PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 18, 2014 - 1:00 PM (local time)
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
Teleconference
3712 Jackson Ave, Bldg. 6, Room 323
Austin, Texas 78731

Agenda

1. Call to Order.

2. Safety Briefing.

3. Approval of Minutes from July 24, 2014 meeting.
   (Action)

4. TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the committee regarding public transportation matters.

5. Presentation and discussion of Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning.
   (Action)

6. Public comment - Public comment will only be accepted in person. The public is invited to attend the meeting in person or listen by phone at a listen-in toll-free number: 1-866-637-1408 (US) with conference code: 897 305 0787. An audio recording of the meeting will be placed on the Internet following the meeting.

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

8. Adjourn.
   (Action)

I certify that I have reviewed this document and that it conforms to all applicable Texas Register filing requirements.

CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Leonard Reese, Associate General Counsel, (512) 463-8630.
MINUTES FOR ADOPTION
Public Transportation Advisory Committee – Teleconference Meeting
200 E. Riverside Drive, Austin TX 1st Floor Auditorium
July 24, 2014

Committee Members Present and Participating:
Michelle Bloomer, Chair
J.R. Salazar, Vice Chair
Rob Stephens

Committee Members Participating via Teleconference:
Glenn Gadbois

TxDOT Present and Participating:
Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Kelly Kirkland, Planning Section Manager, PTN
Steve Wright, Coordination Planner, PTN
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN
Casey Dusza, Planner, Transportation Planning and Programming Division (TPP)

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order
Michelle Bloomer called the meeting to order at 8:40 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Safety Briefing
Josh Ribakove gave a safety briefing at 8:41 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of Minutes from May 27, 2014 Meeting

MOTION Rob Stephens moved to approve the May 27, 2014 meeting minutes.

SECOND J.R. Salazar seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously at 8:51 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Division Director’s Report
Eric Gleason spoke about items of concern, including funding for asset replacement and maintenance, the loss of Medicaid funding which is being redirected to HHS, and the impact of energy sector activity upon transit operations in Texas at 8:43 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) discussion. (Action)

Discussion of this item began at 8:52 A.M.

Comments from Glenn Gadbois, Michelle Bloomer, Rob Stephens, Eric Gleason.

Mr. Gadbois suggested that the forthcoming LAR letter include a rider with specific incremental requests, in addition to the large general request. The timeline for this letter was discussed. Eric Gleason suggested that it be sent to the Legislature no later than mid-August.
MOTION  Glenn Gadbois makes a motion to draft a new LAR letter.

SECOND  2nd by J.R. Salazar.

Motion passes unanimously at 9:03 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Presentation and discussion of Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning (Action)

Steve Wright spoke briefly about the planning performance metrics his working group has suggested and addressed questions about regional planning coordination at 9:05 A.M.

Comments from all committee members and Eric Gleason.

Committee inquired about a proposed additional metric: number of trips. Steve Wright indicated that this idea had been discussed and rejected by the working group, as “number of trips” is a poor indicator because it is impacted greatly by factors other than planning. Eric Gleason spoke about a misconception that PTAC is working under (that TxDOT’s spending on coordinated planning is consistent), pointing out that TxDOT’s spending on coordinated planning is greatly reduced during non-update years.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 7: Presentation and Discussion of TxDOT’s Texas Transportation Plan 2040 (TTP)

Casey Dusza gave a presentation on TTP’s interactive online budgeting tool at 10:01 A.M.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 8: Public Comment

At 10:17 A.M. Sarah Cook, General Manager of SouthWest Area Regional Transit District stated that:

• Her organization was doing a regional needs assessment re: energy sector activity and would have draft results by mid-August.
• Her area was likely to be re-designated as Small Urban rather than Rural in the 2020 Census.
• The elderly population is negatively impacted (economically) by the energy boom in her area.
• TxDOT, like her organization, needs to “think outside the bus.”

