

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Room 323  
Building 6  
3712 Jackson Avenue  
Austin, Texas

Wednesday,  
January 23, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN AUSTIN:

Michelle Bloomer, Chair  
J.R. Salazar, Vice Chair  
Glenn Gadbois  
Brad Underwood

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE:

Rob Stephens

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Dr. Al Abeson  
Christina Melton Crain

STAFF:

Eric Gleason, PTN Director  
Bobby Killebrew, PTN Deputy Director  
Kelly Kirkland, PTN

*ON THE RECORD REPORTING*  
*(512) 450-0342*

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call to Order	3
2. In accordance with 43 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) '1.82, Election of Officers	3
3. Approval of Minutes from November 8, 2012 meeting	7
4. Division Director's report to the committee regarding public transportation matters	8
5. Discussion and comment of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission's Medical Transportation Program	20
6. Discussion and comment on potential rulemaking necessary to implement MAP-21 changes	32
7. Review and discussion of PTAC Work Plan and update of current activities related to work plan elements, consistent with committee duties as described in 43 Texas Administrative Code '1.84(b)(3)	87
8. Public comment	none
9. Confirm date of next meeting	90
10. Adjourn	91

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MS. BLOOMER: It's one o'clock and I call the  
3 meeting to order.

4 Moving on to item 2, in accordance with the  
5 Administrative Code, election of officers, and I'm going  
6 to turn this over to Bobby Killebrew.

7 MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you, Michelle.

8 For the record, I'm Bobby Killebrew, deputy  
9 director of TxDOT's Public Transportation Division.

10 And in regards to item number 2, in the  
11 Administrative Code there's a set of rules that governs  
12 this committee and how it's supposed to conduct business  
13 and so forth, and one of those is election of officers,  
14 and in the Administrative Code, regarding election of  
15 officers for this committee is every two years the  
16 committee should go through a process to elect a chair and  
17 vice chair. And for the purposes of this committee, the  
18 chair and vice chair can serve an unlimited number of  
19 terms, so both the current chair and vice chair can stand  
20 for reelection.

21 And as Michelle has asked me to take this item  
22 on the agenda, I'll pause for a minute because we have  
23 another member joining the group.

24 MR. GADBOIS: You don't have to pause.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: We're on item number 2 which is

1 election of officers. I'll conduct item number 2 then.  
2 So the floor is open for nominations for the position of  
3 chair of the Public Transportation Advisory Committee.  
4 Are there any nominations?

5 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Before we do, can  
6 I ask a question. It says one or two years. Did we  
7 appoint for one or two years?

8 MR. KILLEBREW: The term is to serve a minimum  
9 of one year, but it's every two years that we go through  
10 the process of the elections of chair and vice chair.

11 MR. GADBOIS: So we elected our chair and vice  
12 chair two years ago.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: At least two years ago. It's  
14 actually a little bit longer.

15 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Just checking.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: See if we could have an easy  
17 ride on an extra year.

18 MR. KILLEBREW: We've stretched it a little bit  
19 long.

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: Bobby, I believe that Michelle  
21 has done a great job and I would nominate her to continue  
22 serving in that role.

23 MR. SALAZAR: And this is J.R. I'd second  
24 that.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: I have Michelle as nominated

1 for the position of chair. Any further nominations?

2 MR. GADBOIS: Just a question to the rest of  
3 you. Does anybody else want to be chair?

4 (General talking and laughter.)

5 MR. STEPHENS: Is Michelle okay with being  
6 chair?

7 MR. GADBOIS: You're not supposed to ask that  
8 question.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Rob. Yes. This is  
10 Michelle. I'm willing to continue to serve as chair if  
11 that is the desire of the committee.

12 MR. STEPHENS: Awesome, awesome. Okay.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: Hearing no other nominations  
14 then I'll close the floor for nominations and take the  
15 vote of the committee and I'll take a roll call vote for  
16 Michelle as chair of the Public Transportation Advisory  
17 Committee.

18 Michelle?

19 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

20 MR. KILLEBREW: J.R.?

21 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

22 MR. KILLEBREW: Brad?

23 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

24 MR. KILLEBREW: Glenn?

25 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

1 MR. KILLEBREW: And Rob?

2 MR. STEPHENS: Aye.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: Congratulations, Michelle, you  
4 continue as PTAC's chair

5 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you all very much. So does  
6 that mean I get to take the second part?

