. MCBETH: This is John again. I think the first question that -- and I spend a lot of time over there. First question we'll be asked and even by friendly people -- and we do have a lot of friendly people over in the pink building -- will be: Well, how is this money going to get distributed?

Some of that's a selfish question, and some of that is a public policy question. So I think it would be helpful if we -- perhaps the next PTAC meeting or the one after the next PTAC meeting -- came up with a pat answer that TxDOT is going to have a prescriptive manner in which they distribute this money, you're going to have to have a plan, you're going to have to have a timeline, you're going to have to say how much money you're going to need to do it, how many more people are you going to serve, something that we can say to the -- because the only way to resurrect an exceptional item -- as you say, they're stripped out of our budget as soon as they get over there -- is to have the leadership resurrected and those are the guys that ask the hard

distribution --

25

1 questions. 2 I don't know who's going to be in charge of Appropriations this time, but we know the Chair of 3 Transportation will be on the Appropriations Committee 4 and I don't have a real good feel on who's going to be 5 the Transportation Chair. 6 7 So here's my dilemma --MR. GLEASON: it's kind of like a rock and hard place dilemma -because in this timeframe, this committee could have a 9 conversation and reach a conclusion. 10 11 MR. MCBETH: Uh-huh. 12 I don't believe we could MR. GLEASON: 13 translate that conclusion in this timeframe to a TxDOT. 14 MR. MCBETH: Okay. I know that's a 15 tough -- that's tough, yeah. 16 MR. GLEASON: So we're willing to allow 17 the committee to have a conversation to get to where you 18 think you need to be. We just would need to stop short 19 of it being anything described as a Department --20 MR. MCBETH: As TxDOT's policy, yeah. 21 Right. 2.2 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. Because I think the 23 only answer we could give at this time is, you know, 24 we're going to have to do rulemaking around the

```
1
                   MR. MCBETH: Yeah.
 2
                   MR. GLEASON: -- of funds if it's in
 3
    anything other than a formula distribution.
 4
                   MR. MCBETH: And that will probably be
    adequate as an answer. TxDOT will have to do rulemaking
 5
    because we have a formula, and this is going to
 6
    circumvent that formula. So, yeah, I understand that.
    We can go -- we'll go with the March date.
 9
                                 So that's our dilemma right
                   MR. GLEASON:
10
   now, so.
                   MR. SALAZAR: I'm fine with that.
11
12
                   MR. GLEASON: You're fine with --
13
                   MR. MCBETH: That works.
14
                   MR. SALAZAR: We can delay until
15
    March with the 41 million, and going forward with the
16
    intercity bus program.
17
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Okay.
18
                   MR. SALAZAR:
                                 Seeing if we can line that
19
    up.
20
                   MR. MCBETH: Okay. That's Agenda Item
21
   No. 8.
2.2
                   Agenda Item No. 9 is public comments.
23
                   Josh, do we have anybody signed up for
24
    public comments?
25
                   MR. RIBAKOVE: I haven't received any
```

25

1 speaker cards, but we do have sheets on the table in the 2 front if anybody is interested in making public comment. We can take care of that. 3 MR. MCBETH: Is there anybody interested 4 5 in a public comment? 6 MR. ERIC BACKES: The only public comment that I wanted to make, my name's Eric Backes. And I am the brand new Executive Director of the Texas Transit 9 Association, and I just wanted to introduce myself. 10 MR. MCBETH: Welcome, welcome. 11 MR. ERIC BACKES: And I'm here if you have any questions for me, and I look forward to working 12 13 with y'all. Thank you. 14 Okay. No. 10, propose and MR. MCBETH: 15 discuss agenda items for the next meeting and confirm a 16 date of the next meeting. I have one person that wants 17 to talk about agenda items, and it's Ken Fickes from 18 Houston. 19 MR. FICKES: Ken Fickes from Houston, 20 Texas. Pass these around. Hopefully, I have enough of 21 these. 2.2 I've talked with Eric about this before 23 and I sent him an e-mail a few months ago, hoping I

wasn't going too far off the reservation on this; but

I've been want -- I've been looking at development

credits and the policies around the state for the last three years. And before Bobby Killebrew left, he sent me a lot of data on how much of an issue by TxDOT to most of the smaller providers.

And maybe I need to back up for a minute for those of you who are not familiar with development credits. They used to be called toll credits, and they're generated by toll roads being built. They're not cash. They're not real money, but they can count — they can count for your match if you're spending federal dollars. So what I've seen is we've got a disparity in the programs around the state. There's four different policies, and none of them are even close to being the same. And even, I think, CAMPO here in Austin just got theirs revised I think in January of this year.

Last summer, they did their TAC and got it approved for change. They were operating under an old policy that was missing a lot of elements to it.

But I would like to bring this back again for us to look at. In February of 2012, we changed our guiding principles and one of the things that we are supposed to be doing is develop a consistent and transparent method to award funds and that included development credits.

Well, about six months later, the commission put together a committee to review the use of

1 development credits and come up with some alternatives 2 and so they wound up giving -- what -- 75 percent of it was divided and sent out to the MPOs for their areas if it was generated and then y'all kept 25 percent or something like that. So am I wrong? Am I close? 5 6 MR. GLEASON: Development credits are generated with toll projects. 8 MR. FICKES: Right. 9 The current rules, current MR. GLEASON: 10 Administrative Code rules adopted by the commission, say that 75 percent of the development credits generated by 11 any region, stay in that region. 12 13 MR. FICKES: Right. 14 MR. GLEASON: And that the MPO of that 15 region has the ability to create its own rules on how it 16 wants to distribute development credits. 25 percent of 17 it is -- goes to a statewide pot for purposes for use 18 around the remaining balance of the state, under some 19 more specific rules that are laid out in the 2.0 Administrative Code to apply only to those 25 percent. 21 MR. FICKES: Right. 2.2 MR. GLEASON: And that's where you see 23 these differences in approaches --24 MR. FICKES: Right. 25 MR. GLEASON: -- coming up with regions

September 18, 2018 Page 88

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

that are generating these things, are developing their
own policies and procedures on how to distribute them
and who gets them for what purpose and we have a
separate approach for using the other 25 percent.

MR. FICKES: Right.

MR. GLEASON: So.

MR. FICKES: And, like, between Houston and NCTCOG and Dallas/Fort Worth, they have a more liberal policy than, say, the City of Houston does. They have an actual carve-out for transit agencies that need funding. Whereas in our area, we don't have that. It's like pulling teeth to get development credits in the Houston region. So that's what we've evolved to over the last -- what -- seven years.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MR. FICKES: No, six years. And I just think it merits a look-at to see if we're on the right track with this, is it okay they way we're doing it, or is it creating a disparity in the system amongst the providers. I don't know the answer to that. I haven't had the time to completely study and vet that out.

TTI did a review in 2013. It was fairly inconclusive, and it didn't really address that. So I just wanted to throw it out to the committee and see how y'all feel about it.

1 MR. GLEASON: So this would be an example 2 of an action item --3 MR. MCBETH: Uh-huh. MR. GLEASON: -- if the committee wanted 4 to add that to your work program, this discussion; and 5 we would -- we've got some idea of what you're looking 6 We would need to lead, I think, with that which we have, more or less. 8 9 MR. FICKES: Right. 10 MR. GLEASON: And some sort of sense of 11 timing of when you'd like to see it. 12 MR. FICKES: Okay. Anybody else have any 13 interest in that? 14 MR. MCBETH: This is John. I'm always 15 open to discussing more funding. I'd like to -- I guess 16 we could add it to the next PTAC agenda just for a 17 discussion purpose to determine -- just get a report 18 from TxDOT on: Is there any opportunity for this rule 19 to be changed? I remember when this came up, the whole 20 75 percent/25 percent. I wouldn't have a problem 21 putting it in here for discussion. I just think we may 22 just need to know a lot more about it. 23 MR. GLEASON: So one of the things, for 24 example, an approach could be to bring a handful of these other folks in, for example, and ask them to 25

September 18, 2018 Page 90

1 describe how they do the program. How does NCT 2 calculate it, and how does H-GAC apply? So the committee could hear; and then we could talk about how 3 4 we manage the statewide pot, as well. I don't necessarily think our staff would be a bit able to 5 describe how NCT calculates its program. So we could --6 7 MR. FICKES: Well, I know they -- I have the same issue. 8 MR. GLEASON: Right. 10 MR. FICKES: This is Ken. I have the 11 same issue. 12 MR. GLEASON: So if we could arrange that 13 kind of a conversation --14 MR. FICKES: This is just a review of 15 their policies. It doesn't necessarily say it's the way it is in the real world. I think that's a good idea. 16 17 Also, I think we need to know how much TxDOT's issued 18 over the last few years in development credits because 19 it's hard to evaluate that without knowing. I know what 2.0 we've done in Houston, which is pretty small. 21 MR. GLEASON: Right. So we can describe 22 our approach, you know, and where -- you know, public 23 transportation gets a pot every year of 15 million or if 24 we have --25 MR. FICKES: Or --

```
1
                   MR. GLEASON: -- multiple billion of
 2
    this --
 3
                   MR. FICKES: Or up to 50 percent of the
    total, if I read that correctly.
 4
 5
                   MR. GLEASON: What's that?
 6
                   MR. FICKES: Or up to -- you get 15
    percent or no less than 50 percent of the total, is that
   how it reads?
 8
                                 No. We get 15 million a
 9
                   MR. GLEASON:
10
    year --
11
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Right.
12
                   MR. GLEASON: -- unless the total amount
13
    available drops --
14
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Right.
15
                   MR. GLEASON: -- at which point, we'll
16
    only get half of what the --
17
                   MR. FICKES: Right, that was it.
18
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 It's complicate, but
19
    it's --
20
                   MR. FICKES: I recently read it again.
21
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Right now -- this is John.
22
    But right now, the rural and the small urban program,
    from my perspective, I mean, no one has called me and
23
24
    told me that they have not gotten the total of credits
25
    they've requested. And the commission just gave you
```

```
1
    permission to distribute them basically on your own
 2
    without having to come back to the commission.
                   MR. FICKES:
                                I remember that now.
 3
 4
                   MR. MCBETH: So you're given an amount
    that you can distribute, which I think that's a -- I
 5
    don't want to make the commission mad and take that away
 6
    because I remember how hard it used to be to go get
           Now, it's y'all just distribute them.
                   MR. GLEASON: Just throw them off the
 9
10
    rooftop.
11
                   MR. MCBETH: No, not actually. You've
12
    got to apply for them and justify them, but --
13
                   MR. FICKES:
                                We do.
14
                   MR. MCBETH: -- it's a lot easier than
15
    going in front of the commission each and every time.
16
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 That was mostly a timing
17
    issue --
18
                   MR. MCBETH:
                               Sure.
19
                   MR. GLEASON: -- and it just took time.
20
                   MR. FICKES:
                                Right.
21
                               I'm sorry. Just if I could
                   MR. CLINE:
22
    offer a suggestion. Even in COG -- even in NCTCOG, it's
23
    not real easy. While they have a very liberal program
24
    in terms of what's applicable, it's still not real easy
25
    to do.
```

```
1
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 It's never easy.
 2
                   MR. CLINE: It's never easy. Okay.
 3
    suggestion would be to start with -- 25 percent is a
    huge chunk of money, right? I mean, 15 -- I mean,
 4
    that's still a big bucket of cash, right?
 5
 6
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 It's not cash; but, yeah.
 7
                   MR. CLINE: I know it's not cash.
                                                       It's
    CT cash.
              I know.
 8
                       This is where it really gets
 9
    complicated --
10
                   MR. GLEASON: Yeah.
                   MR. CLINE: -- because it's not real
11
12
    money.
13
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Right.
14
                   MR. CLINE: You've got to have other --
15
    start with, okay, what are the possibilities if this
16
    money was available that we could use it for, right?
17
    How it could be utilized and then go back to the
18
    question of saying, "Do we -- A, do we have enough; and,
19
    B, do we need to talk more about that, "because if the
    question came back: Does TxDOT -- who I think holds
2.0
21
    sway over the TDC program overall, correct -- was to
22
    say, "Really what you need to do is a certain percentage
    of this needs to be allocated to transit or we're not
23
24
    going to say that, "right? Because statewide we already
25
    are, right? 25 percent?
```