Michelle Bloomer indicated that she wants to see a working group put together on the issue.

At 10:22 A.M. Judy Telge from Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living stated that seniors are not being adequately served in her region. She brought along a resolution approved by the Silver-Haired Legislature calling for the establishment of a coordinated statewide interagency mobility council. She suggested that Centers for Independent Living be included at the table with TxDOT, HHSC, WorkForce, and others. She proposed that the council be coordinated by the Secretary of State’s office.
Ms. Telge also expressed her approval of TxDOT’s efforts toward transparency with PTAC – that transcripts, audio recordings, and meeting handouts are now posted on TxDOT.gov in a timely manner.

**AGENDA ITEM 9: Confirm Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for 1 P.M. on Tuesday, September 30, 2014 at 3712 Jackson Ave, Bldg. 6, Room 323, Austin, Texas 78731.

**AGENDA ITEM 10: Adjourn**

**MOTION** Rob Stephens moved to adjourn the meeting.

**SECOND** J.R. Salazar.

Meeting adjourned at 10:34 A.M.
AGENDA ITEM 5

(three documents)
Regionally Coordinated Transportation Planning
PTAC Meeting
Nov. 18, 2014

RCTP SUCCESS STORIES (as requested by PTAC at July 2014 meeting)

In September, the Public Transportation Division invited lead agencies in 22 planning regions (where lead agencies are actively engaged in the regional transportation planning effort) to share success stories. This was not mandatory. Twelve agencies responded with 24 stories. Attached is a synopsis of these stories as well as the more detailed descriptions provided by the lead agencies.

FUTURE DIRECTION OF RCTP IN TEXAS

TxDOT convened a 30-member statewide stakeholder working group in 2013 to provide input and make recommendations for future direction of the RCTP process in Texas. This group represented diverse interests and geographic areas impacted by RCTP. This group presented TxDOT with a comprehensive set of recommendations covering a wide array of matters including roles and expectations of lead agencies, funding priorities, content of regional plans, inclusion of priority population groups, improved quality and accountability, and a need to establish performance measures.

As a follow up to these recommendations, TxDOT convened a second, nine-member working group in 2014 to consider and recommend performance measures for demonstrating success and value concerning the RCTP effort in Texas. Again, this working group included a diverse representation of stakeholders. The working group presented TxDOT with a set of recommendations.

All recommendations of both working groups were previously presented to and discussed with the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) which offered additional input and guidance. In response to above activities, TxDOT determined a new direction to be initiated in 2015 with the start of the next 5-year plan update. Additionally, TxDOT developed a guidebook for lead agencies. TxDOT will present this guidebook and share other information on this new direction with lead agencies in early 2015 during a series of regional workshops.

New Direction Roll Out & FY 2016 Funding Application

- Issue application packet in February & March 2015 during regional workshops with lead agency staff; applications are due in May 2015; contracts to be executed in Sept. 2015
- Funding will be for a 5-year update to regional transportation plans; Updated plans are due by Dec. 30, 2016
- Regional workshops also will include sharing of best practices & guidance for conducting the 5-year update

Guidebook

- Content focuses on clarifying Lead Agency & TxDOT responsibilities (a draft table of contents is attached)
- Guidebook will be presented at regional workshops
- The guidebook includes information on performance measures, previously shared and discussed with PTAC. TxDOT will collect measures specifically concerning regionally coordinated transportation planning as presented below (these are in addition to traditional transit performance measures TxDOT collects such as ones on ridership, vehicle utilization, and riders per trip).
  - Project measures for regionally coordinated transportation planning
    - Emphasis on the need for local performance metrics
    - Funding preferences will be given to pilot project that include specific project measures
  - Statewide measures for regionally coordinated transportation planning
    - Number of active, formal partnerships
    - Number of individuals engaged in transportation planning & education activities
- Number of projects in the plan to address unmet needs that move from planning to an implementation phase
- Number of projects or activities to address unmet transportation needs that are either fully or partially completed
  - TxDOT will provide funding to regional lead agencies to collect and report a core set of data to demonstrate usefulness of the regional transportation plan.
  - TxDOT will work to improve capacity at the state level to collect and track access to transportation of priority populations such as individuals 65 and older, individuals with disabilities, veterans and others