7 MR. KILLEBREW: I can do the second part as  
8 well, if you like.

9 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Keep going, you're on  
10 a roll.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: To continue on, we also need to  
12 look at the position of vice chair, and so the floor is  
13 now open for nominations for the position of vice chair of  
14 the Public Transportation Advisory Committee.

15 MR. GADBOIS: And that was J.R. Correct? I  
16 nominate J.R. if he's so willing.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: I don't think Michelle could do  
18 it without J.R., so I'll second that motion.

19 MR. KILLEBREW: I have a nomination of J.R. Is  
20 there any further nominations?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: Move nominations cease.

23 MR. KILLEBREW: And J.R., I assume that you are  
24 accepting that nomination as well?

25 MR. SALAZAR: Sure. I'll let Michelle do all

1 the work.

2 (General talking and laughter.)

3 MR. KILLEBREW: Then I'll close the nomination  
4 process and we'll go to the vote for J.R. as vice chair of  
5 the Public Transportation Advisory Committee. How do you  
6 vote, Michelle?

7 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: And J.R.?

9 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Brad?

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

12 MR. KILLEBREW: Glenn?

13 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

14 MR. KILLEBREW: And Rob?

15 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: Okay. Congratulations, J.R.,  
17 as vice chair of the Public Transportation Advisory  
18 Committee.

19 And with that, Michelle, I'll hand it back over  
20 to you.

21 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you, Bobby.

22 So moving on to item 3 on the agenda, approval  
23 of the minutes from the November 8, 2012 meeting. Are  
24 there any comments or questions regarding the meeting  
25 minutes?

1 (No response.)

2 MS. BLOOMER: If not, I will hear a motion.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: So moved.

4 MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion. A second?

5 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I'll second that.

6 MS. BLOOMER: We have a motion and a second.

7 I'll call the vote. Glenn, we're going to start with you.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Brad?

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

11 MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

12 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye.

14 And Rob?

15 MR. STEPHENS: Aye.

16 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Minutes pass.

17 Moving on to item 4 on the agenda, the division  
18 director's report. Eric.

19 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric Gleason, director of  
20 the Public Transportation Division.

21 I'm not going to go through this report in  
22 detail, I think you all have had a chance to look at it,  
23 but I would like to highlight one item on there about  
24 midway down: Upcoming commission meeting topics at the  
25 February meeting.

1           Our Finance Division thinks that the current  
2 language in the TDC rules is not clear enough with respect  
3 to the 15 million development credits that at the start of  
4 each fiscal year Public Transportation has 15 million, and  
5 their read on it was that we got 15 million each year  
6 whether we spent them or not, and the intent was that it  
7 just replenished to 15- depending on how much was spent in  
8 the previous year. So not a substantive change to the  
9 rules but they are moving ahead with those proposed  
10 changes at the February meeting. We've not seen them yet  
11 either. So this is something that they felt they needed  
12 to do to clarify at some point a confusion on their part.

13           MS. BLOOMER: Did we offer that if they were  
14 willing to maintain the 15 million a year, we were more  
15 than open to accepting?

16           MR. GLEASON: Well, I wasn't the only one who  
17 remembered that, James Bass remembered, everyone  
18 remembered the way it should be, it's just that these are  
19 folks in Finance who weren't part of the process but they  
20 are responsible for tracking and documenting use of TDCs.  
21 The good news is it's being institutionalized.

22           MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

23           MR. GADBOIS: Discussion? Can we ask  
24 questions?

25           MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

1 MR. GLEASON: Yes, you may.

2 MR. GADBOIS: So hopefully just quickly, Eric,  
3 15 million set aside for transit, is that a ceiling, 15  
4 million? We could spend more than 15 million but we have  
5 at least 15 million set aside for transit.

6 MR. GLEASON: It's a floor each year, it's a  
7 floor that's established each fiscal year, 15 million  
8 development credits. It is for the purposes of the  
9 programs that the department administers. Within areas  
10 that also generate the TDCs, such as DFW and Houston, if  
11 there are rural programs within that area, then they go  
12 there first. But it gets replenished each year to 15  
13 million.

14 MR. GADBOIS: And then how have we been -- we  
15 the transit world in general -- how have we been in terms  
16 of use of the 15 million?

