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MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then let's go ahead and call the meeting to order at 8:46.

We'll move on to Agenda Item 2: The safety briefing.

MR. KILLEBREW: Good morning, Michelle, this is Bobby.

MS. BLOOMER: Good morning, Bobby.

MR. KILLEBREW: And just to let you know, since we had some downtime, I went ahead and conducted a safety briefing outside of your normal meeting. So we've already accomplished that and we don't need to do it again.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then we will move on to Item 3: Approval of the minutes from the November 18th, 2014 meeting.

Before I ask for a motion, has everybody had a chance to review the minutes, and are there any questions?

(No audible response.)

Hearing no questions, I'll go ahead and call for the motion.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R.

I move to approve.

MR. STEPHENS: This is Rob.

I second.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Having a motion and a second,
I'm going to stop because I forgot to do one step.

So, obviously, J.R. and Rob are in Austin. Is there -- are there any other members in Austin?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes, Michelle.

John is with us today, too.


MR. McBETH: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: What about Glenn?

MR. SALAZAR: No Glenn.

MS. BLOOMER: No Glenn?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Glenn will be -- Glenn will be calling in shortly.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Okay, so no Glenn, no Brad.

So -- okay. So, since I'm here and ya'll are there, I'm just going to go ahead and call everybody's name and we can do it that way for approval of the minutes.

So we do have a motion and a second.

So, John?

MR. McBETH: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

Rob? Yes?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And, J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Michelle?
Yes.

So the minutes are approved. We'll move on to Item 4, which is TxDOT Public Transportation Division Director's Report.

Eric?

MR. GLEASON: Good morning, Michelle.

This is Eric Gleason, director of public transportation for TxDOT, and Michelle, just so you know, on the phone what you can't see is we have a -- we have a pretty good attendance this morning at the meeting from members of the public. I think most of them would identify themselves as transit providers.

MS. BLOOMER: Great, thank you.

MR. GLEASON: So we had a very successful, I think anyways, Semi-Annual Meeting yesterday, well-attended, a lot of good topics, some good discussion. And so a lot of folks have, obviously, taken the opportunity since they were in Austin to stay over another night to attend the meeting. So -- which is great to see; we don't often see this many, many people in the crowd.

From a Director's Report standpoint, it's been relatively quiet. What I will say for the Committee is that we are now entering what I think of as our high season from an activity-at-the-Commission standpoint. We expect and we are hoping to see federal apportionments by the very end of...
this month or the first week of February. We are positioned at the February Commission meeting to begin rolling out 5311 Program awards for the formula portion based on needs and performance.

And then as we move into the April/May/June time frame, we'll be working our way through some of the Discretionary Program awards as we typically do, as well. And then with June, assuming the Legislature completes its business on time, with June, we would anticipate the State FY 16 formula awards. So this is typically a busy time of a year for us.

And we have two important dates out there -- well, there's one important date out there for two important efforts. February 9th is when proposals for both the 5310 Program and the Coordinated Call are due. So it's a really busy time.

And that -- that's the extent of my report. I'd be happy to answer any questions folks might have.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Do any of the members have any questions for Eric?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Hearing none -- before I move on, I just wanted to thank those that are in the audience for attending the PTAC meeting and sharing your thoughts with us. I do apologize, I had hoped to be there with you yesterday and
today in Austin; unfortunately, I was not able to get my child care stars to align perfectly to make that happen, but I look forward to seeing you at the next Semi-Annual in July.

Okay. Having heard the Director's Report, we'll go ahead and move on to Item 5 on the agenda, which is: Discussion of general guidance and reporting requirements for the 5310 Program.

MR. GADBOIS: And before we start, Glenn is now on the phone.

(A chorus of "Good mornings")

MS. BLOOMER: Welcome, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: Thanks much.

And I'm sorry I'm not there, but I'm not sharing my crud with ya'll.

MR. GLEASON: And we very much appreciate that.

MR. McBETH: We very much appreciate that.

MR. GADBOIS: I figured.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Glenn, just to let you know, J.R., Rob, and John are all in Austin and I am on the phone with you, okay?

MR. GLEASON: Glenn, this is Eric.

Just as well, we have a pretty good audience this morning, largely transit providers who were here yesterday for one of our Semi-Annual Meetings. So we probably have
close to 20 people in the audience. We have a couple folks -- Coastal Bend Independent Living Center, Judy is here, and then someone from the State Independent Living Council is here, as well, so pretty good crowd this morning.

MR. GADBOIS: Super. Thanks.

MS. BLOOMER: Who's going to be doing the 5310 Report?

MR. GLEASON: Okay. So Kris Dudley will be providing this for the Committee and giving, as requested, an update on some of the new guidance that we are working with, with the 5310 Program.

So, Kris, go ahead.

MS. DUDLEY: Thank you.

Good morning. For the record, my name is Kris Dudley. I'm excited to be here this morning. It's been kind of a long road here.

I'm going to basically go over what we've provided for you in your packet. The first page -- I'm not going to read it, of course -- the first page talks about the significant changes. And like I mentioned yesterday at the Operators Meeting, the eligible subrecipients or the eligible recipients for these 5310 dollars has indeed, changed.

And yesterday in the meeting I talked about how our TAC does not necessarily follow, at this point, the...
federal guidance. And that was -- so, I believe what the
statement that I made was, "The TAC was wrong." Well, the
TAC isn't really wrong; the TAC just hasn't caught up to the
federal guidance. But what the TAC does say is that, as far
as Texas is concerned, the recipients, the eligible
recipients, the first group of eligible recipients are the
small urban and rural providers.

When the circular was final on June 6, 2014, the
eligible subrecipients are nonprofit entities, number one,
and then secondly, those groups that are -- and I don't want
to use the word blessed -- or deemed by legislation or local
order to serve those individuals that this program targets:
individuals with disabilities and seniors. So there are a
number of organizations in the state that are recognized to
coordinate services for individuals with disabilities and
seniors, and those are Centers for Independent Living, as
well as the Aging and Disability Resource Center. And so, I
think, federally, those two groups are coming closer under
the HHSC umbrella.

The funding, the funding categories have been
split. Once you get past the fact that the whole Texas
appropriation has now been divvied up, sixty percent to the
large urban areas, of which there are fourteen in the state,
and then forty percent for the small, urban and the rural
areas which come to the State for us to do our competitive
process, which we maintain and do at the local level. That has not changed, as far as MAP-21.

But what the circular does do now -- because it also incorporates New Freedom Projects -- it divides the funding up to -- into two subsets, which is traditional capital and then the second subset is called other; it's other capital or operating, okay. And in your packet, I have included the circular, because when the circular discusses 5310 and it talks about the "other category"; that other category is, a lot of it is the actual New Freedom-type activities. So, yes, it's the traditional operating insurance, et cetera, driver salaries, but it also incorporates a lot of the New Freedom-type programs. The traditional fifty-five percent is eligible for those eligible recipients, and that's the nontraditional providers or the nonprofit providers, those organizations eligible to serve the two targeted groups.

And in Texas, because it's such a major change to the program, what we have tried to do is allow partnerships between the 5311 and the 5307 agencies with some of these nonprofit entities. We had long, long, long discussions with FTA, both national, as well -- headquarters FTA, as well as Region 6. Because this was so new and we listened to all the FTA webinars and we went over and over with Gil Williams at the federal level about the traditional -- the
fifty-five percent of the dollars being spent on traditional projects, which is the usual capital: the vehicles, purchase of service, et cetera.