**Funding Allocation Priorities During Years Between 5-Year Updates**

- The **bulk** of funding will be awarded for pilot projects that address priorities identified in regional transportation plans.
  - Preference will be given to proposed projects with:
    - Measurable outcomes
    - Letters of support from lead agencies
    - Local match
    - Demonstrated relevance and replicability in other regions of Texas
  - Awards will be made competitively as part of TxDOT's annual coordinated call for projects. Any eligible applicant (not limited to designated lead agencies) may apply.
- **Some** funding will be awarded to lead agencies in each of Texas’ 24 planning regions for costs associated with data collection and reporting of performance metrics/indicators
  - These funds will be awarded on a non-competitive basis to designated lead agencies
  - Probably less than $5,000 per lead agency

**MILESTONE DATES**


May 2015: FY 2016 funding applications are due.

Sept. 2015: Execute contracts to begin 5-year updates of regional transportation plans for each of Texas’ 24 planning regions.

**Regionally Coordinated Transportation Planning (RCTP)**

**Success Stories, Synopsis**

This is a synopsis of success stories provided by lead agencies. More detailed descriptions of each success story are available from the Public Transportation Division upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Region</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project / Purpose</th>
<th>Impact of the RCTP Process on the Project</th>
<th>Outcome/Success/Highlight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** Panhandle RPC | **1** | Veterans Transportation Summit. | Summit stemmed directly from the RCTP process  
To bring together parties to discuss veterans’ transp. needs & infrastructure to identify gaps & solutions.  
Diverse partners & elected officials essential to success | People came together for 1st time to discuss this issue |
| **2** South Plains Assoc. of Govts. | Regional Transportation in Disaster Situations. | The Regional Coordination Committee identified the need for this project  
To develop a plan for providing transp. to individuals w/special needs or w/out transp. during a large-scale emergency or disaster | 7 counties received physical & digital maps to facilitate mass evacuation  
Success will be measured when protocols are implemented during a disaster |
| **3** Nortex RPC | Project Nortex. | Concept came from the RCTP committee  
To develop a Web site to allow (1) human services agents to schedule trips for clients & (2) riders to coord. trips betw. dif. transp. providers  
Website would not be possible w/out partnership of transportation providers & end users | Creation of website |
| **5** East Texas COG | Marshall Depot Accessibility. | Issue was raised & solved through coordination process.  
To make this depot wheelchair accessible.  
Project involved several essential partners | An elevator lift that allows persons in a wheelchair to access the Depot |
| **6** East Texas COG | Seamless Fare. | RCTP process created a mechanism for this need to be recognized  
To develop a single fare to use when boarding multiple transp. modes in 14-county region  
Collaboration essential | This planning project has not been completed |
| **6** East Texas COG | Coordination Strategies. | Collaboration essential  
To research options for transp. providers to function more efficiently | A report & matrix for the transp. steering committee to use to promote more coordinated, efficient public transp. services |
| **8** El Paso County | Big Bend Region Rural Transit Services | The need for but lack of general public transportation service was discovered through the RCTP process.  
To introduce general public transportation services to five rural counties that had never participated in the Section 5311 program  
RCTP provided a mechanism to research options, identify & engage stakeholders in 5 rural counties, & lead stakeholders through the process to join an adjoining rural transit district. | Commissioners’ courts from Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis & Presidio Cos. agreed to join the Permian Basin RTD  
Sec. 5311 public transp. services now in these 5 counties for the 1st time  
Today, the system has a fleet of 20 vehicles dispatched from 4 cities, logs 1,000 + revenue miles/day & provides demand response services to 20,000 square mi. area |
| **8** El Paso County | Highly Rural Transportation Program for Veterans. | The gap in transportation services for veterans was identified through the RCTP comprehensive needs assessment  
To create an affordable transp. option for veterans residing in remote communities who must travel long distances to VA medical care  