17 MR. GLEASON: It's about three times the annual  
18 average for the last five years. Now, having said that,  
19 some of the major metropolitan systems who are not  
20 generating toll revenues, like San Antonio, if they wanted  
21 to use TDCs for fleet procurement, so this is a floor, so  
22 we have an opportunity, assuming we anticipate the need,  
23 in any given year of requesting or getting approval for  
24 more.

25 MR. GADBOIS: And again, so my last and final

1 question along these lines, do we do anything to make sure  
2 that transit agencies understand how helpful these  
3 development credits could be to build or beef up our  
4 requests for TDCs?

5 MR. GLEASON: Do we do anything? The recent  
6 history is that we've used them for capital investments.

7 MR. GADBOIS: No. I'm looking at do we do  
8 anything to build market share. Do we build demand for  
9 TDCs, do we do anything to build demand?

10 MR. GLEASON: No, I wouldn't say we go out and  
11 beat the bushes to create demand for them. Everyone is  
12 aware of them.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Whether they understand what they  
14 are or how they can use them or not.

15 MR. GLEASON: Well, to the extent that they  
16 understand that they can be a replacement for local match,  
17 yes.

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: And you talked about them at  
19 the last two, if not three, semiannual meetings. Is that  
20 correct? You've talked about the uses and what we've done  
21 with them.

22 MR. GLEASON: When the rules were being  
23 revised, we probably talked about them at two successive  
24 semiannual meetings.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: So that kind of raised

1 awareness of them again, I believe.

2 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm just wondering whether we  
3 really don't have as much need for them as I think we  
4 should because they're limited in their benefit but  
5 they're incredibly handy if you can figure out a way to  
6 use them. I'm wondering whether people just aren't  
7 figuring out a way to use them, or whether we really don't  
8 have that much demand.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Well, Glenn, I think part of  
10 issue or discussion that came up when we were going  
11 through the rulemaking process was that as far as the  
12 transit industry is concerned, most folks are very aware  
13 of TDCs and how to use them, versus maybe a little less on  
14 the highway side, because we have been using them  
15 consistently on an annual basis, anywhere from an average  
16 of 3- to 4-, all the way up to 8 million in a given year,  
17 and that's why we settled on the 15-. But I do think part  
18 of that might be what they've been eligible for in the  
19 past, capital only, whereas, going forward the discussion  
20 is now that we have 15 million are there more strategic  
21 ways we can utilize that to leverage available federal  
22 funds and other funds to provide more service. And so I  
23 think that's where the conversation may need to go  
24 forward.

25 My other question is if every year we have a 15

1 million sort of starting spot and then we spend down, we  
2 spend 10-, then we get 10-, not 15-, so we're back up at  
3 15-, is do we want to actively pursue spending that 15- on  
4 a consistent basis.

5 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I remember that  
6 discussion in terms of rulemaking. Kind of my ad hoc  
7 remembrance of when these items come before commission is  
8 that there are relatively few people that are consistently  
9 asking for and using TDCs, and everybody isn't for some  
10 reason, just don't know what that is.

11 MR. GLEASON: Well, there's a couple of things,  
12 Glenn. The last four or five years the department has  
13 been reasonably successful in competing for federal  
14 discretionary funds, and in that case it's most every  
15 rural transit district also working with TDCs to help draw  
16 down those funds.

17 In the 5310 program it's used fairly  
18 extensively for vehicle procurement purposes. We haven't  
19 done this for a while, but back in 2007 and '08 we used  
20 the portion of the rural program that the commission could  
21 make a discretionary decision on, we used that to also  
22 finance the match for fleet. So we've used it very  
23 diligently and very strategically over the years, and most  
24 everyone, if not everyone, has used them at some point.

25 What you see in the commission environment

1 mostly outside of the one or two times a year we might go  
2 for 5310 or the coordinated call, you see where we've  
3 gotten an isolated request from someone and we have to go  
4 to the commission to get it awarded.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

6 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Just maybe a  
7 question back up to November. So in November we took  
8 requests for TDCs for three agencies, and like you  
9 mentioned, this was separate from the 5310 federal process  
10 and the 5311.

11 MR. GLEASON: Yes. They had some federal  
12 discretionary funding that they did not have local match  
13 for and so they requested TDCs. And the way it works,  
14 technically, is they have to request it of the commission  
15 and have commission approval before their grant will be  
16 approved by FTA for use. They can't come in after the  
17 fact and change that program.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Once your FTA grant is in, it's  
19 in, you can't go back and add TDCs.