And so the best solution that we have been able to come up with in order to allow more 5307 and 5311 folks to be eligible for these dollars is the partnership with the nonprofit or the entity that is deemed by the State or a local government to serve individuals with disabilities and seniors.

And then the public outreach and the Coordinated Plan -- the Coordinated Plan is not a new thing; it's been going on for years ever since SAFETEA-LU. The coordination effort, as many of the folks in this room will tell me, is totally not a new thing. That's why when folks are looking at partnering with different organizations that serve individuals with disabilities and seniors, Oh, guess what? They're already doing it, been doing it for years. Now, let's just adjust how these partnerships work so we can be eligible for the different, you know, the pots of money.

In the public outreach, the circular is very, very clear and you will see this reflected in the application. Individuals with disabilities and seniors need to have a place at the table. They need to be able to provide input on the type of service that they might need. And so in cases that we have heard of to date, we have been holding
conference calls with providers and local groups to try to discuss how they might be eligible for as of these dollars as possible. And what we found is that when the transit operators meet with the seniors or the individuals with disabilities they find that, Well, okay, so we stop at this block, but actually it would be better if, you know, we could stop two blocks away to be more accommodating to the target group. So a lot of the service adjustments that folks are making are not that expensive or that intense. So that's the first piece that we've provided, and that's the major changes.

And then the next piece is the information index, and basically what we've done is give you all the information of this program since MAP-21's inception. We did a little recap of the award for FY 14, and as you can see in the pie chart -- and I'd like to recognize Kari Banta at this time because she provided this information; she actually has done the application this year and she is -- was working with me to do the awards last year. So she's working her way into a leadership position for the 5310 Program.

MR. GLEASON: So, Kris, you're on actually page 4 of the handout, but it's labeled page 2 at the bottom?

MS. DUDLEY: Page 2, yes. It's page 4 of the handout, but it's page 2 of the actual, what you have here,
and I'll just demonstrate: This first page is kind of a
table of contents, if you will, and it describes all the
handouts that you have behind.

    MR. SALAZAR: On that, is -- am I just looking at
that wrong or is the Abilene District not on there?

    MR. GLEASON: We didn't tell you, J.R.?

    MR. SALAZAR: No.

    MS. DUDLEY: We didn't tell you -- well, you're a
hundred percent correct; the Abilene District -- but the
Abilene District did get money in FY 14. A matter of fact,
it got a lot of money and it was a very interesting process,
so we'll send that back out after we include the Abilene
District.

    So that's the first handout, is the award recap
for FY 14. The second document, the next document is
actually a presentation that I gave at the Semi-Annual
Meeting in July of 2013 discussing the changes. And it did,
at the back, ask everybody to take a look at the draft
circular, because at that time, the circular was draft and
it highlighted the areas that I thought folks might find of
interest.

    The next item is the PTAC talking points that we
did September of '13, and that was the last time we had the
opportunity to visit with ya'll regarding this program.

    The next item in your packet is a part of the
circular that we circulated to all the PTCs, and, in turn, we asked them to circulate it to the transit operators that discusses the primary changes to the actual circular.

MR. GLEASON: So that's the circular that is guiding our current efforts?

MS. DUDLEY: This circular is guiding our current efforts, yes, and it's the one that was blessed or that was finalized; it was finalized June 6th, 2014.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. DUDLEY: The next table that you'll see is the funding that's available this year, okay. And this is the -- since the circular has become final. This is the first year we've actually expressed these dollars in the traditional projects column and the rural project -- or the other projects. And if a 5307 or 5311 transit provider wanted to unilaterally come forward with a project, the project would be eligible only under the other projects column, either, be it small, urban or rural.

And so these figures represent the final FY 14 appropriations, and once we -- Texas gets our appropriation, we take the admin dollars off the top which is ten percent, and then we -- not we -- Kelly and Bobby do their magic and they divide it up based on population and other demographic areas -- demographic items in the state to get the local allocations, and then it goes into the local process. So
that's what those numbers represent.

The next piece in your packet is the first section of the application. I got to tell you, this 5310 application has been a challenge. Historically, the 5310 application was attached to the 5307 and the 5311 application. And then there was some discussion that that was too cumbersome, there were too many pages, there was not enough detail. So then we segregated the 5310 application into its own application and we tried to mirror what folks would -- how folks would respond in the Coordinated Call For Projects. So the 5310 application then became a narrative.

Well, then, we understood that once the 5310 application was a narrative, it was not fair to some of the smaller agencies that perhaps would not have the capacity for somebody to write a competitive application. So we've gone back and this first part of the application is basically the program detail information. So it appears to be long, but it really -- the only information an agency would have to fill out would be the agency's specific information that begins on page 17, and this is the part of the application that is generic to every district an operator turns an application into.

As we heard J.R. say yesterday, J.R. is fortunate enough -- J.R. Salazar of Central Texas Rural Transit District -- he's fortunate enough to be able to apply in
four districts for 5310 dollars. And so for each district
that he applies to, he needs to complete a district
supplement. This first --

MR. GLEASON: But the over -- but the boilerplate
just needs to be done --

MS. DUDLEY: Once.

MR. GLEASON: -- once.

MS. DUDLEY: The boilerplate just needs to be done
once, and the reason for these district supplements is so
that each part -- and I'm going to use you as an example,
J.R. -- but each district in which J.R. applies for dollars
only sees this particular part that applies to their
district and their district level of funding. So he would
have to prepare four budgets and four applications that
discuss, individually, what he intends to do for that area.

That's some of the complaint we got last year from
the stakeholder groups is that the application that we had
previously did not discuss the actual activity that was to
benefit the area in which it was being scored. So we had
some issues there, so that's the reason for the district
supplements.

So in J.R.'s case, he would turn in a district
supplement to each of the four districts that he would apply
in and the same agency information detail to -- attached to
each of the four applications.
MR. GLEASON: Kris, if I can --

MS. DUDLEY: Uh-huh?

MR. GLEASON: But I think, as well, we've attempted to really only limit the supplemental information portion that they need to do for each district is the minimum that it can be. We're also trying to respond -- not only did we hear that we weren't asking for an area's specific information, but we also heard that, you know, folks who had to fill out, two, three, or four were frustrated.

MS. DUDLEY: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And so we've had to try to respond to both of those comments; one taking us one way and the other taking us the other way. And so we've tried to get as much into the boilerplate so that doesn't have to be repeated each time and separate out only the information that is needed and is unique to the specific district that it's being applied for.

MS. DUDLEY: Kari, would you agree?

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BANTA: Yes.

My name is Kari Banta. Furthermore, I would say that even within the district supplement, we have broken it down into sections so that there is minimized repetition of the information provided --
MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BANTA: -- by design.

And the short-answer format eliminates -- it's designed so that if you fill in the information in one part, you can refer back to that later and not have to repeat the same.

MS. DUDLEY: Yeah. And so this year's application is short-answer -- thank you, Kari -- is short-answer to accommodate those agencies that may not have staff that is good at responding to a narrative application. So this makes -- this actually levels the playing field.

So, basically, those are the documents. I tried to, when we put this packet together -- when Kari and I put this packet together we tried to highlight the changes first of all, and then by virtue of these -- this passel of documents, provide the history of where we started with MAP-21 -- 5310 and to wince it's evolved with MAP-21.

And as we all know, MAP-21 was a two-year bill. MAP-21 is no longer. We are working all these continuing resolutions, and so we are looking at a reauthorization situation. So we don't know what next year will hold.