Solution was identified thru the RCTP process & various stakeholders were instrumental in securing a VA grant | $150,000 was awarded through a VA grant; program is designed to use existing transp. capacity to ensure a highly coordinated & efficient service delivery model  
The 1st veterans’ trip occurred on 10/8/14 |
| **8** El Paso County | Dialysis Transportation Study. | RCTP process created the forum for the need to be discovered, the capacity to secure additional resources to study this complex issue & the mechanism to find a coordinated solution which likely would not have occurred w/out RCTP  
To conduct an independent medically qualified study of a range of issues related to the transportation of dialysis patients to and from treatment.  
Numerous & diverse partners played unique, key roles | Detailed report w/specific recommendations & framework for moving to a more efficient approach to transp. service delivery  
A deepened understanding of this complex issue.  
An expanded workgroup continues to follow up on report recommendations |
| **10** Concho Valley Transit Dist | IT Advantages for CVTD and Urban and Rural Clients. | Project was a direct result of evaluation & studies done under RCTP process  
To evaluate and plan an electronic dispatch system  
Collaboration w/numerous & diverse partners essential | Updated technology that is still being upgraded to realize advantages not previously explored or considered |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Region</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project / Purpose</th>
<th>Impact of the RCTP Process on the Project</th>
<th>Outcome/Success/Highlight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Capital Area MPO</td>
<td>Office of Mobility Management (OMM)</td>
<td>To close gaps in service identified in the Regional Transit Coordination Committee plan, increase connectivity among all transportation providers in the region, and create a seamless transportation network.</td>
<td>• The coordinated planning process highlighted the disjointed landscape of services in the planning region &amp; specifically identified the OMM as a strategy to address this. • It was unprecedented in the region to have staff not just working for a single agency or provider but dedicated to addressing gaps &amp; coordinating services between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Capital Area MPO</td>
<td>Del Valle Metro Connector</td>
<td>To develop a connector route to connect individuals in Del Valle area w/employment, education &amp; other services in Austin.</td>
<td>• This project would not likely have occurred w/out the coordinated planning process • Project involved collaboration among numerous &amp; diverse partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brazos Valley COG</td>
<td>Regionally Coord. Transp. Planning Workgroup</td>
<td>To get input from those who regularly deal w/transp problems</td>
<td>• There was some inter-organizational cooperation in past, but this group brought more orgs. together to ID problems &amp; resources each org. has to solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South East Texas RPC</td>
<td>Regional Transit Services Guide</td>
<td>To develop a guide to be used by human services and nonprofit case workers to educate clients about public transportation options.</td>
<td>• RCTP process was the catalyst for this project • This coordinated planning process opened lines of communication that allowed for human service agencies and nonprofits to work with transportation providers and planning agencies to address needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South East Texas RPC</td>
<td>Express Bus Service Needs Study</td>
<td>To study the need for express bus service in southeast Texas.</td>
<td>• An express bus service was suggested through the RCTP process. Project would not have occurred without the coordinated planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South East Texas RPC</td>
<td>Transportation Services Education Plan</td>
<td>To develop an education plan for increasing awareness of transportation services in southeast Texas.</td>
<td>• RCTP provided mechanism to complete plan by initiating public involvement &amp; research that uncovered the need; it wouldn’t have occurred otherwise bec .it required sustained interaction among transp. providers, planners, human service agencies, nonprofits &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>Regional Transit Services Guide</td>
<td>To compile a comprehensive listing of transit providers, contact info, summary of fares &amp; service types for 13-co. region.</td>
<td>• Need for project identified in the regional plan • Involved collaboration of numerous &amp; diverse partners • Project might have occurred w/out RCTP process, but, this process provided focus &amp; sharing of best practices that made the project better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Center Connect Transit Expansions</td>