20 MR. GLEASON: Correct.

21 MS. BLOOMER: So there's really two ways TDCs  
22 can be awarded, sort of through the official programming  
23 of a program's annual funding, and then sort of on an ad  
24 hoc basis you receive requests as well. That's sort of  
25 been at a much smaller level of how to do that with the 15

1 million. Will it be the same?

2 MR. GLEASON: Well, the 15 million could  
3 finance \$75 million worth of federal money for capital.  
4 That is an enormous amount of capital. It probably is  
5 pretty close to what we need each year between the rural  
6 and the small urban programs to do fleet replacement and  
7 maintain facilities, so that number is a good number if  
8 the federal funds were available for it.

9 And I don't know what's out there now under  
10 MAP-21 that on a discretionary basis would be available  
11 that we can compete for, using TDCs as match, because  
12 there's not a lot of discretionary money associated with  
13 that.

14 MS. BLOOMER: So does that assume that we're  
15 still restricting the use of TDCs to capital only now that  
16 we have less federal money to draw down?

17 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think we would want to  
18 have a conversation about their use for operating and if  
19 we wanted to try and draw some boundaries around the kinds  
20 of situations where it would be useful. For example, do  
21 we want to get into ongoing operating commitments with  
22 development credits. You know, the 15 million won't go  
23 very far once we start to do that. There may be  
24 situations, though, where for a one-time situation, kind  
25 of a one and done thing where for this year someone had

1 some unanticipated event and they need to plug a hole.  
2 And so that can be an operating application as well.

3 But I think before we get into this in any sort  
4 of strategic and deliberative way, we need to kind of talk  
5 through what kind of boundaries we might want to set  
6 around that stuff.

7 MS. BLOOMER: And would that be something we  
8 would do through the PTAC work plan activities? I think  
9 to get to Glenn's point of can we be a little bit more  
10 strategic, can we better leverage the TDCs.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: I don't disagree, I just think  
12 that we've got some big things on the horizon right now,  
13 and to me, now that we've got the rules kind of shaped in  
14 the TAC the way we want them, I think I like giving more  
15 discretion to PTN to identify those types of situations  
16 and issues. I would like to see us use more TDCs,  
17 obviously, I'm in agreement with that, but I don't know  
18 that we need to put together a whole program, a flow chart  
19 of if this happens you can do this and not do that, and I  
20 like more of the ability. Because I think as few times as  
21 we meet a year, to really set up a program that speaks to  
22 how they're conducting their day-to-day business isn't  
23 productive for us or them, much more the way that we know  
24 best how to run our business and they kind of know best  
25 how to run theirs, and I think we've got it shaped the way

1 the rules need to be formed, and I'm okay with that can be  
2 a discussion later on. I think we have just bigger things  
3 to do at this point. That's my two cents on it.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Any other comments or questions?

5 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I agree with Brad,  
6 I think we have plenty going on and I don't think we need  
7 to go down that road where we're so specific with what we  
8 can and what we can't do with TDCs, and to me that's -- I  
9 don't want to say a non-issue to me, but I think we've got  
10 other things to do.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and to be clear, and kind  
12 of to agree with you, what I was asking that for more is  
13 as you go through explaining the changes in MAP-21, as you  
14 look at how strategically all the money flows and talk to  
15 the transit providers about it, making sure that you have  
16 somebody available that could help them figure out how  
17 strategically to piece all that together I would think  
18 would be incredibly helpful to look at creative options  
19 for using money where money really is needed and works and  
20 using TDCs where they're really needed and can best be  
21 used to see if we can't pump up demand.

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: I just call Bobby when I have  
23 those questions.

24 MR. GADBOIS: There you go.

25 (General laughter.)

1 MR. SALAZAR: Well, and Glenn, to be honest, I  
2 think that's something that's kind of done on a local  
3 level too with the PTCs where they kind of advise us or  
4 give us direction on what we can do and what we can't do.

5 MR. UNDERWOOD: They're intimately involved in  
6 our day-to-day business.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And I appreciate that, and I  
8 also, though, remember and hear always, and have to kind  
9 of remind myself, you guys are the cream of the crop, if  
10 you will. Not everybody is as sophisticated at piecing  
11 things together as you guys are, and so I'm just looking  
12 to make sure everybody is kind of being helped.

13 MR. SALAZAR: I agree with that, I understand  
14 that.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Sorry. I think we cut you off.  
16 The rest of the director's report.