MR. GLEASON: So let's clarify that last point -- this is Eric -- MAP-21 is -- even though we are in a time frame that is beyond the authorization itself; that authorization has been extended in lieu of a replacement
authorization bill?

    MS. DUDLEY: Uh-huh.

    MR. GLEASON: So we are still under MAP-21 authorization --

    MS. DUDLEY: Yeah, by virtue of the continuing resolution.

    MR. GLEASON: -- and will be until we get new authorization.

So it's not that it's gone away?

    MS. DUDLEY: No, no. It hasn't gone anywhere.

    MR. GLEASON: It's just that it was originally intended for '13 and '14 and has simply been extended into '15.

    MS. DUDLEY: And one other thing that I would like to mention that has been posted to the TxDOT website with the 5310 application and information is the questions and answers, and they are quite in-depth, so you guys might want to look at those as well, and maybe Josh can send out that link to ya'll so you will have it readily available.

So, at this point, that's basically all I have, but I'll be happy to address any questions.

    MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric.

Before you jump into questions, just so let you know, we do have one individual in the audience who would like to provide comment on this item and you can either do
that now or you can take it at the end of the meeting; it's your prerogative.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Why don't we go ahead and take the public comment and then that way we can address any issues the individual brings up, along with our own.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay. Michelle, we have Judy with the Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living would like to speak.

So if you don't mind.

MS. TELGE: Where should I --

MR. SALAZAR: Right over here.

MS. DUDLEY: Right here.

MS. TELGE: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Michelle, this is Judy Telge. I'm from Corpus Christi and I am with the Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living.

We are -- I'm not sure if we are a traditional or nontraditional --

MS. DUDLEY: The traditional, according --


MS. DUDLEY: -- to the circular.

MS. TELGE: Well, whatever.

We have been utilizing 5310 funds thanks so much to our local PTC effort and particularly Kris Dudley at the State level, because we were able to develop a program under
JARC several years -- well, five years ago; we're ending
that now -- which was based in exactly the same things that
we're seeing evolve with 5310. So we're very ready and very
grateful for what MAP-21 is allowing.

We have partnerships. We have, based in consumer
choice -- that's a very key part of what we're doing -- and
by doing that, we have learned how to fill the gaps, and
that really is what 5310 is all about for individuals with
disabilities and for seniors. When there's gaps, obviously,
you're not going to take a mass transit model and totally
change to meet those gaps, so that means getting creative
and doing things that may be on a short-term, gap-filling
basis and honestly utilize resources that sometimes,
especially rural transit operators haven't used in the past
as they could, and that would be private transportation.

So the other key to what we've been doing is
mobility management, which is obviously, a capital expense.
That is so critical with seniors and with people with
disabilities. You've got to do the hand-holding. You've
got to do the counseling. You've also got to take care of
the housing and the et cetera, et cetera, et cetera that
these folks often have. They basically face gaps
everywhere.

So those two -- three things, I guess -- two
things, have been critical. We've been able to develop --
the cost-sharing aspect of this we've always done, we, internally, provide some of our funding from other projects to help fund portions of our program just out of necessity. TxDOT can't support it all; we know that.

We have recently become a vendor with DARS, that's Department of Assisted and Rehab Services. We are not under them. They don't fund us as a center. The Feds fund us directly. Some of our centers in Texas do have DARS funding directly; we do not. It's up to each center. But we are now a vendor, and guess what we're doing? We're cost-sharing for their clients. They pay half of what they would have paid to get a consumer to work or keep them at work; we pay the other half. What does that do? It stretches their pot and it stretches our pot, which ends up being TxDOT pot.

So we're extremely excited to see this because the partnerships is what -- I was so happy to see what J.R. is doing, what's happening in Victoria. It's testament to what can work if you use public and private transportation, fill those gaps, get these folks where they need to get, when they need to get there. I just wanted to let you know that this is Center for Independent Living that has been given an opportunity and absolutely hope to see more of that. We are working with our rural transit -- now, I think we're going to work more with them -- and working with our urban as
well.

So thanks for the opportunity and thanks for what you're doing.

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Judy.

MS. TELGE: You're welcome.

MS. BLOOMER: Does that conclude the public comments, Eric, on Item 5?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I will open it up to any questions or discussions from the Committee.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. --

MS. BLOOMER: Any questions from the folks out in Austin?

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R.

The only -- I'm not sure it's a question, I just have a comment. I know there's been a lot of talk about what works in our area or my area, and that's a good thing, but I am a little concerned about some of the now, nontraditional partners not applying or not -- what's going to happen in other areas of the state that maybe isn't happening in my area. I am a little concerned about what's going on there.

MS. DUDLEY: This is Kris Dudley for the record.

J.R., and we are very cognizant of the potential
or the capacity, if you will, of some of our nonprofit partners, potential partners, to handle that FTA Grant dollar and that's why we have encouraged the partnerships with local transit providers, because the FTA dollar comes with lots and lots of strings, you know, you have to have the Title VI plan; you have to have, you know, all the NTD data and things like that.

I think one of the things that differentiates with our aging disability resource centers and our centers for independent living, they are very familiar with those federal-type grants and guidelines and so they are good at the record keeping; they are good at the financial. But that's -- J.R., your big concern has been our concern historically because at the beginning of the 5310 Program, that's basically what was done. Vehicles were, you know, designated to local small nonprofits that may or may not use those vehicles on a regular basis, and a lot of times they would just sit with nothing going on.

So when we look at these, the nonprofits that come unilaterally, are they participating in the regional coordination aspect? I mean we've had people on some of the conference calls that are interested in the money when we talk about it upfront, but then when we say, Well, you have a coordinate and you have to work with others in your region -- Well, no, we don't want that, we just want the bus
for our people, boom, end of report. So we are working --
trying to work very diligently with our PTCs in recognizing
the need for these partnerships because it takes a pretty
well-oiled machine and organization to keep up with FTA.

So I'm not saying it's not going to happen, J.R.,
but what I am saying is that we are trying to encourage
things like you're doing and like Lisa is doing, so the
transit provider can still maintain the responsibility of
providing information for FTA. That's why in your model
with the Center for Independent Living where you are
purchasing the vehicle for the Center for Independent Living
eliminating the need, you know, for a lot of things that you
can do with a vehicle above and beyond, you know, what the
Center for Independent Living may be able to do with the
vehicle. And you have some -- you know, you get to count
the ridership, et cetera, et cetera.

So those are the kinds of partnerships -- and,
John, I know you guys have been doing this for years,
working with the nonprofits. It's just like I said, many of
you guys have been doing this for years and providing the
buses; as a matter of fact, it's your model that J.R. and
Brian Baker in South Plains are working with.

MR. McBETH: Yeah, our nonprofits are totally
freaked out.

MS. DUDLEY: Yeah.
MR. McBETH: They're -- they're like, Who wrote this? What were they thinking? We don't have the ability to do this. That's why we've always worked with you. We have -- we have two staff members assigned to just do the 5310 Program for all the non -- we -- we work with a lot of nonprofits and I can only think of one of them that have the infrastructure in place to comply with this without us helping them. So we're going to continue to go ahead and do what we've been doing, helping them to -- when you start talking about Title VI and all of that other stuff, you lose them. They're like, What? We have to do what?

MS. DUDLEY: Well -- or even having to provide all their information in Spanish because they have a limited English proficiency.