1 MR. GLEASON: 15 million a year. 2 MR. CLINE: 15 million a year is already 3 out there. And then how much of that is being used, 4 right? 5 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. 6 MR. CLINE: And is there a possibility for more, right? To use more if we had more, which I think may be the harder question, right? That may be 8 the -- that may resolve the issue right off the bat in 10 some ways. Not to -- I mean, Ken, not -- I mean, I'm just trying to logically think through it because this 11 is going to be a sense of the issue of how we guys are 12 13 going to want it, you know, because it seems like we 14 could get into some --15 MR. FICKES: Well, it was a sensitive 16 issue in 2012 and '13 when we fought it out in a TAC 17 meeting in Houston, that there were a lot of political 18 agendas in that room about who should have it and who 19 shouldn't. At the end of the day, we wound up with 2.0 something that nobody really likes. 21 MR. GLEASON: Well, let me -- let me --2.2 let us look at reconstructing the issue for the 23 committee. I think there were visions back then of 24 using the drawdown, large elements of the federal 25 program which would allow you to pool your state

```
1
    elements and go do something else with them that might
 2
    be more expeditious for them to obtain them more
    quickly. I'm not sure that ever was realized. It was a
 3
    contentious discussion at the time.
 5
                   Let us look at structuring a conversation
    for the committee on why we are where we are today and
 6
    what it is and then, you know -- I think, John, your
    question about whether or not the Department would be
 8
    willing to consider, is probably going to take some kind
    of a conclusion from this committee --
10
11
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Right.
12
                   MR. GLEASON: -- as to why they ought to
13
    consider reopening it.
14
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                Right.
15
                   MR. GLEASON: Well --
16
                   MR. MCBETH: Because it was a big battle.
17
    It was a big battle.
18
                   MR. GLEASON: It was. You know, I think
19
    this is kind of open-ended right now. I don't know
2.0
    where it might end up.
21
                   MR. FICKES: I don't either.
                                                 I just
2.2
    think it needs to be looked at again, and I've thought
23
    that for a number of years.
24
                   MR. GLEASON: Okay.
25
                                So it's just been more
                   MR. FICKES:
```

```
1
   obvious than, you know -- you can't, though, just change
2
   their policy. In January, previous to then, their
   Director had the authority to do a discretionary award
3
   subject to the award approval. So, I mean, it's --
   they've changed a lot of stuff.
5
6
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                Yeah.
                                        I think what it
   could boil down to was just in the rules where it now
    just allows the MPOs to do as they see fit, there may be
   room for a little more direction in those rules at that
10
   point that would bring a measure of consistency.
                                                      That's
11
   one example of what could happen.
12
                                I don't remember the exact
                   MR. FICKES:
13
   makeup of the committee that TxDOT put together, but I
   do recall that four of the members were MPOs and one was
14
15
   a very large metro. So say what you want to about MPOs;
   but if they want to control the money, I'm sure that's
16
17
   the way their vote went. So, anyway.
18
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                 Yeah. So, okay.
19
                   MR. MCBETH: Okay. Josh, when is the
2.0
   next meeting?
21
                   MR. RIBAKOVE: According to the usual
22
   schedule, that would be the last Tuesday in November,
   which is the 27th. Now, that's the Tuesday after
23
24
   Thanksqiving. So Tuesday the 20th, before Thanksqiving
```

and Tuesday, the 4th of the December.