17 MR. GLEASON: I was just going to mention the  
18 February item on rules and just assume folks could read it  
19 out as well as I could read it out, so I thought the  
20 February item was important.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I saw the 2012-2013  
22 Transit Leadership Seminar. Is there another one planned,  
23 or is the idea to take like a year or two off?

24 MR. GLEASON: Well, it depends. I had actually  
25 thought we wouldn't have this third one, but the demand

1 for it was high enough where we had no trouble filling it.

2 I think it could be a good time to pause for a year.  
3 We'll have trained 75 individuals. And I had wanted to do  
4 something else with the funds, something we've called a  
5 Leadership Challenge Forum, where we pick two or three  
6 topics of significance to the industry and stakeholders  
7 and bring these folks in for two days of facilitated work  
8 around options and next step directions we need to get  
9 moving on. And I don't think we can do both in one year,  
10 just from a financial standpoint.

11 So we've got enough momentum with enough of  
12 these folks having been through the training where it  
13 would be a good opportunity for them to come back and  
14 apply a lot of what they learned, looking in the state  
15 context. Examples would be what are we going to do about  
16 state of good repair, education and awareness for transit  
17 across the state would be a good one, workforce  
18 development is another great topic. There's just three  
19 right there that you could easily structure a really  
20 productive two-day session around that would be really,  
21 really helpful.

22 MR. GADBOIS: And along those lines, January  
23 16, that item, how was the discussion around MAP-21?

24 MR. GLEASON: There were two days. We had  
25 discussion on Wednesday, which was the semiannual meeting

1       itself, and everyone took part in that. And then on  
2       Thursday morning we had workshops that folks could stay an  
3       extra day for and delve more specifically into each of the  
4       areas, and in your packet you've got the feedback from  
5       those workshops.

6                 MR. GADBOIS: Feedback?

7                 MR. GLEASON: Well, not feedback, but the  
8       comments that we received.

9                 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. That wasn't emailed, was  
10       it?

11                MS. BLOOMER: I think Bobby emailed it Friday,  
12       late Thursday.

13                MR. GLEASON: We can get on you one, Glenn

14                MR. GADBOIS: No, I have it.

15                MS. BLOOMER: And I think that's on the agenda  
16       for discussion two items down.

17                MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

18                MS. BLOOMER: Are there any more questions on  
19       the director's report?

20                         (No response.)

21                MS. BLOOMER: If not, we'll move on to item 5:  
22       Discussion and comment on the Texas Health and Human  
23       Services Commission's Medical Transportation Program. And  
24       I believe this is Eric.

25                MR. GLEASON: Yes, I'll take this one.

1           At your last meeting the committee decided that  
2 they wanted to write a letter. At that time, Health and  
3 Human Services was conducting a number of statewide forums  
4 on the various options of service delivery for the Medical  
5 Transportation Program and they were seeking feedback.  
6 They had ten or twelve of these sessions. And the  
7 committee at the time decided that they wanted to weigh  
8 in, in some fashion, and express to HHSC their thoughts on  
9 the service delivery model discussion. Now, since then  
10 we've not seen a letter or written a letter, I'm not sure  
11 what happened to that.

12           What has happened in this same time frame,  
13 though, is that Phil Wilson first met with the industry to  
14 hear about their concerns over the Medicaid Medical  
15 Transportation Program, and then subsequently met with Dr.  
16 Kyle Janek, the executive commissioner for HHSC, to help  
17 promote the idea of letting a small consortium of transit  
18 districts be a pilot for how MTP could be delivered  
19 through transit providers that you could generate an  
20 evaluation of, and at the same time do an evaluation of  
21 the current fully capitated risk brokerage programs that  
22 are happening in Houston and Dallas-Fort Worth areas. And  
23 so you could evaluate those two efforts on some common  
24 performance measures and presumably develop some data on  
25 which to make a decision down the road on what kind of

1 service delivery model might be best for the state.

2 And so Phil met with Dr. Janek the week before  
3 last, and then next week on Tuesday, John McBeth, Carol  
4 Warlick and Dave Marsh are meeting with Chris Traylor, who  
5 is the deputy executive commissioner over at HHSC, to  
6 further talk about what they think the pilot is and how it  
7 can benefit HHSC. So we've made some real progress, I  
8 think, in promoting one of the options that was a part of  
9 the forum discussions, and hopefully result in an  
10 opportunity for transit in sort of a level playing field  
11 environment to demonstrate that it can -- transit folks  
12 are saying, and we would agree that there are better  
13 solutions for managing cost growth over the long run, and  
14 that they can deliver a consistently higher quality of  
15 service than you get from the brokerage model. And so  
16 that's what we're going to be trying to see.