<td>To implement fixed route transit services in southern Brazoria and Galveston Counties.</td>
<td>• This project involved collaboration among numerous &amp; diverse partners including elected officials • The need for expanded transit services in Brazoria and Galveston cos. was identified in the reg. transp. plan • Project might have occurred w/out RCTP process bec. preliminary discussions started before 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>Harris County RIDES/CSD Transit Services</td>
<td>To expand transit services in Harris County</td>
<td>• This project involved collaboration among numerous &amp; diverse partners including elected officials • RCTP process provided funding for the regional transp. plan which included recommendations for expanded transit options in eastern Harris Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>Colorado Valley Transit District (CVTD) Commuter Service in Austin Co.</td>
<td>To implement new transit service in Austin County.</td>
<td>• This project involved collaboration among numerous and diverse partners including elected officials • Need for expanded service was id’d in regional plan • Project might have occurred w/out RCTP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Region</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project / Purpose</td>
<td>Impact of the RCTP Process on the Project</td>
<td>Outcome/Success/Highlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16             | Houston-Galveston Area Council | Fort Bend County (FBC) Transit Services. To develop expanded transit services in Fort Bend County. | • This project involved collaboration among numerous and diverse partners including elected officials  
• RCTP process provided funding for 2006 reg. transp. plan which included recommendations for expanded & better coordinated transit options in Ft Bend Co | • There has been a significant increase in ridership in Fort Bend County due to the expanded transit options  
• Current system-wide ridership was estimated at 370,000 in 2013 |
| 20             | Transp. Coord. Network of the Coastal Bend | Coordinated Transportation Services – Urban and Rural Services Coordination. To address the need for increased mobility of residents in rural areas for the urban transportation provider | • This project responded to several needs identified in the regional plan  
• Collaboration was essential as it allowed for increased efficiency in use of resources while increasing mobility of residents | • Interlocal agreements to coordinate between all transportation providers  
• Memo. of Agreement to contract services between urban & rural transp. providers  
• Increased mobility for rural areas & colonias  
• Data collected on numbers of riders, transp. requests made & trips delivered |
| 20             | Transp. Coord. Network of the Coastal Bend | Job Access Mobility Institute – Public Service Academy. To provide training on transportation options to riders from rural areas. | • This project was facilitated through the RCTP process. | Recruitment of residents from rural cos. who had no previous access to the academy  
• Increased ridership  
• Identified & confirmed that transporting students to training can occur thru a carefully planned ride share program |
| 20             | Transp. Coord. Network of the Coastal Bend | Live Oak Co. & Refugio Co. Transportation Plans. To develop public transp. plans for Live Oak & Refugio Cos. by forming advisory groups to lead the effort & conduct community forums. | • These projects were designed to supplement the Coastal Bend regional transportation plan which provided limited data from these two counties  
• Projects involved collaboration among numerous & diverse partners | • A transportation plan for Live Oak County which led to immediate implementation  
• A transportation plan for Refugio County |
| 24             | Southwest Area Rural Transit | Middle Rio Grande Needs Assessment. To assess public transp. needs, conduct an inventory of transp. resources & identify gaps in transp. services in light of Eagle Ford Shale activities in Planning Region 24 | • This assessment would not have occurred in such a detailed and concentrated way without RCTP coordination  
• Project engaged numerous & diverse partners | • A comprehensive report that identifies needs, resources, inventories, partnerships & activities to address unmet transportation needs and gaps in transportation services |

**Note:** One hundred percent of projects cited RCTP as the catalyst for the project. Cost of projects ranged from $1,300 to $892,000. One half of projects cost $30,500 or less. Five projects cost $47,000 or more. The costs for eight projects was not clear. Fourteen projects leveraged other funds.
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