1 MR. FICKES: Oh, you're looking at 2 alternates? 3 MR. RIBAKOVE: Looking at alternates if 4 that --5 MR. FICKES: Next date would be the 27th, is that what you're saying? 6 7 MR. RIBAKOVE: Normal schedule, next one would be the 27th. 8 9 I would go for the December MR. MCBETH: 10 meeting. That's way before Christmas and after 11 Thanksgiving. 12 MR. FICKES: Which date's that? The 13 December --14 That would be MR. RIBAKOVE: 15 December 4th. 16 We just need kind of -- are MR. GLEASON: 17 we heading that direction? 18 MR. MCBETH: Yeah, that's what I'd like. 19 MR. GLEASON: So that's the general sense of the committee? Stay away from the Thanksgiving 2.0 21 holiday? 22 MR. MCBETH: Yeah, Thanksqiving holiday. 23 Not drift any closer to MR. GLEASON: Christmas? 24 25 Don't drift any closer than MR. MCBETH:

```
the 6th.
 1
 2
                   MR. GLEASON: So we'll figure it out, but
    it's looking like the 4th right now.
 3
 4
                   MR. MCBETH: All right.
 5
                   MR. GLEASON:
                                  Okay.
                                 Okay. Anything else?
 6
                   MR. MCBETH:
                                                        There
   being no other, I'll take a motion to adjourn.
 8
                   MR. FICKES: So moved.
 9
                   MR. WHYTE: Second.
                   MR. MCBETH: I have a motion and a
10
11
    second. Any objections? All in favor say aye.
12
                   (Chorus of ayes)
13
                   MR. MCBETH: All opposed say no. We're
14
    adjourned.
15
                   (Meeting adjourns at 12:04 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
2.0
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

September 18, 2018 Page 99

1	CERTIFICATE		
2	STATE OF TEXAS )		
3	COUNTY OF TRAVIS )		
4	I, Paige S. Watts, Certified Shorthand		
5	Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do hereby		
6	certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as		
7	hereinbefore set out.		
8	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such		
9	were reported by me or under my supervision, later		
10	reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and		
11	control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true,		
12	and correct transcription of the original notes.		
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my		
14	hand and seal this Turn in date 3rd day of October,		
15	2018.		
16			
17			
18			
19	Paign S. Wattr		
20			
21	Paige S. Watts, CSR, RPR CSR No.: 8311		
22	Expiration: December 31, 2018 Firm Registration No. 631		
23	Kim Tindall & Associates, LLC 16414 San Pedro, Suite 900		
24	San Antonio, Texas 78232 Phone 866.672.7880		
25	1110110 000.072.7000		

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: \$16..8

<b>\$</b>	2	4
<b>\$16</b> 15:2	<b>2.2</b> 58:24	<b>40</b> 32:7,10
<b>\$2</b> 58:20	<b>20</b> 40:24 58:21 75:24	<b>41</b> 53:18,19,20 54:15 56:21 57:10
<b>\$26</b> 15:6	<b>20,000</b> 38:15	59:8 60:8,18 77:12 78:7 79:5 80:8 84:15
<b>\$38</b> 54:6	<b>200</b> 4:7,10	4th 96:25 97:15 98:3
<b>\$41</b> 19:20 24:13 55:13	<b>2012</b> 86:20 94:16	
<b>\$50,000</b> 27:20 61:9	<b>2013</b> 88:22	5
<b>\$6.2</b> 71:17 74:11 78:11	<b>2015</b> 15:15 72:13	<b>5</b> 7.22 25.7 0 50.42
<b>\$6.7</b> 10:3	<b>2016</b> 26:7	<b>5</b> 7:22 35:7,8 59:12
<b>\$60,000</b> 21:12	<b>2018</b> 7:4 26:8	<b>50</b> 32:8,11 91:3,7
<b>\$82</b> 8:11 24:19	<b>50/50</b> 76:16,17 <b>2020</b> 64:14	
	<b>2020-2021</b> 19:17	<b>53</b> 33:11
1	<b>2021</b> 16:19	<b>5304</b> 70:8
<b>1</b> 4:11 48:13 58:1	<b>2022</b> 33:19,24	<b>5307</b> 17:8 25:15 30:19 52:7,8 64:12 65:2 67:2
<b>1,000</b> 48:13	<b>20th</b> 64:14 96:24	<b>5310</b> 27:12 33:12 63:7
<b>1,120</b> 32:21	<b>22</b> 58:24	<b>5311</b> 17:9 25:15 27:12 52:7
<b>1.6</b> 58:25	<b>25</b> 22:8,11,14 28:4,24 29:1 87:4,16,	<b>5324</b> 9:16 10:15
<b>10</b> 14:23 15:3,21,24 16:1,23,25	20 88:4 93:3,25	<b>5339</b> 14:20 15:2 16:6 17:8
39:25 40:1,22,24 41:11 85:14	<b>26</b> 39:24 40:21,24	<b>55</b> 33:13
<b>100</b> 31:3 64:19,20,21 65:6	<b>27</b> 28:24,25 29:1	<b>57</b> 23:7
,	<b>27th</b> 96:23 97:5,8	
<b>11</b> 6:10	<b>28th</b> 22:8	6
<b>11,000</b> 6:10	<b>2B-1</b> 4:8	<b>6</b> 15:25 22:7 25:6
<b>12:04</b> 98:15	3	<b>6.2</b> 74:8
<b>13</b> 38:4 41:2 94:16		<b>6.7</b> 12:12
<b>14</b> 53:23 57:14 78:8	<b>3</b> 46:13 54:7,13	<b>6:00</b> 42:7
<b>14-hour</b> 54:5 55:13 57:11	<b>3.0</b> 33:2	<b>6th</b> 98:1
<b>15</b> 31:4,13 32:13,25 35:8 48:11 71:14,15 74:12 90:23 91:6,9 93:4	<b>30</b> 11:13 21:23	
94:1,2	<b>35</b> 65:21	7
<b>16</b> 6:20 15:7,19 16:1,25 38:3,13	<b>350</b> 15:7	<b>7</b> 36:24
<b>17</b> 37:18 38:3,5,13 41:3 46:1	<b>36</b> 28:3,4,25	<b>75</b> 23:6 87:2,11 89:20
<b>18</b> 58:25	<b>360</b> 14:22	<b>78704</b> 4:10
<b>19</b> 50:5,22	<b>37</b> 27:6	
<b>19th</b> 64:11	<b>39.1</b> 33:20	8
<b>1st</b> 25:16 26:8		<b>8</b> 6:14 7:4 20:12 50:4,22 84:21

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: 80..area

**80** 75:9 adjourned 98:14 alternatives 87:1 80/20 76:8 adjourns 98:15 Altoona 32:8 adjust 74:20 **81** 33:8 amazing 24:21 88 32:24 admin 27:17 ambulance 44:8 administer 68:25 amend 68:10 9 administration 8:23 9:7,15 13:21 amendment 68:13 25:14 63:13 America 78:23 9 41:19 43:1,24 84:22 **Administrative** 69:22 87:10,20 Amistad 21:13 9-1-1 4:9 adopt 64:23 amount 10:3 14:21 15:23 20:18 93 23:13 adopted 87:10 21:17 22:13 24:18 66:10 91:12 92:4 advanced 27:21 Α amounts 20:19 59:2 advantages 77:1 **Abilene** 43:9.10 analyze 66:6 advice 72:7 ability 87:15 announcing 8:11 advise 67:22 accept 67:8 annual 38:3 39:22 48:9 54:8 advisory 4:4 5:20 6:23 71:5 accomplish 51:21 anticipate 66:9 **AED** 4:10 account 44:14 anticipated 15:11 16:16 affect 68:13.17 accountability 59:21 62:7 anticipating 35:18 aftermath 9:13 accountable 65:10,25 **Antonio** 6:5 42:4 43:10.16 75:17 age 26:19,24 31:5 accurate 37:24 40:1 apparent 72:17 agencies 17:7 21:11 23:6,16 accustomed 70:25 29:16 35:12,17 57:13 63:7,8 64:3 applicable 92:24 68:14 88:10 achieve 55:21 **application** 11:9,12 15:1 21:3 agency 9:1 21:2 35:8 46:20,23 achieved 55:5 **apply** 31:24 78:9 87:20 90:2 92:12 57:7 58:15 65:5 66:5,19,23,24 67:1 act 18:4 61:11 **approach** 34:10,11 35:18 56:12, **agenda** 7:4 9:5 20:12 36:10,24 21 72:18 75:8 82:2 88:4 89:24 action 11:14 20:25 36:9,11,13,16, 51:2 84:20,22 85:15,17 89:16 90:22 21 50:6 89:2 agendas 78:14 94:18 approaches 59:17 87:23 active 5:5 agree 43:6,23 74:14 78:1 appropriated 9:17 **actual** 88:10 ahead 19:2 53:4 63:22 67:24 **appropriation** 9:13,14 74:12 add 15:3 67:17,18 89:5,16 **aid** 4:12 appropriations 19:18,22 80:16 **added** 74:9 air 37:6 83:3,4 additional 15:22 17:3 19:19,23 Alaska 6:1 approval 7:3 10:18,24 96:4 31:22 38:15 51:15 53:17 54:6 60:7 67:5 alerts 5:12 **approve** 11:11 36:4 64:13 65:10 70:23 Additionally 66:11 allocate 17:16 56:19 approved 7:18 86:17 address 5:6 10:6 15:10 66:16 67:3 allocated 13:3 14:24 20:18,23 79:6 88:23 75:6 93:23 approving 34:9 adequate 31:12 33:2 60:24 84:5 allocation 11:23 21:4 74:20 **April** 82:3 adhere 43:8 allowed 76:20 area 6:14 10:16 21:14 39:2 40:9, 10,11 43:14,18 45:8 47:11,14 adjourn 98:7 alternates 97:2,3 64:18 74:17 76:24 88:11

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: areas..built

**areas** 10:6 11:18 14:24 23:11,14 39:6,12 45:15 47:23 58:6 61:13,21 62:4 77:3,18 81:25 87:3

arrange 90:12

arrangement 22:3

arrangements 76:23

arrival 79:18,21 80:13,16

assessment 26:13 46:16 47:8

**asset** 18:16 25:15,25 26:4,6,8,11, 14 27:5,14 29:6,13,16 31:1 32:18

asset's 26:19

**assets** 26:6,13,14 27:1,3,19 31:14 33:8.11

assistance 23:16

**Association** 21:15 78:23 85:9

**assume** 78:20

**ASTA** 67:6

attached 11:9 64:1

attitude 78:25

attributed 41:20

attributes 23:9

audible 5:12 80:10

audit 47:1

auditorium 5:1

Austin 23:22 24:3 86:14

authority 96:3

average 15:9 47:13

averages 45:2

award 15:18 16:4 21:7,8 86:23

96:3.4

awarded 8:12

ave 7:15 98:11

ayes 7:16,18 98:12

В

**back** 12:19 13:4 16:6 18:8 23:7,22 43:11 46:10 48:4 50:19,20 55:10, 15,18 58:23 59:21 62:16 67:4,16 68:6 71:23 72:13 74:17 75:13 77:19 80:11,19,22 81:10 86:5,19

92:2 93:17,20 94:23

Backes 85:6,7,11

background 37:13 64:10

**bad** 8:19

balance 87:18

Baltimore 48:11

base 24:23 45:17

**based** 11:12 32:1,4,9 35:13 40:5 47:23 51:6 55:19 57:10 59:13

64:17 66:13 78:7

baseline 20:17

basement 48:10

**basic** 23:9 29:8 35:24 53:20

**basically** 24:22 26:21 55:11 64:6,

19 66:5 78:2 92:1

**basis** 48:9

**bat** 94:9

battle 25:3 95:16,17

Beaumont 20:23 21:1

**begin** 79:6

beginning 19:5 38:13 60:23 65:16