17 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I think Michelle,  
18 that TTA is trying to adopt some sort of formal policy on  
19 it as well, what TTA is looking forward to, and I think,  
20 obviously, we support the white paper that's being  
21 discussed in the Austin area and that model there. The  
22 issue that I brought up at the TTA board meeting is the  
23 same issue that I have here. The good thing about that is  
24 that you have a TSAP with me and then you have a  
25 subcontractor with Brad, but our contracts expire in

1 August of this year, and when we start looking at this  
2 pilot project that is going on, what does that mean come  
3 August 31 when those contracts expire.

4 And so we advocate, or at least I should say I  
5 do, for just extension of those contracts for current TSAP  
6 models rather than some of the discussion was at the TTA  
7 meeting the other day that maybe we should have two  
8 projects going on throughout the state, one in Austin that  
9 they all are working on and one in the West Texas area.  
10 And I'm really concerned about that because I am in that  
11 area and we're talking about 70-something counties, and I  
12 wouldn't have a clue on how we're going to get all that  
13 started. So I support the one pilot project that's going  
14 on in the Austin area.

15 MR. GLEASON: So I think a question for the  
16 committee is do you still want to write a letter or not.  
17 I think we need to bring closure to that conversation.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Well, has everybody had a chance  
19 to read the letter? I think the letter fairly well lays  
20 out a lot of the points we had made at the last meeting,  
21 so I think at this point whatever the desire of the  
22 committee is. I think this letter states what we were  
23 trying to communicate in the letter that we, as PTAC,  
24 would have sent. I think it's good that this letter came  
25 from Phil Wilson. Maybe at this point we sort of sit back

1 and cautiously watch what is going on and how it's moving  
2 and see how things go the next couple of months. I think  
3 there's been quite a bit of work and traction since the  
4 HHSC meetings throughout the region.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Since Team 1A and 1B brought this  
6 issue up, Phil's letter -- I mean, I was pleased to see  
7 Phil's letter, number one. I'm pleased to hear about the  
8 conversation on this issue because it's a complicated one,  
9 and really the only thing we were recommending is getting  
10 to a place to where there's more discussion, coordination  
11 and collaboration between the department and HHS in terms  
12 of determining what pilots might look like, how any  
13 transition might happen, et cetera. And so we've gotten  
14 what we were asking for is my opinion.

15 MR. GLEASON: TxDOT has also offered to HHSC  
16 that we would fund and manage the evaluation effort. So  
17 if HHSC is interested in pursuing this pilot, then we  
18 would, with TTI, facilitate a conversation around an  
19 evaluation effort, and presumably it's both pilot and the  
20 brokerage.

21 MR. GADBOIS: And is a topic of conversation  
22 transition? Because you've got the issue of pilots, can  
23 we try other models here. But then you've got the issue  
24 J.R. brings up of we've got some contracts ending and  
25 transition on those.

1 MR. GLEASON: I think, Glenn, that we're not  
2 there yet for that conversation. We don't even know if  
3 the pilot is a go. So I think one of the next issues on  
4 the list is so then what about the rest of the state while  
5 this pilot is going on.

6 Now, if I remember right, the 2006 contracts  
7 had two three-year extensions in them, if I'm remembering  
8 that right, so you're at that limit now.

9 MR. SALAZAR: We're at that limit now, but I  
10 think they left themselves a little bit of wiggle room  
11 with those five -- help me out, Brad -- the roundtables  
12 that went around the state had and you had five options to  
13 choose from. I think one of them was to go ahead and  
14 leave the contracts in place and extend those contracts,  
15 but how technical, I'm not really sure.

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: I believe they referred to them  
17 as enhanced TSAPs. There would be new contracts with  
18 additional monitoring provisions. When the last one was  
19 issued in 2009, it was my understanding that HHSC was very  
20 clear that there would not be any further contract  
21 extensions from the existing contract. But there again, I  
22 think we're playing with a whole new set of rules right  
23 now, so I don't really know where that's going to end up,  
24 J.R. I think what you're saying as far as extending the  
25 existing contracts for the existing TSAPs I think is

1 pretty well received by TTA. That seemed to be the  
2 consensus at our meeting, but there again, I'm not certain  
3 what HHSC's direction would be on this.