MR. McBETH: That, and then most of these people are operating -- they're all well-meaning people that were -- they're volunteers. They're all volunteers. Very few of these organizations have a real structure, and so when you start talking to them about accounting and books of original entry, all this kind of stuff, they're like, A shoe box, we've got a shoe box that we keep receipts in.

But we're going to continue to support those people and help them do their applications even though we won't be the grantee any longer, but we're not -- we're going to continue our model as best we can to keep the
vehicles flowing out there. We do not use any 5310 vehicles
ourselves; we get them and we subcontract them out to other
people and they utilize them.

MS. DUDLEY: And --

MR. McBETH: And it's -- it's worked when -- I
mean I came to Brazos Transit from the Brazos Valley MHMR,
Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center, and the reason
I came is because we had a relationship at that time, and
that was 1982, where Brazos Transit provided MHMR with 5310
vehicles to carry our mentally challenged people to and from
sheltered workshops. So this is a program, in our
organization it's been going on since 1982, and when I
looked at the circular, I, quite frankly, asked the people
at The Community Transportation Association of America, What
were you guys thinking? What were you thinking; you're
dismantling a program that's working.

But they do it completely differently in the
Northeast than we do it down here in Texas. They do it
completely -- because they're a bunch of Socialists.

(Laughter)

MR. GLEASON: Strike that from the record.

(Laughter)

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric, Michelle.

If I could, John, when you asked them what were
they thinking, what did they say?
MR. McBEATH: Well, they basically say they were thinking good thoughts, but went it got over to Federal Transit, the people that write these things wrote it in a different manner than what they were actually asking for. So, you know, the horse is out of the barn. The circular is there. It's too late to do anything about it this time around. There will be -- there will be initiatives in the upcoming reauthorization which is coming pretty quickly; we've got 141 days left until we don't have any more Federal Transit money if we don't get our reauthorization packets. So in the upcoming reauthorization, we're going to try to make changes, but, you know, it's very difficult to change a circular once it's out; it takes forever.

MR. GLEASON: So, I think one of the --

MS. BLOOMER: This is --

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric -- go ahead, Michelle. I'm sorry.

MS. BLOOMER: I just -- I just had a couple questions. I'm wondering at what point -- so, on the second handout that was provided for this item it said, you know, we went -- we started in July of 2013 at the Semi-Annual Operators Meeting and then PTAC meeting. Just looking in that -- through that, I'm wondering at what point we realized that this change to private nonprofits was going to
take effect. Because I heard from quite a -- I won't say quite a few -- I hear from a couple of transit providers that seem to think that this is a complete shock. So that's the first question, and then the second question is how many of the historically -- historic 5310 recipients of rural transit providers are also private nonprofit? And then my third question, which I think John sort of touched on, is if it's a private nonprofit, are they submitting the grant and then do they have the institutional administrative capacity to administer Federal Transit Administration funds, and does TxDOT have any concerns related to that?

MS. DUDLEY: Michelle, I'm going to answer your first question. When you talked about the Semi-Annual Meeting, that's the first handout you were talking -- or the second handout, you were talking about that, right, Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MS. DUDLEY: That, at the bottom or at the very end, I pointed out that there was a draft circular out for review and comment and that the particular attention needed to be paid to the eligible subrecipients for traditional 5310 Projects, as well as the eligible activities. And I recall at that meeting I indicated that everybody should take a look at this and everybody should comment, so I don't know --
MS. BLOOMER: The -- the reason --

MS. DUDLEY: Yes?

MS. BLOOMER: -- the reason I ask is because I don't see it anywhere on the document titled "Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities, Section 5310, MAP-21," and then at the bottom it says "Presented at the TxDOT Semi-Annual Meeting, 7/20/13."

MS. DUDLEY: Are you looking at the --

MS. BLOOMER: I may just be missing it.

MS. DUDLEY: -- at the second page?

That has a front and a back, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Mine, I printed mine off the packet, so it's one, two -- oh, shoot -- three, four, five pages in, and, yes, it's two pages -- one and a half pages.

MS. DUDLEY: And so at the end of that is some highlighted information.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MS. DUDLEY: I don't make reference to, specifically, those -- I make reference to the sections in the circular that folks might find, but I didn't go into the specifics.

MS. BLOOMER: I think a lot of folks -- I appreciate the summary and the comments to please look at these sections. I think a lot of folks may not have reviewed it, because it seems like for quite a few it's a
surprise.

But I guess my question is, is it seems now we're going back to where we were in -- let's see, when did I start this -- 2001, 2002, when TxDOT was funding private nonprofits, and like you said, there was, you know, one vehicle here and one vehicle there and those vehicles were only used to transport that entity's clients. How do we get away from that?

MS. DUDLEY: Well -- and, Michelle, that is, as I had mentioned, with this model that John and J.R. and Brian are working on, the transit provider is purchasing the vehicle and then they are, through a local MOU or a local contract, they are providing the vehicle for the Center for Independent Living in these two cases. And then the contracts like Brazos and J.R. have -- and J.R., do you want to speak to that because you're actually doing it -- but there are standards and measures in there like ridership and mileage utilization, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. SALAZAR: Yes, and we're right in the middle of that contract and I'm glad to hear, John, that you have staff because we may be calling you do get a little guidance on that. And, yes, there is little concern from our perspective about monitoring this new agency that's going to be doing services. And we're to the point of finalizing that contract, but I do think -- and I've visited with Delma
and Jessica, our PTCs in the area, and I have encouraged and they are in agreement, that we need to meet with the Center for Independent Living and say, This is what we expect from you; this is what we think ya'll are going to do; ya'll tell us what ya'll think ya'll want to do and that kind of thing. So we're somewhat in the middle of that process.

MS. DUDLEY: And what we've asked with these contracts is that if a nonprofit gets a vehicle, that they provide transportation not in competition with the local transit providers. For instance, the Center for Independent Living in Abilene is one of the recipients of one of these vehicles and with the 2010 Census, as happened in many parts of the state, the urbanized area grew, but the small urban or the large urban area provider did not take over that gap area where the old urbanized area or the city limits for that area end, and then there's still areas that used to be served by transit but aren't anymore; there are gaps all over the state. So the Center for Independent Living with their vehicle can fill that particular gap for seniors and persons with disabilities.

In some communities there are no accessible taxis. One of those communities was Bryan College Station. There were no accessible taxis. So John is working with the Center for Independent Living and they are doing some of the airport service for individuals with disabilities that need
a ride back and forth to the airport.

So -- and in the case of Center for Independent Living in Coastal Bend and Mounting Horizons Center for Independent Living, the Director Perry Hunter has just joined us, those organizations handle many, many, many federal dollars, and they -- so they have the financial capacity to handle the Federal Transit dollar.

But the smaller itty-bitty agencies --

(Phone ringing.)

Sorry.

MR. GLEASON: We've got a lot of background noise on the phone. If those folks listening in could please mute their phones, we'd appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. DUDLEY: The smaller agencies that maybe have just one nursing home or things like that, that's where we try to encourage or we are -- not try to encourage -- we encourage those agencies to work with the traditional transit -- or the 5307 or the 5311 transit provider. Major out of San Angelo, he's doing that very thing. He's taking up and working with one of those agencies because they just don't have the capacity to handle the 5310 dollars.

MR. McBETH: Yeah, we actually, you know, like in Deep East Texas and Lufkin --

MS. DUDLEY: Uh-huh?