79:11

**begins** 79:12

**behalf** 54:24

Beidenfeld 5:22,24

believer 79:2

Beltway 6:14

benchmark 26:18,23 31:5 32:10

**benchmarks** 26:25 66:7

**Bend** 27:11

**bet** 44:13

**BIEDENFELD** 5:23

biennium 20:20 24:19 60:9

**big** 8:9 9:9 18:20,22 24:19 43:24 55:12 70:12 93:5 95:16,17

billion 91:1

**bit** 10:13 20:11,12 24:24 27:18 30:24 31:7 33:6 45:23 46:8 54:19

81:6,13,21 90:5

bite 77:23

black 28:14

**board** 59:3

**boards** 56:20

**Bobby** 86:2

-

**boil** 96:7

**bold** 59:5

**bomb** 5:5

**booth** 4:12

**bottom** 63:17

bought 17:24

**box** 40:3

brand 31:12 85:8

**Brazos** 6:19

breaking 64:19

breakout 45:7

briefing 4:6 25:7 66:3

briefly 25:18,20

**bring** 8:7 17:9 34:16 36:12 43:11,

22 44:3,8 67:16,25 80:19 86:19

89:24 96:10

bringing 24:2 42:19 66:5

**broad** 38:1

**broke** 64:15

broker 41:5

brokers 41:21,25 43:4

brought 80:22

**brows** 11:19

Bruches 42:11

**Bryan** 42:20

Bryan-college 42:2,3,4,16,17,25

bucket 93:5

budget 24:23 82:23

**budgets** 17:14,15

**build** 60:12

building 4:15,18,20 5:4 76:1 82:10

**built** 86:8

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: bullet..commit

**bullet** 56:4 58:1 **chorus** 7:16 98:12 carry 8:25 42:5,15,17 69:24 **bullets** 61:25 carve 70:9 **chose** 29:1 **bunch** 24:8 carve-out 88:10 **Christina** 5:15 7:7,8 bundle 71:21,23 **case** 4:14,23 5:5 14:8 28:7 36:13 **Christmas** 97:10.24 42:2 43:2 57:19 58:1 72:16 **bunker** 14:10 chunk 24:20 93:4 cases 38:10,11 41:7 43:3 circle 12:19 13:4 **bus** 14:20,22,23 21:10 32:8 44:3 45:3 52:15.20 66:16 67:13 71:11. cash 61:6 86:9 93:5,6,7,8 circumvent 84:7 16 72:15 73:6,15 74:1,10,19 75:21 **categories** 27:14 31:1 **cities** 43:11 76:3,5,21 77:7 78:3,9 81:19 82:5 84:16 categorized 45:16 City 88:9 buses 17:24 31:4 61:2 65:6 category 27:18 clarify 8:16 business 8:5 caused 10:2 **class** 22:8 **buy** 54:11 caveat 49:18 64:23 classes 22:9 census 40:7 **climb** 20:9 C center 76:2 Cline 6:16 7:5 16:22,23 17:17 calculate 90:2 central 6:8,20 29:10,21 34:24 36:1 44:25 48:1,3, 15,20 49:1,8 50:11 55:3 56:1 57:7 **CEO** 6:19 calculates 90:6 60:11 62:15 69:20 71:4 79:23 certification 8:22.24 80:17 92:21 93:2.7.11.14 94:2.6 calculation 40:4 **certified** 9:7 12:25 close 86:13 87:5 calendar 63:18 77:11 **CFO** 46:25 closely 33:15 44:11 call 4:4,9 7:14 10:16,20,21 11:8 17:7 21:9 46:18 71:20,23 Chair 4:3 22:24 25:8,22 34:4 47:24 closer 79:6,8,10 97:23,25 48:21 50:25 52:24 83:3,6 **called** 10:4 28:20 30:14 86:7 91:23 closing 55:18 Chairman 36:19 **calling** 48:12 51:13 **CMAC** 20:23 challenge 34:20 35:3 45:20 calls 47:4 71:24 Code 69:22 87:10.20 **challenges** 41:7 51:19 **CAMPO** 86:14 **COG** 92:22 chance 53:1 capable 61:12 collaborative 27:6 change 24:20 37:11 38:10 56:15 capital 35:1 58:11,12 61:1 72:1 collected 37:15 73:3 86:17 96:1 75:14,23,25 76:7,8,13 collection 37:21 changed 86:20 89:19 96:5 capitol 5:25 6:1 colored 55:16 changing 63:24 captured 57:22,25 Columbia 5:24 characteristics 45:11 46:1 card 47:17 combination 16:9 24:3 41:17 characterize 54:23 cards 85:1 46:17 charge 42:15 83:2 care 85:3 combined 15:5 cheaper 44:8 careful 46:7 comment 85:2.5.6 **check** 67:8 **Carole** 42:18 comments 5:17 50:2 84:22,24 choice 65:6 67:20 Carole's 43:2 commission 8:9 11:4,14 20:21 choices 68:3 21:2 24:11 67:22 70:24 73:2.3 carrier 76:22 86:25 87:10 91:25 92:2,6,15 Carrollton 6:17 choose 56:12 67:20

choosing 38:8

**commit** 77:21

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: commitment..customer

commitment 56:8,14 59:14 conflict 68:15 93:21 correctly 34:5 91:4 **committee** 4:4 5:20,21 6:23 8:3,6, conforming 19:4 21 9:3 19:11 20:4 23:4 24:13 confusing 49:8 corresponds 32:10 25:18,23 36:13 38:25 40:2 47:23, 25 50:9 51:1,5,10,22 52:10 53:13, confusion 28:9 cost 33:18,20 54:8 76:7 16 54:22,25 57:4 60:17 62:17 63:6 congestion 39:9 costs 54:12 76:13 67:19.20 68:5 69:12 70:7.16 72:6.8 77:4,14 81:3,10 82:2 83:4,9,17 congratulations 25:2 Council 21:8 86:25 88:24 89:4 90:3 94:23 95:6, Congress 9:20 count 86:9.10 10 96:13 97:20 counterintuitive 39:8,13 congressional 9:12,14 committee's 19:19 47:18 51:2 54:18 congressionally 9:17 **counties** 6:10,20 **common** 33:15 conjunction 8:5 country 45:3 58:19,22,23 communicate 59:22 connect 75:19 county 6:12 27:11 54:5 communicated 57:4 connection 66:20 72:20 75:20 countywide 6:15 communities 61:4.6 connections 76:25 couple 11:18 37:25 58:10 63:1 78:4,14,16 Community 78:22 connectivity 74:23 cover 60:20 62:8 65:2 75:1 companies 78:16 **Conroe** 14:9 **coverage** 19:20 53:22 54:3 56:16 **compare** 38:3 47:13 49:9,20 considered 52:14 60:4 compared 32:22 48:22 consistency 96:10 **covered** 33:8,12 54:5 61:23 Comparing 79:24 consistent 45:1 54:18 86:22 **covers** 33:23 complete 34:20 51:11 consultant 61:10 72:13 **Crain** 5:15 completely 73:19 88:21 consultant's 61:11 crapshoot 24:17 complexity 39:9 contentious 95:4 create 54:1 56:15 59:10 74:24 **compliance** 29:17,19 46:13,20 context 47:21 53:15 60:18 76:1 87:15 complicate 91:18 creates 56:14 continuous 37:22 complicated 93:9 contract 42:2 43:8,13 creating 53:21 88:19 comply 69:7 creative 76:20 contracting 76:8,13 components 26:17 credits 17:11 86:1,7,23 87:1,6,11, contracts 75:10 16 88:12 90:18 91:24 comprehensive 66:9 control 57:9 79:4 96:16 **critic** 49:10 compromised 53:19 controversial 66:22 critical 43:3 concern 39:6 convened 8:7 **critics** 49:25 concluded 40:18 **conversation** 13:11,15 51:1 53:12 cross 21:10 54:21,22,24,25 56:6 57:5,23 70:6,7 concludes 24:6 72:7,16 73:5 77:13 81:21 83:10,17 **CT** 93:8 conclusion 83:10,13 95:10 90:13 95:5 **curious** 33:12 conclusions 38:2 conversations 57:4 59:16 current 15:10 63:19 72:10 75:8 **condition** 26:13,16 31:9 **coordinated** 21:9 71:20 87:9 conduct 23:4 Coordinator 25:24 custom 5:13 **conference** 21:15,21 22:21,22 **copies** 35:21 customer 23:5,9 confirm 34:7 85:15 correct 13:24 29:25 48:25 74:3

cut 15:20 74:16,18 cut aways 33:15

D

**D.C.** 16:6

**Dallas** 42:3 44:2 75:17

Dallas/fort 88:8

damage 10:1,8,9 12:9,25

damages 12:25 dangers 49:22

**data** 32:5 37:15,19,21 38:1 40:11 44:11 45:22 49:12,19 66:6 86:3

**Database** 48:8 66:14

date 39:1 84:8 85:16 97:5

date's 97:12

day 42:5 43:10 53:22 78:8 94:19

days 11:13 21:23 53:24 55:14 78:8

dead 79:18,19,21 80:13

deadhead 44:1,2

deadline 26:7

deal 9:10 70:12

dealt 9:3 21:4 78:22

decade 32:4

**December** 11:16 81:13 96:25

97:9,13,15

decide 57:13 74:10 78:15

decides 65:23

deciding 55:24

decision 29:5 57:23 73:1

decisions 35:2 55:8 56:20

declaration 10:16

declining 45:10

decrease 38:20 39:7.23

decreasing 41:16

defensible 20:10

deferred 63:10,11

defined 64:18

definition 64:17

**degree** 23:25

delay 84:14

deliberate 52:15

deliver 57:15

delivered 57:15

**demand** 45:17

dense 45:15

dent 17:25 18:2,12

**Department** 8:25 10:20 14:25 15:15 19:16 20:4 23:4 37:14 56:11

80:21 81:4 83:19 95:8

Department's 19:24

depend 15:8 56:6

depending 10:24 38:22 65:22

73:1

depends 57:1

describe 47:7 90:1,6,21

description 54:18

designated 11:1 29:15

**desires** 36:13

**desk** 5:2

detail 77:22

determination 11:10

determinations 17:15

determine 66:7 89:17

develop 10:23 63:8 64:2 65:7,8,9

66:2 67:2 86:22

developing 27:5 30:25 65:21 88:1

**development** 17:11 21:8 85:25 86:6,23 87:1,6,11,16 88:12 90:18

dictate 57:8

die 18:1

Dietrich 5:22,23 53:25

difference 31:15 80:1

differences 87:23

difficult 37:24 40:8 54:20

difficulty 26:2

dilemma 83:7,8 84:9

direct 11:1,23 30:7

directed 14:4

direction 28:12 30:17 41:15 78:15

96:9 97:17

directly 10:1 11:2

Director 8:1 77:21 85:8 96:3

**Director's** 7:23 8:2

disabilities 38:20

disagree 48:20

discharge 43:9 44:1

discharges 43:20

discretionary 15:2 19:2 21:3

71:21 96:3

**discuss** 85:15

discussed 52:13

discussing 63:25 89:15

**discussion** 6:6 7:13 47:25 50:5,22 51:3,8,12,23 53:16 56:13 57:1 62:1 70:11 77:2,7 80:19,23 81:2 89:5,

17.21 95:4

discussions 47:22

disparity 86:11 88:19

disposal 32:2

distribute 82:17 87:16 88:2 92:1,

5,8

distributed 82:11

distributing 9:8

**distribution** 83:25 84:3

**district** 6:9,10,19 21:5 28:7,16 30:19,20,21 41:24 58:20,22,23

**districts** 28:4,6 39:22 40:4 55:9

56:12

dive 53:1

divided 64:16 87:3

division 7:23 55:9 57:19 62:25

67:23

Division's 25:24

document 66:8 67:1