4 But I agree with Eric. Let's do the pilot  
5 first, then we'll pick up that issue. I think too many  
6 things on the table at one time might be confusing and  
7 look like --

8 MR. SALAZAR: Or to the point, let's commit to  
9 the pilot, the one pilot, let's focus on it, not two or  
10 three throughout the state or that kind of thing.

11 MR. GLEASON: Well, that's the purpose of next  
12 Tuesday's meeting. So I'm hopeful that we'll get to a  
13 point where we'll hear from HHSC whether it's a go or not.

14 MR. SALAZAR: And just one more thing, with  
15 HHSC right now, I can tell you that speaking from the TSAP  
16 perspective, they're asking for a whole lot of information  
17 from us right now and you wouldn't believe how much time  
18 we're spending getting documentation for everything for  
19 them, but it has been a big process.

20 MR. GLEASON: They are incredibly sensitive  
21 right now to fraud, and they seem to have reached a  
22 conclusion that they're paying for more trips than they  
23 should, significantly more trips than they should. In my  
24 mind, when we managed the program, the greatest potential  
25 for that existed in the larger metropolitan areas where

1 you have well developed fixed route systems and ADA  
2 systems, and you just knew that many of the trips that  
3 were being carried by the MTP could have taken place on  
4 those systems. The MTP program was offering a higher  
5 quality trip and a more convenient trip for people to  
6 take, and so it was being used.

7 You don't have that kind of footprint of fixed  
8 route and ADA services outside of those areas in the  
9 state, in the small urban and particularly rural areas  
10 they're nonexistent. And so as long as it's not a fraud  
11 issue, if it's just someone -- it's kind of a fraud but  
12 it's not like someone is trying to game the system, but  
13 they're just taking advantage of a better trip, they're  
14 calling and getting a ride.

15 MR. STEPHENS: Eric, I didn't mean to interrupt  
16 you, but isn't MTP in charge, they administer that program  
17 and they determine eligibility, so I don't know how it  
18 could be fraud if they're the ones that decide who's  
19 eligible and who isn't.

20 MR. GLEASON: Right. But they don't have the  
21 ability, or it's very difficult on a consistent basis for  
22 them to determine that this particular trip really could  
23 take place on Houston Metro.

24 MR. STEPHENS: I see. But that's still an  
25 internal issue. They decide who's eligible and who isn't.

1 I can't see how it could be fraud if they're establishing  
2 eligibility and they approve the trip to a TSAP. I don't  
3 see that connection.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Rob, I think a lot of it, too,  
5 especially in the Dallas-Fort Worth area with what's going  
6 on right now, there's an issue of flooding their system  
7 and ticket books being purchased and where those all go  
8 and that kind of thing. And so I think that's going to be  
9 an interesting situation to watch in the coming months as  
10 well, and it's going to address directly what Eric is  
11 talking about.

12 MR. STEPHENS: I don't know all the efforts  
13 that have been taken to try to remedy some of those  
14 issues, but it's been a while since I've worked an MTP  
15 program, but we used to sell fixed route tickets to the  
16 MTP program managers, and I don't know how they would  
17 disburse them but we would send them straight to the MTP  
18 offices. I don't know, it seemed like everything was in  
19 their control, so I don't know, maybe that's why they've  
20 been going down this path for something different, they've  
21 had trouble managing that program.

22 MS. BLOOMER: And I think just one last  
23 question. My understanding of the full risk brokerage is  
24 under that system it's in the broker's best interest to  
25 find the most cost efficient trip for that individual, so

1 if we can purchase them a \$1.25 pass to ride a fixed route  
2 service, then we should be doing that, versus providing a  
3 more expensive point-to-point service. If you have a  
4 certain amount of money and you have to provide all the  
5 trips that are needed, it's in your best interest to make  
6 sure that you're providing the most efficient trip, not  
7 necessarily the quickest or the fastest.

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: And actually, Michelle, under  
9 that system it's not even based on the amount of trips to  
10 perform, it's based on the amount of eligible clients at  
11 the time, not even the amount of trips that need to be  
12 done.

13 MR. GLEASON: And technically, you could argue  
14 that if they managed to find that, that's not an MTP trip  
15 anymore and they'd get nothing for it because it's a  
16 program of last resort.