MR. McBETH: -- in Bryan we are fortunate; we have
the Independent Living Center, well-developed infrastructure, good people. They came to us and said, Help us with this, but we know we have to take the responsibility. But in Lufkin, we are literally working with the local community to find someone --

MS. DUDLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. McBETH: -- that can do this, and it's going to take awhile to get that infrastructure in place. We have a couple of leads on what we're going to do, but in the much smaller Deep East Texas communities, this is going to be somewhat more difficult.

MS. DUDLEY: A challenge.

MR. McBETH: I think, to kind of respond to Michelle's question, I think what they were thinking when they wrote this because they put the statement in there that if you were getting a vehicle, it had to be a part of the Human Service Client Transportation Plan that the Regional Coordinating Council put together and they thought that would be -- that would be enough to make sure that they were going to continue to coordinate.

I think the people who wrote it have a misunderstanding of how that process actually works, because in certain parts of the country, that process is a well-defined process, particularly in New England, and it works like a charm. But when you get out into more of the
southern and western states, it's not that well-organized of a process.

So that's what they were hoping, and the one thing that we see that could be a problem is people -- nonprofits that we've always provided vehicles to, those vehicles came with some strings. Not as many strings as they're going to have with FTA, but they came with strings like you've got to put a minimum of a thousand miles a month on the vehicle. If you go two months without doing that, we're going to come get the vehicle, we're going to take it away from you and we're going to put miles on it. You had to do preventive maintenance. You have to provide us with those records. You have to show us that you're doing oil changes. You have to show us all of this stuff. You have to give us a copy of your insurance policy, not your insurance binder. We want to see all that stuff.

And that's my fear, is that, I think TxDOT is going to have to, at the PTC level, really set some standards for the vehicles that are going out there to make sure that we don't go back to where we were several -- well, a couple of decades ago where people did get a vehicle, Kris, and they did just set it there and it just sat there.

We went and rescued several of those vehicles and rehabbed them and utilized them for several years, but when we got them, the people who had them had them for six years
and not one of them had more than in nine thousand miles on it.

MS. DUDLEY: Right. No -- and we, you know, realize -- I mean right now we're going back to some of those vehicles from 2001, you know, and they're just sitting somewhere or, you know, limited utilization. So we're trying very diligently and collectively with our PTCs to work on projects that don't let that happen.

MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, this is Rob Stephens. I do want to make a comment.

I do understand what you're saying. What I -- there's not much that we can do about the circular being -- and come out. It wasn't timely and maybe there weren't many folks who had a chance to react, but what I do appreciate is TxDOT staff really trying to open up options and allowing us to, in areas where John and J.R. have established relationships and there is infrastructure, allowing those to develop normally through the course of business where these guys can help each other out.

I know in my area, we're a relatively young transit system and we don't have those sophisticated infrastructures and relationships really don't exist right now, but we're working, you know, to make those happen.

But I do appreciate TxDOT's approach in allowing some flexibility and options in there for the nontraditional
provider or the smaller and rural to work with some of the
new traditional providers to get services to those that need
them, the disabled and the elderly, so I do appreciate that.

MS. DUDLEY: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Rob.

That helps because I think one of my concerns -- I
mean I think it's great that in John and J.R.'s areas they
have a model in place. I guess where my concern is coming
from for those areas that don't, either how do they get to a
point where they have those partnerships and can set up a
model -- so I just want to make sure that we're spending
these dollars and maximizing the number of trips provided
statewide since we all know funding is limited, but trips
seem to be unlimited. So I appreciate the -- that comment,
because it gives me a little bit more, I guess, a warm fuzzy
that there are things already in place.

But I did like what John was saying about, you
know, the minimum miles per month or some sort of standard
so we just ensure that if these vehicles are provided, that
they're in use and they're in use consistent with what they
would have been in use with the traditional transit provider
in the area.

MS. DUDLEY: And that's, quite frankly, why we --
we adopted John's model, is because there was -- there were
some measures and standards in place, Michelle, to, you
know -- so we avoid what happened back in 2001.

MS. BLOOMER: All right.

MR. GADBOIS: So, this is Glenn.

Michelle, if you're done, I've got two questions.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: So, the first is, you know, John, I think you're absolutely right, the Coordinated Public Transportation Human Service Plans are where, you know, FTA expected the coordinated planning to occur, such that the nonprofit and transit partnerships were developed. And so my question to both, I guess, John and Kris is, is there a way to strengthen our criteria, you know, that number two criteria under district supplement that has twenty points to provide some clear guidance on how those Coordinated Public Transportation Plans can become better to actually function as intended or anticipated by the circular?

MR. McBETH: From a circular point of view, because of the way they wrote it, the circular makes it very clear upfront at the very beginning that 5311 and 5307 are not intended to be recipients of these funds and that kind of closes the door right there. The one thing that would make the Coordinated Plan probably stronger and better would be a requirement that every Coordinated Plan has to be endorsed by the local transit district or the local 5307 provider in the same manner that it has to be endorsed by
the large urban, the large UZAs.

Houston Metro is not going to give anybody any money without endorsing their plan first, I can guarantee you that, from the meetings that I've sat in. So I think that's one point that you could add. You could add one thing in there that would require that those Human Service Plans -- even though we're members of those committees, we're just one member and those committees are huge -- but if you put a statement in there that, Is this endorsed by the rural transit district or the urban transit district in this area?

That would make it -- that would strengthen it somewhat and make sure that it was coordinated, because if they weren't going to coordinate it with anybody else -- if they were going to get a vehicle and they were going to limit it to their people, then I would -- I would never -- I would never put my signature on it. Because we're all about not enough resources and what resources you have, you've got to use them up.

Glenn, I think that's, that's the one thing that we can add to the application, and I don't know -- I read the circular -- I don't know if that's within the -- I don't know if you can put that in the -- I don't know if the circular would allow you to put it in there. It's something that the people here at TxDOT, you got people who read these
things for a living who could probably tell us that and tell us what the language would need to say if we wanted to do that. And I think that would only add strength to it and it would require -- it would bring about -- keep the, keep the coordination going.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thanks.

MR. McBeth: You bet.

MR. GADBOIS: Kris, anything else?

MS. DUDLEY: No. Glenn, I don't feel -- since I've been working primarily with the 5310 piece and peripherally only with the planning, I don't feel that I am qualified to answer, actually.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. If you will think about that and talk to, you know, others at TxDOT about John's suggestion, because that sounds like it could be helpful.

So here's my second question, as I understand the process as described, Kris, each district is going to consider only their piece of an application. And I kind of understand that, that for the user or stakeholder side it's, What's in it for me? For the District it's, you know, This is the money I have that I need to allocate.

There are, however, in examples like J.R.'s, potential for economy of scale that may be factors that should be considered in an application beyond that money allocated for -- be requested and allocated for a district.
If that's so, is there a way to include that in the district's consideration in the scoring?

MS. DUDLEY: Glenn, so -- to kind of rephrase -- this is Kris, I'm sorry -- to rephrase what you're saying is that, in essence -- and we'll use J.R. -- bless you -- as the example because he has to apply to four districts; I think John has to do the same -- that because of the model of J.R.'s program, which you refer to as "economy of scale," that there maybe should -- and I don't use this term loosely -- but maybe J.R.'s application should be given a priority in those districts?

MR. GADBOIS: No. Well, not necessarily a priority.