documentation 66:10 essentially 64:12 **EI** 21:13,15 22:21 dollars 86:11 esteemed 48:21 element 28:11 44:12 75:14,25 76:6 door 4:19 51:20 estimate 33:19 57:10 elements 26:11 34:6,8 47:3 53:20 **DOT** 11:15 estimated 58:18 76:21 86:18 94:24 95:1 double 24:22.23.24 **evacuate** 4:14.18 elevator 4:18 double-check 13:14 evaluate 26:22 31:9 90:19 **else's** 46:7 download 37:10 event 6:15 10:8 17:4 47:3 56:15 emergency 4:9 9:15,18 10:16 downstairs 4:11 12:4 69:4 everyone's 35:21 employment 61:11 draft 63:3,21 evolved 88:13 drafted 65:13 **empty** 44:2 evolving 67:12 drawdown 94:24 encompasses 69:5 exact 96:12 end 11:7 22:20 66:25 72:21 77:16 **exceed** 32:14 drift 97:23.25 79:8 94:19 95:20 **Drive** 4:8,10,22 excellent 31:11 endgame 25:17 **drop** 38:23 40:19,21,22 45:1,2 exception 30:9 55:24 **ending** 75:18 dropped 63:6 exceptional 19:22 20:16 51:17 endorse 50:12 70:21,24 53:19 80:15 81:2 82:22 **drops** 91:13 endorsement 69:23 exclude 40:3 due 15:14,18 18:22 64:14 engage 72:6 73:8 77:4 excluded 49:6 **dwarfs** 48:10 enhance 71:16 **excuse** 27:12 dynamic 80:14 enormous 37:21 executive 65:10,25 78:20 85:8 Ε **ensure** 29:18 exercise 46:22 56:11 78:7 entail 51:12 70:5 **existed** 54:2.3 e-mail 85:23 **entails** 62:21 exiting 4:19 earlier 31:20 32:20,23 33:21 45:24 entertain 47:24 **expand** 19:21 63:2 69:3 entire 22:13 29:3 53:23 54:4,24 expanded 19:20 early 11:16 63:18 81:13 57:6 **expectation** 39:8 56:14 60:13 easier 22:9 92:14 entities 27:6 **expectations** 35:16 54:19 57:2 easiest 78:1.13 entity 29:11 40:14 80:23 expected 59:23 **easily** 41:20 entrance 5:1 expecting 4:23 8:21 east 4:7,10 6:13,20 environment 39:10 45:18 expeditious 95:2 Eastern 45:14 **equal** 35:8 expenditure 47:11,14 easy 42:25 49:14,24 92:23,24 equally 74:1 93:1,2 **expense** 44:21,22 53:21 54:7 equipment 19:5 26:23 27:19,20 economic 26:20 expenses 22:13 76:9,11 31:13,14,17 33:6,7,9 effort 25:17 33:25 37:22 51:14 expensive 27:21 Eric 7:25 8:16 16:8 25:24 32:20 62:21 64:1 67:14,24 70:10 73:7 34:24 36:25 41:18 44:25 48:3 50:4. experiencing 23:24 efforts 68:7 24 55:3 62:23 63:1 67:18 69:20 explain 38:23 41:10 44:6 85:6,7,11,22 eight-fold 79:25 explained 58:1 esoteric 48:9

explains 41:10
explanation 39:1
explanations 38:10
explore 39:15
expressed 56:8,9

**extent** 20:6 38:23 54:21 56:5,7 57:3 77:15

exterior 4:25 external 47:1

extensive 57:5

extinguishers 4:15

extra 58:20

## F

facilitate 76:23

**facilities** 26:20 27:16,17 31:7 33:1,3,10

**facility** 14:20,23 26:16,22 31:10 33:5,11 76:4

facing 4:21

fact 28:5 44:23 60:3

factors 46:18,19,22

failed 57:15 65:16

fair 66:10

fairly 23:24 70:3 88:22

fall 12:1 16:4 18:1

falloff 41:8

falls 19:5 22:19

familiar 27:15 46:15 86:6

fashion 37:24 faster 44:17

favor 7:15 98:11

**February** 22:20 86:20

federal 8:11,23 9:7,14 13:21 17:3

25:14 34:15 86:10 94:24

**feds** 29:18

**feedback** 46:8 47:9,21 67:5,11 72:7

feel 77:20 83:5 88:25

feels 53:13 60:17

feet 14:15

felt 51:22

fenceline 4:21

fewer 31:5 64:21 65:5

Fickes 6:12 7:11 9:23 11:21,22,25 12:5,8,10,14,17,20,23 13:1,6,9,12 22:16 30:1,5,8,23 36:3,9,14,18 45:5 55:23 56:2 68:9,13,21 69:1, 10,14,18 74:21 75:5,11 76:7,14,17 85:17,19 87:8,13,21,24 88:5,7,16 89:9,12 90:7,10,14,25 91:3,6,11, 14,17,20 92:3,13,20 94:15 95:21, 25 96:12 97:1,5,12 98:8

field 23:20 24:3

figure 81:9 98:2

fill 22:10

fillable 65:15

**final** 10:18,24 21:8 37:17 52:4 63:6 64:13 71:10

**finally** 8:24 21:12 22:23,25 23:17 52:3.6.11

find 11:1 26:11 35:22 38:17 39:18

finding 47:1

**fine** 19:14 84:11,12

finessing 34:17

fire 4:14,15

**fiscal** 37:16

fit 96:8

five-year 38:4 39:16 44:24 45:21

63:2

fixed 9:1 47:2

**fleet** 14:25 15:4,9,22 16:9 17:5,20, 22,25 20:24 21:3 32:22 33:21 34:25 54:8,9,11,12

fleshed 82:1

flex 15:3,24,25 17:2

flexed 15:4

flexibility 66:17

flexible 56:18 62:4

**flip** 60:1 69:21

floor 4:13,16

flowing 35:2

focus 24:5 33:5 40:2 47:10 68:7

focused 81:19 82:5

**folks** 9:10 17:13 21:25 22:21 24:1 28:1,6,18 40:13 47:11,12 52:25

54:16 89:25

follow 5:6 78:2 80:21

forefront 80:23 forgotten 14:21

**format** 56:18

**formula** 56:19 59:11 70:13 84:3,6,

7

Fort 27:11

fortunately 66:12

**forward** 6:5,6 10:23 11:15 47:22

50:14 69:24 84:15 85:12

forwarded 10:18

fought 25:3 94:16

found 20:13 75:15

four-or-five 23:6

four-year 33:23

fourth 40:12

fraction 33:7

Friday 43:9 53:24 54:5

friendly 82:9

front 4:19 72:9 85:2 92:15

**FTA** 10:18,24 11:10,16 12:25 14:20 28:12 30:11 31:8 34:5,7 62:25 63:21 64:4,14,23 65:4,14 66:11

67:4 71:14 76:19

FTA's 52:3

full 22:8 51:11 61:11

full-risk 41:5

fully 24:15

fun 36:22

functioning 26:17

functions 8:25

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: fund..historical

fund 9:15 68:3 76:4

fundamental 56:24

fundamentally 52:19

funded 65:3

**funding** 8:12 9:8,25 10:3,5,6 11:2, 3 12:6,11,16 13:3,24,25 14:1,19,20 15:2,3,15,22,24,25 17:2,3,8 18:5 19:23,24 20:1,19,24 21:17 23:7 25:15 30:19 35:15,16 37:19 38:6, 22 41:6 45:19 51:15,24 52:8 60:7 63:25 64:5,6 68:1 69:22 70:10,19 71:6,13,21 75:9 88:11 89:15

fundings 70:6

**funds** 9:20 11:23 16:24 17:6 29:12 56:17 59:23 64:12 67:2 72:1,4 76:12 84:2 86:23

**future** 10:8 16:24 33:5 47:22 51:5 62:2

**FY** 37:18 41:2 46:1 50:5,22

G

Galveston 40:7,9

gate 29:7

gather 4:20

**gave** 15:23,24 47:12 55:15,20 64:11 91:25

**general** 6:8,17,19 17:19 18:1 20:1 35:17 45:3 97:19

generally 18:17 27:22 38:16

generated 86:8 87:4,7,11

generating 88:1

**generator** 14:11,14

generously 64:5

gentlemen 74:22

get all 16:24

**give** 7:20 16:1 47:11 55:13 57:3 61:9 64:23 67:11 83:23

giving 46:7 87:2

glance 38:7

**Gleason** 7:6,9,24,25 8:1,18 9:24 11:24 12:3,6,9,11,15,19,21,24 13:2,7,10,16,23 14:2,5,7,12,17

16:11,13,15,18,21 17:1,18 18:3,7, 9,14,19 19:1,8,11,14,16 22:17 23:3 24:9,24 25:7,11 27:24 29:14,22 30:4,7,9 34:4 35:11 36:6,8,11,15, 23 37:1,3,7 42:21 44:10,15,19 45:4,6 48:5,16,25 49:7 50:1,8,13, 16,25 53:5,7,10 56:3 57:21 60:15 61:15,19,23,25 62:12,14,16 63:10 64:7 67:19 68:12,18,22 69:9,11,15 70:2,18,22 71:1,7,10 74:3 75:4,8, 12 76:10,16,19 79:8,12 80:14,18 81:1,17 83:7,12,16,22 84:2,9,12,17 87:6,9,14,22,25 88:6,15 89:1,4,10, 23 90:9,12,21 91:1,5,9,12,15,18 92:9,16,19 93:1,6,10,13 94:1,5,21 95:12,15,18,24 96:6,18 97:16,19, 23 98:2,5

goals 66:21

**good** 6:6 13:16 16:7,16 18:17 22:16 23:8 24:8 25:22 26:5 27:4 32:24 33:18 34:16 44:24 48:24 49:19,20 50:20 54:12 63:5,9 64:24 83:5 90:16

goods 65:14

Grande 21:7

grant 13:12 20:19 71:22

grants 16:24

**Great** 5:9 19:15

greater 35:9 80:3

greatest 46:14

Greyhound 78:21

group 25:2 28:20 29:20 67:6

grouping 42:6

guard's 5:2

guess 89:15

guidance 30:11 31:9 65:19 67:5

guideway 9:1

guiding 86:20

guns 57:18

guys 34:18 73:15 82:25 94:12

Н

H-GAC 90:2

half 14:15 45:9 91:16

hallway 4:17

handful 89:24

handle 6:13

hands 37:5

hanging 76:24

happen 69:8 96:11

happened 43:20

happy 22:15 23:12 34:2

**hard** 25:2,3 32:17 82:25 83:8 90:19

92:7

harder 94:8

harping 49:10

Harris 6:12

**Harvey** 9:13,21 10:2,10 11:18

**hate** 79:18

headed 41:15

heading 80:12 97:17

hear 18:14,17 77:19 81:10 90:3

heard 13:18 14:1 23:7

hearing 7:14 58:3 70:25

**heavy** 75:23

held 27:8

helpful 47:7,21 69:23 71:8 82:14

helping 6:5 65:17

helps 26:21 31:9

**Hey** 30:15

**high** 14:15 23:24 47:4,5

higher 33:2 46:25 75:14

highest 72:4

highlight 37:11 38:8

highlighted 38:11

highway 15:5

Hill 58:19,22

hire 61:10

historic 32:1

historical 59:8

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: historically..Jim

**historically** 56:10 71:19 75:12

**history** 15:12 35:14,15 37:22

hit 58:5

hold 21:22

holding 45:10

holds 93:20

holiday 97:21,22

holidays 81:14

home 43:22 44:3,8

honestly 44:24 47:9

**honor** 42:1

hope 31:4 55:22

hoping 15:14 85:23

horizon 33:23

hospital 43:9,20 44:1

hour 44:21,22

hours 53:23 57:14 78:8

house 6:1

housekeeping 5:10

**Houston** 10:21 12:12 13:7 42:5 75:17 85:18,19 88:7,9,13 90:20

94:17

huge 18:12 80:2 93:4

**hurdles** 13:20

hurricane 9:13 10:2,10 69:4

hurricanes 9:22

1

i.e. 56:15

idea 47:12 62:3 77:16 89:6 90:16

identified 23:14 45:22

identify 38:4 71:25

imagination 70:5

imagine 58:9

impact 55:7

impacted 11:18

impacts 40:8

imperfect 28:17

implement 65:11

implementation 20:15 51:19

72:25 77:12 82:3

implications 51:24 52:7 62:5

important 33:17 53:13

improvement 23:11,14 37:23

inaccurate 40:5,6

incident 69:3

incidents 39:2,3,11 66:6

inclement 4:24

include 11:11 17:6 28:10 30:21

included 18:16 19:18,21 20:4

21:3,6 51:14 86:23

includes 28:24 35:15

including 50:23

inclusive 29:6 57:6

inconclusive 88:23

increase 39:4 40:17 41:14

increasing 39:9 41:16 44:17

Independent 60:3

indicator 40:23

individual 65:22

individuals 38:19

industry 54:24 57:6 73:6

inflated 40:15

inform 27:8

information 11:9 16:5 28:14 35:1

39:21 46:13 47:19 49:20 64:4

65:19 66:3

informed 20:5

infrastructure 31:23

inherent 46:18.22

initial 30:17

initially 32:15

**input** 80:9

inside 4:24

instance 10:19

instructions 5:6

intended 10:6,12 15:10 51:21

**intent** 47:16

interaction 23:15

**intercity** 21:10 52:15,20 71:11,16 72:15 73:6,14,15 74:1,7,10,16,19 76:3,5,21 77:7 78:3,9 79:25 81:19

82:5 84:16

interest 46:14 73:6 89:13

**interested** 47:23 50:9 51:10 58:3

70:20 85:2,4

interesting 34:10 44:19 46:12

72:16

interpretation 34:21

interstate 79:24

introduce 25:8 85:9

introduction 5:20

inventory 26:12

investing 17:20

investment 18:23 27:1 33:5 35:2

60:2,4,7 62:5,8 72:10 75:15

**investments** 72:1 76:4

involved 76:9

involves 63:16

**Irma** 9:21

**issue** 34:17 36:22 56:10 57:24

58:5 73:11 86:3 90:8,11 92:17

94:9,12,16,22

**issued** 90:17

issues 49:3 60:17 69:6 82:3

item 7:4,22 9:11 19:22 20:16 25:6 36:24 46:13 50:4,22 51:17 53:19

80:15 82:22 84:20,22 89:2

items 8:2,8 50:24 59:5 69:24 81:3

85:15,17

J

J.R. 6:7.22 74:14

**January** 22:19 79:13,15 81:14,19

86:15 96:2

Jim 6:16 7:12 16:23 29:10 34:23

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: Jim's..manage

44:25

Jim's 70:24

job 10:22 24:6

**John** 4:3 6:18 7:6 13:17,19 16:8 17:20 41:18 60:21 70:14 73:13 74:15 77:25 81:7 82:6 89:14 91:21 95:7

John's 43:7

Josh 4:5 7:19 84:23 96:19

July 8:5,23 39:23 45:24 64:11,14

June 8:8 justify 92:12

Κ

**keeping** 45:19

Kelly 7:20 69:3

**Ken** 6:12 7:13 11:21 12:22 30:1 36:2 68:8,9 74:22 85:17,19 90:10 94:10

**key** 38:2 45:21 53:16 56:3,4 58:5 67:17 76:24

kidding 16:17

Killebrew 86:2

**kind** 14:9 22:2 34:10,17 38:11 41:15 43:14 49:18 52:25 56:16 58:3,4 59:1,3,15 65:7,19 69:21 72:12 74:23 75:22 80:12 83:8 90:13 95:9,19 97:16

kinds 49:2 59:23

kits 4:12

knew 63:23

knowing 90:19

knowledge 23:17,18 24:2,5 76:11

Kosub 25:9,22,23 29:25 30:24

Kristen 21:22 22:10

L

laid 53:14 59:3 87:19

**Lake** 14:9

laptop 5:11

**LAR** 51:16 53:18

**large** 5:1,3 20:2 43:25 56:5 64:16, 21,22 94:24 96:15

larger 20:3

largest 24:18

late 11:16

lead 63:9 89:7

leadership 22:7 82:24

**leap** 70:4

learn 32:18

learned 46:18

**leave** 7:20 36:18 50:16 52:24 53:2, 12 77:17 82:1

Leaving 75:24

left 4:20 75:2,5 86:2

**Legislative** 19:18 24:12

**legislature** 19:17 24:17 37:14,18 55:10 56:7.14 57:2

**lessons** 33:25

letting 73:9

**level** 4:11 15:18 35:14 40:15 46:14 54:2 56:11 77:22

leverage 17:2

liberal 88:9 92:23

**life** 18:23 26:18,23,24 31:5,15 32:10,11 80:19

lift 27:21

light-duty 32:11 33:14

likelihood 68:12

likes 94:20

likewise 31:13

limit 42:22.24

limited 50:23

**list** 10:17,23 11:15 51:6 67:17

listed 46:2 66:15

listening 5:14

live 5:24 48:10 65:11

**Liz** 42:11

**lobby** 4:11

local 17:13 56:19 61:4,5

located 4:12,16

lock 60:7

logically 94:11

long 22:2,12 35:16 73:10

longer 59:13

longest-lived 6:22

look-at 88:17

**looked** 30:15 44:20,23 46:1 95:22

loop 55:18 59:20

lose 42:2

**lot** 4:21 22:23,24 23:19 31:16 32:6 35:23 41:7 43:3 46:24 74:6,25 75:16 79:3,18 82:7,9 86:3,18 89:22 92:14 94:17 96:5

lots 24:1

Lower 21:7

Lubbock 43:9

М

mad 92:6

made 17:25 33:5 57:20 68:3

magnitude 80:2

main 4:11 26:11 28:18

maintain 26:4 27:4 33:18

maintenance 27:17,23 31:17 33:10

majority 12:6 33:1

**make** 5:16 13:4 16:3 17:15 22:3 23:14 28:1 29:23 34:19 35:1 36:4 48:21 50:11 51:9 54:17 55:17 56:20,22 57:22,23,24 58:5 61:21 66:20 69:8,15 75:1,20 85:7 92:6

makes 34:19

**makeup** 96:13

**making** 18:2,12 19:6 29:5 48:23 53:12 55:12 58:11 76:5 85:2

manage 67:3 90:4

managed 56:25 59:19

**management** 18:16 25:15 26:1,4, 6,8,12 27:5 29:6,13,16 31:1 32:5, 19 66:2 67:9 69:5

Manager 6:8,19

**manner** 82:17

map 54:1 55:15,16 77:8

Marc 6:3,4 53:25

**March** 21:16 27:8 81:19 82:3 84:8,

15

**Maria** 9:21

Mark 46:10 62:19,22,24

marked 4:12.15

match 15:23 17:12 49:18 76:22

86:10

matching 16:24

materials 66:3

matters 7:24 67:22

maximum 16:2

Mcbeth 4:1,3 5:9 6:3,18 7:1,8,10, 12,17 13:19,20,25 14:3,6,11,14 16:8,12,14,17,20 17:19 18:6,8,11, 18,25 19:3,10,13,15 23:1 24:8,10 25:1,10 36:2,5,7,20,24 37:2,5 41:18 42:23 43:25 44:13,18 48:2,7, 18 50:2,14,20 53:3,6,8 60:10,21 61:16,22,24 62:11,13 70:14,19,23 71:2,9 73:13 74:4 77:25 79:10,14 80:25 81:16 82:6 83:11,14,20 84:1, 4,13,20 85:4,10,14 89:3,14 91:21 92:4,11,14,18 95:11,14,16 96:19 97:9,18,22,25 98:4,6,10,13

meaning 19:22 75:13

meaningful 40:2

means 40:16 57:24

measure 26:25 96:10

measures 47:10 59:24 66:15

measuring 62:6

**Medicaid** 40:25 41:3,20,23 42:12

43:4,13 44:12,16

medical 4:9 40:25 41:4

medium 33:14

medium-to-large-sized 6:9

**meet** 16:7 26:7 29:8 32:13 35:24 81:11

**meeting** 4:2,4 5:8,21 8:4,6 17:22 19:12 32:16,17 39:23 45:24 48:17 52:13 62:2 81:12,14 82:14,15 85:15.16 94:17 96:20 97:10 98:15

meetings 8:9,12 54:1 78:4

meets 34:8

member 5:15 6:22

**members** 5:21,22 11:18 24:14 25:23 48:7 50:25 96:14

mention 9:11 20:25 65:16

mentioned 33:20 45:24 63:2

**merits** 88:17

met 8:3 14:18 52:3

method 86:22

methodical 70:3

metro 6:14 10:21 11:25 12:12 13:7

96:15

metropolitan 39:6,10

middle 31:10

**mileage** 26:24 31:6,16,18,19 32:7, 8 35:10 41:14,16 42:10 44:11,16,

**miles** 6:11 26:15,19 41:13 43:18 44:1.20

**million** 8:11 10:3 12:12 14:22 15:2,3,6,19,21,24,25 16:1,23 19:20 24:13,19 33:20 53:18,20 54:6,7,13, 15 55:13 56:21 57:10 58:20,24 59:8,12 60:8,18 71:17 74:8,11 77:12 78:7,11 79:5 80:5 84:15 90:23 91:9 94:1,2

**mind** 18:3 39:8 53:11 55:22 60:20 81:10

mine 36:23

minefield 73:15,21

minimum 44:14

minivans 33:16

minute 58:24 86:5

minutes 7:3.18 48:17

misleading 27:18

**missing** 86:18

misusing 73:23

model 26:21

models 72:14

moment 8:14

Monday 53:24 54:4

money 9:16 12:13,24 14:6 15:3 17:13,16 18:21 20:13 24:18,20 34:15 46:24 51:20 52:16 55:16,19, 20,25 56:13 57:3 58:21 60:5,23,24 61:18 64:1 73:17,18,22 75:2,5 78:18 79:1,21 82:11,17,19 86:9 93:4,12,16 96:16

money's 35:2

monitors 5:14

month 11:8 81:11

months 54:23 62:10 63:1 77:6

79:17 85:23 86:24

monumental 55:5

morning 25:22 42:7 69:3

motion 7:12 36:2,4,5 98:7,10

mountain 18:13

**move** 4:24 5:19 7:3 25:5 29:4

36:22 50:14 58:5

moved 7:5 22:20 41:6 75:22 98:8

moving 6:6 41:4 47:22 50:4 56:17

77:21

MPO 20:23 21:1,4 87:14

**MPOS** 87:3 96:8,14,15

MTAS 37:20

multimodal 76:2

multiple 28:21 71:22 91:1

Ν

name's 6:7 85:7

**names** 9:22

national 45:2 48:8 66:12,13,21

75:21 78:18

nationally 45:7 78:19

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: nationwide..people

nationwide 14:22 obligation 29:11 outcome 59:8 nature 56:6 obtain 95:2 outlasted 7:1,2 obtained 32:5 nay 7:17 outstanding 24:11 25:3 obtaining 32:25 overcome 35:3 nays 7:18 **NCT** 90:1.6 obvious 96:1 oversight 8:22 9:1 46:22 NCTCOG 88:8 92:22 occasions 42:17 overview 47:20 nearing 25:17 occur 62:17 Ρ necessarily 9:3,4 17:13 34:20 October 22:8,18 25:16 26:7,8 36:15 49:5 80:21 90:5,15 **odd** 29:2 **p.m.** 98:15 needed 14:9 23:17 28:19 50:8 offer 28:19 92:22 pace 45:19 51:22 63:19 **older** 31:19 packet 8:10,17 39:20,24 network 75:21 on-site 5:7 pager 51:14 52:1,2,11 63:15 news 16:7 24:8 25:4 63:5,9 64:24 65:14 one-minute 20:22 **pagers** 52:22 **nice** 6:2 ongoing 53:21 54:6 75:9,16 paid 22:13 non-txdot 68:17 online 5:15 58:9 paraphrasing 80:20 noon 42:9 open 22:12 89:15 parked 61:3 **normal** 81:11 97:7 open-door 27:12 parking 4:21 normalizing 35:4 open-ended 95:19 part 6:6 9:24 10:4 11:10 15:17 17:6 19:3 21:18,25 28:16,22 29:20 note 24:11 49:23 opening 70:13 33:17 34:11 37:22 45:14 51:16 notebook 42:12 operating 31:14 39:10 40:14 43:5 54:3 63:20 67:23,25 69:4,5 73:7 44:21,22 45:18 46:20 53:21 54:7 77:2 notice 14:19 28:3 58:20 75:10,24 76:8,10,11 86:17 participants 27:9 28:1 notification 11:22 operation 53:22,23 76:22 participate 73:16 **notion** 75:18 operations 10:7 28:25 participating 27:7 November 11:16 81:12,18 96:22 opinion 73:14 partnering 21:11 **NTA** 31:21 opportunities 15:12 52:17 68:4 Paso 21:13,15 22:21 **NTD** 48:4,6,7,22 49:12 71:22 76:20 77:1 pass 42:18 85:20 **nuances** 76:25 opportunity 14:19 27:10 47:7 67:21 89:18 passenger 27:17 number 8:2 17:25 18:2 20:2.3.6 40:1 51:4 57:12 69:2 72:9 95:23 opposed 7:17 54:24 71:24 72:19 past 9:4 31:5 32:2,3 81:1 98:13 **numbers** 49:12,16 66:18 pat 82:16 opt 27:10 numerous 78:23 path 78:3 opted 27:10 nutshell 66:4 67:13 patterns 32:2 optimism 15:17 pay 22:2 42:14,15 44:3,4 0 option 28:20 60:12 65:8 72:24 peak 64:20 65:6 order 4:4 19:24 20:22 55:7 69:21 objections 98:11 penalties 32:15,18 76:23 objective 55:21 **people** 5:13 13:4,13 19:4 24:2,15 orientation 75:23.24 25:2 31:9 42:5,6,17 43:11 59:22 objectives 66:21 oriented 65:20 74:1,25 79:20 82:9,10,20