Let me use a specific example and I'll switch to John because John mentioned this specific example. Where John actually provides resources to help with both the application and in the administration of these grants; that is -- that should be match at a minimum, right? And if it's match in the resource that crosses over every one of the applications that may cross over districts and -- in which case that's an economy of scale. And what I want to make sure of is that in our application, any abilities-type factors can be considered by the district -- not necessarily that it gives them priority, but that they can consider that.
MR. GLEASON: Glenn, this is Eric.

I think there's room in the process for that and we clearly take the responsibility to make sure that those conversations happen if they need to. I think, you know, fundamentally what we're looking for from the stakeholder groups is a recommendation, and so as those recommendations come forward to us, we become more and more aware of where there may be economies of scale and where there may be issues among districts which have, you know, where an agency may have several applications in several districts.

So it's a -- you know, the conversation at the district level is not intended to be the final conversation; it's a communication issue for us as we work through the proposals. And then as we consider the recommendation, it's another opportunity for us to revise the results based on those kinds of things. And so, you know, it's not a perfect process from that standpoint, but I think we are obligated at the division level to ensure that these kinds of opportunities are caught and accounted for, and I think there's room in the process to do that.

MS. DUDLEY: And, Glenn, to --

MR. GLEASON: Does that get at your question?

MR. GADBOIS: It does. It's less formal --

MR. GLEASON: Yes, it is.

MR. GADBOIS: -- and I would like that I, that I
get it.

    MR. GLEASON: Okay. Well, we can work on making
it more formal. I think part of this, too -- some of the
conversation we had back in 2013 was recognizing that the
program was changing and that it may be -- you know, the
third year into it might be a great time to kind of take a
breath and see where we're at and see if we have to make a
major course adjustment. And I think that will all add up
to the conversation at the time.

    MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

    MS. DUDLEY: But one thing I did want to add to
Eric's explanation is, Glenn, this year, which is totally
different from anything that we have done before, we are
providing three different sessions for the PTCs to bring
their stakeholders for training. Because we're aiming as --
for consistency statewide. So, you know, what you've
mentioned could be part of the conversation we have with the
local stakeholders when we do those training sessions.

    MR. GADBOIS: Super. Thanks.

    MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions from the
Committee?

    (No audible response.)

    Okay. Hearing none, we will move on to Item 6:
Discussion of dollar amounts needed for fleet replacement
and expansion.
MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. I'm going to start the conversation. This item is on the agenda as an outgrowth of some conversation from the last meeting. It may have been in the context of a discussion on the Department's legislative appropriations request.

What we have assembled for you in your packet is information from a number of different places to kind of get at this overall question of need. And so I'm looking at the pages associated with Agenda Item 6, fleet replacement needs. The first page in your handout is a snapshot of the current fleet and where it falls from a depreciation standpoint giving the Committee members sort of an ability to develop a sense of overall condition to the range of depreciation values. So what we've got here for you is a depreciation rate of seventy-five percent, a hundred percent or a hundred and fifty percent based on mileage, and the percentages are based on industry standards for vehicle types.

And we divided the fleet into the fleets associated with urban areas, exclusive of the metropolitan areas, exclusive of those areas, but urban areas and rural areas of the state. And so as you make your way down, you know, if you look at, you know, in the best of all worlds with available funding and a consistent source of available funding, you would probably try to manage your program at
the point where when a vehicle passed seventy-five percent
of its useful life, you would begin looking to procure a
replacement vehicle for that so by the time you got that
replacement vehicle on your property and ready to roll, you
might be at a hundred percent. But, you know, if you had
enough money and enough stability in a program to just
strategically put yourself in a position where, you know,
you are routinely taking care of any member of the fleet,
which is over seventy-five percent. And you can look across
and you can see if you -- you know, a snapshot of the fleet
that is approaching 3,000 vehicles, you can see where we
fall today with respect to that. You know, we're dealing
with over half of the members in both the urban fleet and
the rural fleet being over seventy-five percent of the
mileage.

The flipside of that, if you go to the bottom of
the table and you take a snapshot of those vehicles which
are in excess of a hundred and fifty percent of their useful
mileage, you can see the numbers of vehicles and the
replacement value associated with those. And what we know
about that hundred and fifty percent threshold is that it's
a threshold which is routinely met in the industry. If you
are an agency with best-practice maintenance practices in
place in the workplace, if you are an agency that, you know,
routinely takes care of your fleet and replaces it, then
it's -- a hundred fifty percent is not a -- it's not an excessive standard to use; it's something that can be achieved. And, certainly, in the funding environment in red, it's something that gets us to numbers that are more realistic in terms of the amount of money we might be able to bring to the problem.

So that's a snapshot of the current fleet. The next page you have in your packet is information from the Department's long-range plan, which is on target to be considered by the Commission at their February meeting this year. And this is an excerpt from that on summarizing work done to try to identify long-range transit capital needs in the 2015 to 2040 time frame.

You know, over three-quarters of the amount is associated with the preservation of the current investment. We have identified a fairly significant amount associated with service expansion, and then a relatively smaller chunk, but not insignificant in terms of our availability to fund some major new projects. And this is what people have on the books. This is what we have in our State Transportation Improvement Plan. This is what the known at this time.

And, you know, this is always sort of a work-in-progress, these kinds of numbers around transit. We, as a State, don't, don't pay the amount of attention to this kind of a question that we do on the highway side, but
I think in general, each time we do this, this number gets better. So that gives you a -- so you have a current snapshot. This gives you a sense of an estimate of what we would need to bring to the issue over the long term.

And then the next three pages of your packet are actually a description of --

MR. GADBOIS: Eric?
MR. GLEASON: Yes.
MR. GADBOIS: Eric?
MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir?
MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn.
MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir?
MR. GADBOIS: Hang on one second. I want to make sure I understand the number.
MR. GLEASON: Okay.
MR. GADBOIS: On preservation you have 3,110 and that's millions, so that number is $3,110,000,000?
MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
MR. GADBOIS: Okay.
MR. GLEASON: Over the time frame of the plan.
MR. GADBOIS: Okay.
MR. GLEASON: The next three pages are a description of a program which is -- the funding for which is included in the Department's legislative appropriations request.
And, actually, if I could ask the Committee members to actually turn to the last page, and I'm looking at a graph that's titled "Projected Investment Impacts," and if you could ignore for the moment, the red line on that graph and just focus on the blue and the green. What the blue and the green communicate are, you know, if we did nothing about this, it shows you over the next three years where we would stand with respect to the numbers of members of the fleet that would be in excess of a hundred fifty percent based on mileage. And then the green line shows you the current capacity that we have with the Federal 5339 problem to address that.

And, you know, one of the major things -- and this is a federal priority for the Department and I know it is for the industry -- is in a reauthorization of federal -- federal authorization that we need to do something about the levels of funding and the allocations of funding and the formula versus discretionary elements of bus and bus facilities capital funds. So that green line shows you that we have a very limited ability, financially, to address this issue.

The red line that is labeled "State Program" shows you an estimate of what we believe we can accomplish with the amount of funds that are included in the LAR for the Department plus the assumption that the industry will use
other federal formula or local funds as match for those State funds that are in the LAR. This shows you what we think we can do in terms of addressing the -- this issue.

The other pages you have are actually a description of the program specifically and our thoughts on how it comes together and how we intend to implement it, but I think I'll stop at this point and see if -- and I think, Glenn, you were the one at the last meeting that were asking about this, so let's see what kind of questions are out there.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions for the Committee?

(No audible response.)