**percent** 14:23 23:13 31:13 32:8, 11,13,24,25 35:7,8 39:24,25 40:1, 21,22,24 41:11,19 43:1,24 48:13 71:14,15 74:12 75:9,24 87:2,4,11, 16,20 88:4 89:20 91:3,7 93:3,25

percent/25 89:20

percentage 41:19 93:22

**performance** 31:2 37:1,12,15 46:17,19 47:10,13 49:21 50:7 59:21 60:2 62:7 72:12

performing 52:16

**perfunctory** 70:11 71:5

permission 21:24 92:1

person 42:6.16 44:3 57:7 85:16

personal 49:23

personnel 5:7

**perspective** 60:22 78:18 79:5 91:23

phasing 58:8 62:6

phones 5:11 phrase 63:12

**pick** 43:11,21 44:3 63:13 72:19 81:20

picked 80:22

picking 82:2

**picture** 33:22 56:8 59:10,13 81:22

**piece** 27:20 50:9,10 53:17 71:5,6 78:1,13

**pieces** 33:8

pink 82:10

**place** 5:4 17:5 21:11 25:16 26:9 43:12 83:8

**plan** 18:16 25:20 26:1,4,8,12 27:5, 11,13 28:1,5,10,16,20,21,23 29:3, 6,16,20 30:2,22 31:1 32:19,21 33:8,9,13,14,23 34:6,7 35:1,23 58:17 60:24 61:9,10,12,17 62:3 63:8 64:13,15,23,25 65:2,8,18 66:12,18,20 67:7,14 68:14 69:1 73:9 74:9 82:18

planning 21:1 68:25 79:18

**plans** 25:15 34:9 58:15 64:2,14 65:22 66:16

play 47:3

pleased 46:9

**plug** 59:11

**point** 43:12 54:19 56:4 60:1 62:9 63:4 64:19 65:21 81:24 91:15 96:10

pointed 57:18

policies 71:12 86:1,13 88:2 90:15

**policy** 67:22 82:13 83:20 86:18 88:9 96:2

political 94:17

pool 94:25
poor 31:11

poorly 43:4

population 45:10,11 64:18

portion 43:1,25 59:10 60:19

position 11:14 18:17 34:13 35:22

positive 38:17

possibilities 93:15

possibility 22:10 56:9 94:6

pot 13:2 87:17 90:4,23

potential 27:9 51:5 80:1

pots 9:25

practical 35:17

practices 71:12

precluded 9:8

preface 5:17

prefer 53:3

preference 81:18

prepare 10:10

prepared 14:25 38:5 52:1

prepares 37:14

prescriptive 56:12,20 62:5 68:22

72:21 82:16

presentation 39:19 68:1

preserving 16:23

President 78:20

press 8:10

presuming 34:25 55:4

**pretty** 16:16 18:17 23:8 24:21 32:24 38:20 40:17,19 44:23 66:8 73:11,14 76:20 80:24 90:20

previous 20:20 37:16 46:10 54:1

96:2

previously 9:19

price 15:9 74:25

primary 41:5

**primed** 65:20

principles 86:21

prioritization 27:2

private 73:22 79:2

proactive 72:22

problem 89:20

procedures 88:2

proceed 4:25

**process** 27:6,7 49:11 71:20,25

73:2

process-type 68:20

produced 63:14,15

productive 5:8

profile 45:25

**program** 8:13 9:16 10:4,12,15,22 11:3 12:4 13:18 15:4 16:6 17:4,5, 16,23 18:15 25:24 29:13,15 34:16 35:16 38:21 39:3 41:1,4,5,6,9,20, 22 42:12 43:4,5 44:16 45:7,8 46:15,16 47:11 50:5,23 51:25 52:8, 15,18,20 56:25 59:18 62:6 65:1,3,4 68:3,25 70:9 71:11,13 72:3,15,22 73:4,16 74:19 75:13,15 77:1 79:25 84:16 89:5 90:1,6 91:22 92:23 93:21 94:25

program/rural 75:19

**programs** 8:13 14:23 23:19 41:25 45:13 55:6 71:22,24 86:12

progress 19:6 63:3

**project** 10:5,14,20,23 17:7 21:13

**projects** 10:16,18,25 11:1,8,16

20:22 87:7

promise 55:12 57:19

promised 57:14 properties 21:22 22:3 proposals 17:7 71:23 72:18 propose 85:14 proposed 51:14 63:3 77:10 proposing 63:17 72:8 77:4 prove 37:23 provide 23:7 28:8 37:19 38:6,25 provided 39:21 45:24 46:6 64:5 provider 11:3 45:25 55:24 65:1 **providers** 27:13 31:24 33:12 43:14 64:12.16 76:5 86:4 88:20 provision 63:22 PTAC 7:23 69:23 82:14,15 89:16 **PTN** 65:20 **PTS** 27:11 **public** 4:3 5:6,20 6:17,23 7:22,24 8:1 9:2 26:5 32:4 55:9 57:18 60:13 62:24 63:20 79:1 82:13 84:22,24 85:2,5,6 90:22 published 63:6 65:15 66:11 pull 8:4 60:13 **pulled** 49:11 pulling 88:12 purchasing 21:20 purpose 9:18 15:16 26:3 51:21 53:15 54:17 56:21 57:21 64:7,8 68:24 88:3 89:17 purposes 8:14 17:12 52:21 87:17 pursuing 50:9 73:5 put 5:10,12 9:16 14:19 15:25 16:1 17:11 19:9 30:11 31:16 34:18 36:11 43:18 44:7 47:9 54:10 61:7 63:21 72:9 74:24 86:25 96:13 puts 46:24

putting 10:15 11:7 49:14 59:24

60:16 65:18 89:21

**question** 17:19 19:4 23:6,22 31:20 48:1,21 68:10 69:18,20,25 78:24

Q

80:6 82:7,8,12,13 93:18,20 94:8 95:8

questioned 48:22 questioning 78:25

questions 11:20 17:18 23:9 34:3 53:9 83:1 85:12

quick 16:4 38:6 53:5 68:9 quickly 20:23 25:19 62:20 71:12 95:3

quizzical 11:19

R

radar 79:16 rail 9:1 31:23

rate 23:8 44:17

ran 49:2

rated 33:2 ratio 76:14 reach 83:10

read 8:19 81:7 91:4,20

readers 30:14 reads 91:8

real 14:14 20:23 25:7 51:17 55:22 62:20 71:12 83:5 86:9 90:16 92:23, 24 93:11

realized 9:10 95:3

reason 9:6 15:16 36:20 41:21 43:24 48:15,24 69:12

reasonable 35:15 57:12

reasons 40:21

recall 25:12 52:13 96:14

**receive** 64:12

received 9:25 11:22 30:18 84:25

receives 67:1 receiving 29:12 recently 18:21 91:20

recipient 10:25 29:15 68:17

recipients 10:1 11:1 25:14 30:7 38:22 41:6 52:7

recognize 20:8 28:18 40:13

recognized 51:18

recognizing 34:14 72:25

recommended 10:17,23 11:15 23:11 24:13

reconstructing 94:22

recover 10:9

recovery 12:7,9 13:23,25 18:4

reduce 10:7 reeled 40:18 refer 73:17

referring 27:19

reflection 23:18 40:1 region 87:12,15 88:13

Regional 21:1 regions 87:25 regular 19:24

regulations 46:21

relate 26:19

related 9:18 40:25 release 8:11 21:24

reliable 40:11.22 relief 9:15 12:4

remaining 87:18 remains 20:19

remember 89:19 92:3,7 96:12

reminder 36:12 removed 40:20 removing 73:22 renovation 75:16 reopening 95:13

repair 10:1 16:18 26:5 27:4 33:18 34:16 54:12

replace 15:7 19:5 27:2 54:13

replaced 18:24

replacement 15:1,4,9,11,22 17:5 20:24 54:8

replica 6:2

**report** 7:23 8:2 17:22 24:7 37:15, 18 38:2 47:17 48:9 50:21 66:14 78:5 89:17

report's 50:18

reported 8:21 48:6,13 reporting 40:6 55:10,15

represent 15:21 29:3 41:9 55:1

represented 55:2 representing 6:17 represents 33:7 71:18

Republic 5:25

**request** 15:1 19:18,19,22 20:7,17 24:12 53:19 80:15,16

requested 91:25

requesting 11:10 24:12

requests 42:1,13

require 11:13 19:23 63:24 66:9

required 8:24 37:14 71:14

**requirement** 34:8 36:16 60:22 61:3 63:7 64:1 66:1,9 68:16

requirements 26:21 29:8 35:25

66:1

requiring 25:14

researching 38:24 39:5

reservation 69:16 85:24

reserve 70:15,20

**resiliency** 10:5,14 11:23 12:11,15, 18 14:1

resolve 94:9

respond 10:21 11:13 81:25

respondents 23:13 response 6:15 23:8,15

responsibility 29:23

responsible 10:15

rest 48:12

restrooms 4:17

result 73:2 resulted 40:16

resulting 72:4

results 23:12 35:4 48:22

resurrect 82:22

resurrected 82:25

retiring 24:1,2

**revenue** 20:1 27:16 41:12 44:20, 21,22 64:19 65:6

**review** 34:19 67:10 70:11,16,21 71:11 72:18,23 86:25 88:22 90:14

reviews 67:9 revised 86:15

revisions 63:19 68:19,20

reward 32:16

**RIBAKOVE** 4:7 8:16 84:25 96:21 97:3,7,14

rider 41:23 42:10 45:3

**ridership** 38:12,14 39:24 40:9,17 41:14,16 44:15,20 45:1,3,20

rise 39:12

risk 10:6,7 46:15,18,19,25 47:4,5,8

**Riverside** 4:8,10,22

road 18:22 31:10 42:25

roads 86:8 rock 83:8

Rodeo 22:5

role 41:7

**rolling** 26:14,22 27:15 31:3,15 32:23

rooftop 92:10

room 4:8 5:3 24:15 94:18 96:9

roughly 14:22 32:22 routes 74:2,16,18

routine 17:5

rug 60:13

**rule** 26:6 28:12 29:8 34:8 52:4 62:18 63:8 67:14 68:18 71:5 89:18

rulemaking 52:10 67:23,25 73:2

83:24 84:5

**rules** 30:13 46:21 63:1,3,6,19,22 67:2 68:15 69:13 70:3,11,17 77:10 81:20 87:9,10,15,19 96:7,9

run 58:12

running 41:22

rural 6:8,9,21 11:3 14:24,25 16:10, 11,12,13 17:23,25 18:15 20:24 21:2,5 28:3,8,10,19,24,25 29:4,15 30:2,20,21 31:24 32:7,22 38:14 39:23 40:4,10 41:23,25 45:7,8,15, 16 55:6 63:7 65:1,3 71:13 73:18 74:5,12 75:19 76:4,24 91:22

rurals 27:10 41:14

S

**safe** 5:8

safekeeping 7:21

safest 5:4

**safety** 4:5 8:22 9:1 34:12 39:2,3,7 52:4 62:18 63:1,8 64:2,25 65:2,22 66:1,6,7,12,16,19 67:13 77:8 78:1 81:20

**Salazar** 6:7,24 43:6 74:14 84:11, 14,18

**San** 6:4 42:4 43:10,16 75:17

**Sandy** 9:19

satisfaction 23:5,10

satisfied 23:10

satisfied/satisfied 23:13

**scale** 26:21 31:8 33:3,4

scares 45:23
scariest 60:12
scary 60:11

schedule 11:6 81:12 96:22 97:7

scheduled 22:7

**scope** 51:13,14 53:15 54:17

Scott 42:18,19 screen 79:16

seats 21:19,21,23,24

sector 73:22 79:2

**secure** 21:19

security 4:12 5:7 27:21