Glenn, I know this was an item you had requested. Do you have any questions for Eric?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, some observations before questions.

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: But I'm happy to let the people in the room comment first if ya'll got any, and then I'll jump in with a few observations.

None? Okay.

So, Eric, first, thank you very much for doing this. I'm sure it was a lot of work, but I find it both helpful and somewhat hopeful. With your last chart it
sounds like the steps that have been taken in, you know, the current appropriations and the commitment from TxDOT actually fill a gap that would have been critical otherwise. You know, and so looking from the green line through the red line, that's a huge gap that the State -- that TxDOT is now asking the State to step up and fill, and I find it hopeful that you're asking for that.

Now, we -- now, I guess the question is what we'll actually get in appropriations? And so the other -- I mean the only other question is, has this presentation been done to the industry and/or is the industry going to -- willing to step up and help TxDOT to actually make the appropriations happen?

MR. GLEASON: The answers to your questions, Glenn, are yes. And just to be clear, that where this appears in our appropriation, this is included as a part of our baseline request, so it is not identified as an exceptional item; it's in our baseline request.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And what we're actually doing is flexing highway funding over to transit for these purposes.

MR. GADBOIS: Right. And that's exceptional and, you know, congratulations to TxDOT for doing that.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you, I appreciate that.

MR. GADBOIS: But you still have to get your
budget through the legislative process?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. McBETH: But the fact is --

MR. GADBOIS: And legislators need to understand how critical this is.

MR. McBETH: The fact that it's in the base budget bodes very, very well for it because it's in the base budget. And going through appropriations, that's now Representative Otto's Committee and he's always been a very strong proponent of, at least rural transit, because of his -- he represents Liberty County and Brazos does a lot of rural transit in Liberty County, so I think that because TxDOT has asked for this in their base budget, I don't think anyone is really going to question it. I don't -- I don't see it happening, but there's always the possibility because it is coming from STP funds and it's being flexed, there could always be the somebody saying, Well, that seems to me like a diversion, but I don't think that it's going to happen. It's a small amount of money.

MR. GLEASON: So one of the things, if I can, that is unique about this effort is that it's going to be very deliberate and strategic in terms of the fleet that gets replaced. So, you know, in the past when we have done fleet replacement, we have many times, we have simply tried to make sure that everybody gets something, recognizing that
everyone has needs.

In this instance, we are going to take a draw up the line from the worst member of the fleet or the highest-mileage member of the fleet and we're going to draw up the line until we reach the amount of money that we have available and we're going to start picking those off one at a time as we can.

Now, having said that, those agencies that have fleet that are included in that draw-up-the-line exercise, the idea here is that working with the industry, we're going to establish some thresholds, if you will, or some criteria that will help us be sure that when we give these scarce funds to these agencies, that they have in place in their program best-practice maintenance efforts; that they're in compliance with our vehicle maintenance requirements; that there is a relatively high rate of fleet utilization in the organization; and that they are -- they have in their capital programs and their boards have adopted budgets that allow them to set aside funds for fleet replacement for these purposes.

So this is a significant change, if you will, in how we as a Department are approaching this opportunity and we are taking deliberate steps or anticipate taking deliberate steps to strategically award these funds to those agencies that we can be sure are going to make the best use
of this and also take the best care of the fleet that they get. That's a big deal.

MR. GADBOIS: I like it. Great.

MR. GLEASON: Well, getting there -- it's sounds -- it's far easier for me to say than to get there. We are intending -- it's our intent to -- assuming this is approved, we want to be able to move quickly following its approval and to be in a position in late August or September -- probably September -- to have a Commission award. And then to have project grant agreements signed and executed and procurement efforts underway by November. I think it's incumbent on us with this first shot out of the barrel to do it well and to be able to demonstrate performance before the end of this next biennium so that we can make the case for continued funding that will put us on a sustainable platform, which whether it's enough money or not, if it's a sustainable platform that we can count on, then we can really begin to do some good fleet planning work and keep those depreciation levels down on a predictable basis.

MR. GADBOIS: And I'm sure you're already doing this, but to the extent you let the transit agencies know as early as possible what the criteria will be, what they need to have in place?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.
MR. GADBOIS: That will give them more time to do it if they don't already have it.

MR. GLEASON: We talked about it yesterday at the Semi-Annual Meeting and in the next thirty days or so, I intend to solicit interest on the part of the industry to help us develop what those criteria that they will be held accountable to are. It would be my intention to say, These are the areas we'd like to develop something, you know, compliance, fleet utilization and so forth, and then to work with the industry to develop the specific criteria in each of those areas so that they know and are a part of deciding how to move this program forward.

MR. GADBOIS: Great. Thanks much.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

Are there any other questions on Item 6 from the Committee or comments?

(No audible response.)

I just want to say thank you, Eric, for pulling that information together. I would agree with Glenn, the red line is, I think, much -- is a much better picture of where I think a lot of us thought we were or where we were going to be at our last meeting, so I appreciate that.

We'll go ahead and move on to Item 7: Discussion of Committee --
MR. McBETH: Is this an action item?

MS. BLOOMER: Let me stop for a second.

MR. McBETH: Well --

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah, I wanted to go back to 6. It says action, but was that just to allow us to take action or was there some specific action that staff was looking for?

MR. GLEASON: It's to allow you to take action. We are not looking for action from the Committee at all.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then going on to Item 7: Discussion of Committee priorities in the areas of effort. I don't have anything specific on this topic.

Are there any other members that have an item that they'd like to discuss and/or recommend for the next agenda?

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric.

If I can, before we get into this conversation, just a quick ground rule for Committee members. I think because the agenda item is not specific to a topic, what we -- what we can do with this item is we can, we can -- Committee members can introduce ideas for topics they would like to consider. We can have questions asked of that person to clarify exactly what the intent of that topic would be.

What we need to safeguard against would be any kind of a conversation that might begin to look like the Committee was talking about the merits of that topic or some
of the, you know, and beginning to sound as though they are reaching some conclusions about it.

Does that make sense?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. Thank you.

With that sort of guidance provided, one of my, I guess issues for sort of opening it up is I know we have our work plan. It's been a few years or months since we've worked on that. One of the items was regional coordination, which I think we've addressed over the last six to eight months. We might with our new member, John, want to re-look at that at our next meeting and see if there's anything we want to change or fine-tune, if we still have the work plan.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. So, I'm sorry --

MS. BLOOMER: So I'll open with that.

MR. GLEASON: I'm sorry, Michelle.

Are you asking for us to bring the work plan back in total or just asking about if there was anything on regional coordination topic that John recognizes -- recognizing his new participation wanted to re-visit?

MS. BLOOMER: I think we might -- no, not the second -- the first item that we may want to bring the work plan back --

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: -- more formally. I believe we have items that have been on the agenda that's usually on most of
the agendas to talk about the work plan, but we haven't had a substantial discussion on the work plan --

    MR. GLEASON: Okay.

    MS. BLOOMER: -- in quite, in quite some time. So I think that would be helpful to bring John up to speed on that.

    MR. GLEASON: Okay.

    MS. BLOOMER: And then also open it up, if there's any tweaks you need to make to the work plan at that point.

    MR. GLEASON: Okay.

    MR. McBETH: This is John.

    I had a couple of issues. The first one is I don't think the PTAC has ever looked at this, this particular issue, but it's an issue that has the capacity to really change the way transit is conducted in specific areas. And this is the issue of when cities go over 200,000 population, which we just had occur to us when the Woodlands and Conroe were fused by the census and went over 200,000 population. Those cities historically have been eligible to continue to draw from the State funds that they got when they were under 200,000 population, as long as they do it through the established transit district that was serving them.

    I think that we have the brewing of a perfect storm if we don't have at least TxDOT study that issue. And
I'm not saying they haven't -- it's very possible that Eric has people already looking at it -- but right now, you know, at one time we only had one city that was in that position, and that was Laredo. Now, we have several, Lubbock, the Woodlands -- I can't name them all, but there are several that went over 200,000 that are drawing from that pot -- while at the same time we are adding -- we have people going -- cities going from rural into the new -- into becoming new small urbans.

And I any if you look at the Metroplex and the enclave cities, this could, in the next -- with the next census, this could really impact the amount of State funds that were going to be available to the small urban pot if the 200,000 and above continue to draw from that, unless the Legislature establishes another fund for that category of cities, say 200,000 to 500,000.

And I'm not trying to pick a fight with anybody, I'm just saying I think that is an issue that's on the horizon and I think we really -- and I don't know if Eric has the resources to study it -- but it's something that we really need to study and we need to get a handle on as to what's going to happen, because I know Bryan College Station is going to go over 200,000 in the next census. It's probably already over 200,000. So we would just be another city that's reaching in there and taking that money, so ...
MR. GADBOIS: And, John -- Eric, correct me if I'm wrong -- but you deployed TTI, you know, after the last census to do some analysis of that. It's old now, okay. And I think John is probably right; it's worth getting a jump on it early if we're able to get, you know, data and projections.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, what we did with the last census, we actually commissioned TTI to do the work prior to the census. It was back in 2009, I think when they did the work. The census was done, of course, in 2010, but the urbanized area decision didn't come for another two years after that, and that's really one -- that's really the one that triggers, then, for the next fiscal year funding, that triggers all the changes.

So my thoughts on this would be, you know, if the Committee were to flush out a scope of work, if you will -- for lack of a better word -- to address this issue or identify the major areas within this issue that it was interested in, we could look at engaging TTI in beginning to get some work done on those things.

MR. McBETH: We can put that in the work plan, if we bring the work plan --

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. McBETH: -- back and revise the work plan and put that in there.
MR. GLEASON: That -- that's correct.

MR. McBETH: That's the direction I wanted to go.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, but what I would like is a fairly -- at the time -- and I'm just clarifying this just so see where we're going -- I think it could be helpful to have a fairly -- just a brainstorm conversation at the Committee level, if you will --

MR. McBETH: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- to identify all the possible different nuances there are to this general issue of growth and how well we are positioned to deal with that.

MR. McBETH: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. McBETH: That was -- that was one issue.

The other issue is -- I'm just throwing this out there -- we have a new governor. We have a new lieutenant governor. Each of those offices currently have one position available on this Committee and it's the position of a transit user, and I don't know what the protocol has been in the past but I would just like to see someone contact them and tell them, you know, while you're appointing people, there is this Committee over there and you do have opening and it's for someone who uses transit and we do whatever we need to do to help them in getting them those other two members.
I think having users on this Committee is probably more important than having anybody else on the Committee because this Committee is supposed to be advising the Department as to the direction that public transportation is supposed to be going and the user should really have the best idea of that. And I'm just throwing that out there. I don't know what the protocol is.

MR. GLEASON: Background information --

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, did you have a comment?

MR. GLEASON: Well, yes.

Background information, we have communicated with each of the appointing offices under the previous Administration on the vacancy issue. We will talk with our legislative affairs folks on when they think an appropriate time would be to re-raise this issue with the new Administration.

The speaker, of course, is the same, so we're -- and the speaker, I think --

MR. McBETH: His are all full.

MR. GLEASON: -- all the speaker appointments are full.

So with the new governor and the new lieutenant governor I'm not sure what the right time will be, but we will have a conversation with our State legislative affairs folks certainly before your next meeting and update you on
that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other thoughts, ideas, suggestions from the members in Austin and/or Glenn?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Hearing none -- did we only have the one public comment, Eric?

MR. GLEASON: Judy has -- Judy Telge from Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living is also signed up to speak under this item, and Judy --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: I guess -- did Judy have to leave?

Okay. So Judy is not in the crowd any longer, so ...

MS. BANTA: Her stuff is here.

MR. GLEASON: Her stuff is here?

Maybe we can check the lobby. Hard to miss the orange-red hair.

We have found her.

You're up.

MS. TELGE: I am?

MR. GLEASON: Yeah. We're in public comment.

You signed up to comment on Number 8.

MS. TELGE: I did. And I knew ya'll weren't going to do what --

MR. GLEASON: Same comment. So you covered it in
the previous one?

MS. TELGE: I did except for a couple of things I forgot.

MR. GLEASON: Well, then, come on up.

Identify yourself for the record, again, please.

MS. TELGE: Yes, sir.

For the record, Judy Telge from Corpus Christi, Texas, with the Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living, and thank you for the second opportunity to address the Committee and officials.

The two things that I did forget to say when I spoke earlier about the successes that we have done in the Corpus Christi/Coastal Bend area with 5310 money, two things. One is that -- and we found this early on because we had a consultant, a national consultant come in to tell us in doing mobility management, you don't have to own the vehicle to provide the service, and we took that to heart.

We do not want to buy a vehicle with 5310 money, and other centers for independent living also do not want to purchase yet another vehicle to be on the road; that's what you guys do. Transit providers have those vehicles.

What we want to do is make sure that those gaps are filled and those gaps are filled with purchase of service and/or vouchers, which were available through JARC. So that's, I think, a significant thing, especially after
hearing the conversation that ya'll had with 5310, okay.

Thank you and that's it. Thank you.

MR. GLEASON: That concludes public comment, Michelle.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Is she there?

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, are you on mute?

MS. BLOOMER: Sorry. Sorry, I put myself on mute, gosh darn it.

I'm like, Josh, hello? Josh?

Do we have a date for our next PTAC meeting?

MR. GLEASON: It's coming up, Michelle.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Currently, we are scheduled for the last Tuesday in March. I don't have a calendar in front of me.

MR. GLEASON: The last Tuesday in March, Michelle, is the current schedule.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: The 31st.

MR. RIBAKOVE: The 31st.

MS. BLOOMER: The last day in March -- oh, the 31st, okay. So March 31st.

And we don't have anything that should conflict with that as of now, either conferences, Semi-Annual, so -- and we usually have it in the afternoon, correct, at 1:00 or 1:30?
MR. RIBAKOVE: 1:30 in the afternoon up at Camp Hubbard, up on Jackson Avenue in Austin, yeah.

MR. GLEASON: And just to --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So, Members, next meeting, Tuesday, March 31st, at 1:30 in Austin.

MR. GLEASON: And, Michelle, if I could, just a general plea to Committee members to let us know as soon as you know whether you can attend or not or whether you will be on the phone. The biggest issue for us is determining whether we will have a quorum or not. So as soon as you know your schedule with respect to that meeting and where you'll be, please let us know -- please let Josh know.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you.

Hearing no other comments or questions, I make a motion or do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. McBETH: So moved.

MR. SALAZAR: Second.

MS. BLOOMER: I have a second.

All in favor?

(Chorus of "Ayes")

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you.

Everybody have a great day.

MR. GLEASON: Thanks, Michelle.

MR. GADBOIS: Thanks.

(Proceedings concluded at 10:22 a.m.)
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