**sees** 32:6

Index: selected..stay selected 10:25 11:3 sign 65:10 **speed** 8:7 23:20 24:4 42:21,24 selection 10:14 **signed** 84:23 **spend** 48:12 55:25 56:13 58:10 60:25 81:18 82:4,7 selfish 82:12 significant 9:5 18:15 21:17 37:10 spending 78:6 79:1 86:10 38:9 39:4,18 40:6,17,19,23 41:3 **semiannual** 8:5 39:23 51:19 67:21 73:3 **spent** 14:6 52:16 58:11 59:12 seminar 22:7 significantly 40:15 78:12 **Seniors** 38:19 signify 7:15 38:16 **split** 44:12 sense 34:19 50:11 89:10 94:12 signing 7:19 **spoken** 25:18 97:19 silent 5:11,12 sponsoring 22:4,5 sensitive 73:11 94:15 skyrocketing 42:11 spread 73:24,25 78:10 separate 13:2 71:24 88:4 slammed 49:24 **Sprick** 62:19.23.24 63:11 64:8 **September** 20:21 22:6 33:24 slamming 49:12 **spring** 37:17 serve 6:20 45:13 74:6 82:21 Springs 21:9 slices 38:1 served 61:5 **slide** 29:9 39:16,20 45:23 46:3,4, square 6:10 **service** 6:14 19:21 21:10 27:12 11 28:8,11 31:17 40:15 43:14,17 **staff** 23:20,25 70:1 77:23 90:5 slight 39:6 41:14 53:22,24 54:2,5,9,10 55:8,13 stairs 4:19 5:1 57:11,15 58:12,13 59:25 64:20 **slope** 20:9 65:6 72:1 76:5 standalone 28:24 63:7 slug 18:20,23 services 6:13 71:16 75:19 76:3 standalones 64:25 **small** 6:21 10:3 13:15 16:10 17:23 serving 61:14 standard 26:19 32:9 28:15 30:2.13 38:14 54:3 59:9 session 22:18 54:20 55:2 77:16 64:16,18,21 65:5 90:20 91:22 **standpoint** 10:14 11:6 16:5 20:15 79:6,9,12,21 80:19 81:6,15 24:5 29:17,19 39:17 51:20 77:6 smaller 33:7 39:12 86:4 set 5:11 21:21 31:2 32:10 49:16 **start** 4:2 5:21 18:4,9 22:7 53:10 SMS 66:4 71:14,15 64:24 93:3,15 snapshot 38:3 **shape** 24:20 32:24 51:2 started 27:7 47:4 sooner 77:7 **share** 64:4 76:2 starts 81:15,16 **sort** 35:17 38:1,6 58:7 63:15 68:19 **sharp** 38:20 **state** 8:11,22 9:1,6,9,25 10:17 72:17,20 89:10 11:15 16:18 19:17,21 20:19 26:4 sheets 85:1 sources 17:8 19:24 68:1 27:4 28:4,19 30:18 33:18 34:16 **shield** 14:10 37:14,16 39:13 41:4 43:21 45:9,14 southeast 20:24 21:1 53:23 54:4,12 56:15 59:10 65:22 shift 56:24 80:1 Southwest 21:14 67:9 71:15 73:25 74:6,13 78:6,10 shooter 5:5 86:1,12 87:18 94:25 span 53:22 60:3 State's 26:5 **short** 23:5 83:18 speak 7:19 34:6 81:4 shortly 8:22 **statement** 20:5.10 speaker 85:1 **states** 21:25 22:12 52:18 64:11 **show** 38:21 49:21 78:17,21 speaking 5:18 72:14,24 **showed** 39:23 59:13 **specific** 9:17 56:15 66:18,23 77:1 statewide 87:17 90:4 93:24 **showing** 39:6 55:15 72:12 87:19 **Station** 42:3,4,16,17,25 **shows** 39:25 specifically 62:3

specifics 23:21 34:21

spectrum 72:21

side 12:2 15:5 19:6 38:14 40:3

sidewalks 4:21

stay 4:24 22:22 35:17 43:17 87:12

**stats** 48:4,5

97:20

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: stayed..tie

stayed 47:1 summarizes 37:15 **TDC** 93:21 **steady** 45:10 summarizing 37:18 52:1 63:16 Technical 26:2 teeth 88:12 **steep** 20:9 **summer** 86:16 telephones 48:11 **step** 59:1,2 **Super** 9:19 step-back 72:17 support 17:13 19:20 27:22 33:10 telling 49:15 69:2 79:20 58:12 74:21 steps 33:22 72:9 template 65:15 supposed 4:2 86:21 **stilts** 14:15 Temple 42:18,25 surprise 40:7 **stock** 26:15,22 27:15 31:3,15 ten 62:10 75:13 32:23 surrounding 22:12 tend 31:16 stop 11:17 27:25 83:18 survey 23:5,6 tendency 39:11 storm 9:19 10:11 sustain 40:16,18 tenth 59:6 story 48:19 57:13,14 80:5 sustainability 61:7 term 31:8 33:2.4 59:13 Strategic 25:24 sustaining 60:6 62:7 terminals 75:20 strategy 72:25 sway 93:21 terms 32:12 33:22 72:22 76:21 stripped 80:15 82:23 **swings** 38:21 92:24 strong 79:2 testing 32:9 **swipes** 38:1 struck 55:4 sync 48:23 Texarkana 42:4 structuring 95:5 **system** 5:7 27:21 32:5 37:16 38:6, **Texas** 5:24,25 6:8,17,20 9:2,9 7 45:25 46:1 47:4,5 61:7 66:2 12:12 20:24 21:1,22,23 22:1,3,9, struggle 81:13 88:19 11,14 24:21 28:9 45:7 52:18 72:5, stuck 63:22 24 73:20,25 74:13,17 78:19 85:8, system's 73:18 **study** 88:21 systems 9:2 28:19,24 29:4 37:19 **Thanksgiving** 96:24 97:11,20,22 stuff 13:21 14:3 25:4 49:24 58:3.4 40:20 45:4,5 74:6 Theo 25:9,19,21,23 27:24,25 34:6 96:5 35:13 65:17 Т stupid 42:13 44:6 theory 59:13 **sub-recipients** 28:21 46:16 table 17:9,12 56:25 75:3,6 85:1 **thing** 5:10 28:2,18 46:12 50:7 subcontract 41:7 54:20 55:3 58:9,16 60:5 61:8,17 tablet 5:11 73:15 74:8 78:9,18,19 subject 96:4 **TAC** 63:19,20 68:10,16,18,24 **things** 6:6 20:14 22:24 23:18 24:6 submitted 15:1 37:17 60:24 86:16 94:16 29:2 37:8 38:9 39:18 46:23 49:6 subprogram 10:4 taking 22:23 34:11 51:7 56:22 57:9 65:15 66:14 67:11 80:10 86:21 88:1 89:23 subsequent 28:13 30:11 talk 13:8 20:11,12 25:25 30:24 53:13 58:2 59:16 64:3 66:6 67:16 thinking 15:14,17 18:4 63:24 subset 18:15 29:4 73:8,12 78:14 85:17 90:3 93:19 69:13 subsidizing 74:2 talked 13:12 25:4 60:17 62:9 85:22 Thirty-eight 53:20 subtopics 59:4 talking 12:1 22:10 44:5 55:24 thought 8:18,19 49:17 79:24 95:22 successful 15:6,13 20:7 60:8 73:9,21 thoughts 52:1 62:17 succession 23:25 **TAM** 32:21 65:7,18 66:18 67:4,7 threat 5:6 suggest 15:19 49:25 52:23 target 31:4,22 32:25 33:7 49:14 throw 79:23 88:24 92:9 suggestion 92:22 93:3 targets 30:25 31:2 32:1,12,16,17, tie 48:4 23 49:25 66:7

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: TIGER..vehicles

**TIGER** 15:15 18:21

time 5:8 8:6 9:19 14:8 18:20 22:24 23:1,15,23 29:5 33:25 38:5 52:14, 23 53:22 54:19 62:9 63:23 72:2 73:7,20 76:19 77:22 82:4,7 83:3,23 88:21 92:15,19 95:4

**timeframe** 9:12 14:18 40:14 41:2 55:2 82:3 83:9,13

timeline 60:25 82:19

times 54:11 78:23

timetable 77:9

**timing** 58:8 62:6 77:13,19 89:11 92:16

**today** 18:15 20:17 25:19 26:1 29:2 38:23 39:24 51:9 52:16 54:2 57:21, 24 61:19,20 71:11 77:19 95:6

told 16:3 52:5 91:24

toll 86:7,8 87:7

top 42:11

**topic** 9:3 20:6,12 47:25 51:10,15 52:2 53:14 71:10 73:9,19 74:9

topic's 67:17

**topics** 50:23 51:5,9,15 52:22 53:16 56:3,4

tornado 4:24

**total** 15:5 32:22 33:11,13 91:4,7, 12,24

touched 51:4

tough 83:15

track 88:18

tradeoffs 68:2

traditional 41:5 56:18

traditionally 22:19

training 21:18,20,25 22:4 66:3

transit 6:8,9,13,19 8:23 9:7,8,15 10:1,7 13:21 20:19 21:5,15 22:21 24:21 25:13,14,25 26:4,6,11,20 28:3,6,7,8,19,24,25 29:13 30:19, 20,21,25 37:18 39:22 40:4,13 41:23 48:8 55:24 56:12 58:19,22, 23 66:13 67:22 71:22 73:18 74:5 76:2,4 85:8 88:10 93:23

transitioned 40:10

translate 52:9 83:13

transparent 86:22

transpired 51:7

**transportation** 4:3 5:20 6:23 7:23,24 8:1 9:2 26:5 32:5 40:25 41:4 43:13 55:9 57:18 62:25 63:20 74:7 78:23 83:4,6 90:23

travel 52:21

trend 37:16 38:17,18 40:2

trended 47:15

trending 38:16 41:13

trends 37:12 45:22

triennial 67:9

triggered 46:8,14

triggers 39:5

trip 42:1 44:17

trips 43:7,15

true 48:18

truth 49:3.5

**TSAP** 43:13

TTA 21:14 22:5

**TTI** 88:22

**TTI's** 58:18

**Tuesday** 96:22,23,24,25

turn 4:20 25:8 54:4 58:17 62:19

turnaround 16:5

turnover 23:25

two-thirds 21:19,21 32:22 33:21

34:25

**Txdot** 7:22 8:1 10:15 21:20 29:12, 14 32:6,9 35:3 41:21 55:6 65:9,12 82:16 83:13 84:5 86:3 89:18 93:20 96:13

TXDOT's 62:24 83:20 90:17

types 32:11 33:14

**typically** 8:4,8 11:5 31:18 32:6 76:1

U

**uh-huh** 18:6 83:11 88:15 89:3

uncommon 41:24 underneath 60:14

**understand** 28:1 34:5 35:21 40:8 55:23 74:4 84:7

understanding 12:22 51:11

understood 12:17 13:13 28:11

51:23

**unit** 4:10

units 32:7

universe 60:16

**unlike** 10:19

unsubsidized 76:21

unsuccessful 17:4

upcoming 9:5 21:14

update 34:1

updated 37:8

updating 35:23

uptick 38:14 39:3

upward 38:16

**urban** 6:21 16:10 17:23 28:6,7,16 30:3,18 31:21 39:12 64:2,11,16,19 65:1.3 67:9 91:22

urbanized 39:2 40:10

urbans 30:14 41:13

**usual** 96:21

utilized 93:17

٧

Valley 21:8,10

variety 8:13

vary 66:23

vast 33:1

vehicle 32:11 33:14 41:12 44:20

**vehicles** 15:7 27:16,23 31:17 32:21 33:10,13 58:21,24 64:20

TxDot PTAC Meeting September 18, 2018
Index: verify..You-all

verify 59:2

version 22:7 37:8

**versus** 38:13 45:18 56:20 57:5,13 62:4 68:4 77:15

vet 88:21

vetted 24:15 73:19

Vice 78:20 visions 94:23

visit 6:2

volunteered 37:4

Von 5:22,23,24 voracious 30:14 vote 7:14 96:17

vulnerability 10:7

W

wait 48:16 58:23

**walk** 25:19,20 38:12 52:25 53:5,6 59:15 62:20

walking 4:19

**wall** 44:5

walls 4:25

wanted 69:7 85:7,9 88:24 89:4

Warlick 42:19

water 14:8,10,16

watershed 8:14

ways 44:4,7 94:10

weather 4:24

webinar 27:8

week 21:15 53:24 55:14 65:18 78:8

weirdness 30:10

west 5:24 74:16

western 45:9

whatsoever 9:9

white 28:15 42:18,20

Whoa 16:14 Whyte 6:4 98:9 windowless 5:3

windows 4:25

wishes 47:25

witnessed 32:2

word 67:5

worded 50:15

words 68:15 80:6

**work** 10:12 23:19 24:14 25:12 50:5,22 58:18 65:12 72:13 74:9

75:17 89:5

working 26:7 41:25 67:6 85:12

works 52:4 84:13

world 23:2 28:17 90:16

worst 31:11

worth 24:14 70:7,10 88:8

wound 87:2 94:19

Wow 16:20

wrapped 75:9

write 64:15,22 65:12

wrong 13:14 41:15 87:5

Υ

**y'all** 25:12 27:15 34:3 77:17 80:10 85:13 87:4 88:25 92:8

year 8:15 15:22 17:6 19:20 25:16 27:8 35:22 37:13,17 38:21 47:17 48:12,14 50:18 51:3 53:18 54:6,13 63:18 67:15 71:21 77:6,11 86:15 90:23 91:10 94:1,2

year's 24:14

years 15:12,13 16:15 17:21 18:22 27:3 32:3 35:10 47:2 52:5 54:14 55:14 58:10 60:9 63:21 64:12 66:25 67:10 69:2 74:15 75:3,6,14 77:5 86:2 88:14,16 90:18 95:23

yesterday 37:9

You-all 8:10