17 MR. STEPHENS: I know there's a lot of  
18 variables in determining eligibility and the most  
19 efficient way to get at it. When I heard the fraud I just  
20 kind of thought: Gosh, how could we connect that with  
21 what's happening.

22 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think, Rob, there are two  
23 elements to the paying for more trips than they should,  
24 and the first one is that some trips could be taken on  
25 public transportation systems. The second part of it is

1 that it's just deliberate fraud, trips that are never  
2 being made. So I don't know in their mind the extent to  
3 which they have both those ideas in mind or whether they  
4 believe that trips are being documented that have never  
5 happened.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Oh, I see. There's probably a  
7 lot of opportunity for improvement in that program. When  
8 I used to run an MTP program, it was complex. I had an  
9 operations manager at the time that was extremely hands-on  
10 and knew a lot of things about a lot of stuff, and he'd  
11 come tell me all the time, he'd say: I think, Rob, I  
12 think these people, they're not really taking a trip to  
13 the doctor's office, they're doing something else. I  
14 mean, we'd take them wherever we'd get a fax over to where  
15 we'd need to take them, but I'd always tell them: That's  
16 none of our business where he goes, we took him to the  
17 address we were to take him to; what they do with that  
18 trip or where they go, that's between them and somebody  
19 else.

20 But there's a lot of improvement that needs to  
21 happen in that program, definitely. I agree with that.

22 MR. GADBOIS: So I have one last question, or  
23 to go back to my question to make sure I understand the  
24 answer. So in the letter to Dr. Janek, last line of the  
25 second paragraph: "In your deliberations on this issue, I

1     urge you to strongly consider the potential benefit of an  
2     ongoing partnership with the transit industry to meet the  
3     challenges of program growth and diversity in Texas." We  
4     have sufficiently covered the immediate idea of a pilot,  
5     but that statement suggests a much broader opportunity to  
6     collaborate and coordinate. I understand your answer was  
7     first step first, and I don't mean to be getting in your  
8     business of strategy, what I want to make sure, though,  
9     that I understand is are we seeing, or do we just not know  
10    yet, is there an interest, willingness, opportunity to  
11    have that broader discussion about partnership beyond a  
12    pilot? Do we even know that yet?

13           MR. GLEASON: I think we don't know that yet.  
14    The notion of a partnership, a statewide partnership with  
15    transit providers on an ongoing basis for the delivery of  
16    the program because there's a larger benefit to the state  
17    to leverage the existing investment in the systems that  
18    are already there, quality of life issue, all those  
19    things, in my mind, the pilot will need to kind of prove  
20    itself on some efficiency and effectiveness measures, and  
21    that if successful in that, then I think the notion of a  
22    long-term partnership would make some sense. Right now  
23    there's no set of data that you can look at and say we all  
24    agree on the data because we are part of creating the work  
25    that went to produce it.

1           And Phil's position very clearly right here is  
2 prove it up. I mean, his position and the department's  
3 position is that we think there's enough potential benefit  
4 where the opportunity for a pilot to see if these kind of  
5 things really can come true is worth a shot. And that's  
6 his whole line here.

7           MR. GADBOIS: Get it. Okay.

8           MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I think for now the  
9 committee is fine with leaving it at the letter from Phil  
10 Wilson and we'll wait and see, but I think what we're  
11 seeing so far is very positive. So we'll just wait to see  
12 that hopefully we get the green light on the pilot and  
13 that we're able to show the results to continue the  
14 partnership.

15           MR. GADBOIS: Positive from TxDOT's side;  
16 haven't heard anything from HHS yet.

17           MS. BLOOMER: Well, the fact that Phil Wilson  
18 was able to meet with Dr. Janek I think is very positive,  
19 and I know some other folks have some meetings to discuss  
20 this, so I think we're moving in the right direction.

21           We'll move on to item 6, which is a discussion  
22 and comment on potential rulemaking related to MAP-21, and  
23 I believe that's Bobby.

24           MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you. Once again, Bobby  
25 Killebrew, deputy director of Public Transportation

1 Division here at TxDOT.

2 In your package, members -- and Glenn, I don't  
3 know how we didn't get this email to you, but hopefully  
4 maybe it's stuck in limbo someplace, but you have a copy  
5 in front of you today.

6 MR. GADBOIS: I got this part.

7 MR. KILLEBREW: Rob, do you have in front of  
8 you the feedback we received from the semiannual meeting?

9 It was something that was emailed out on Friday, along  
10 with the director's report.

11 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, I do. Thank you, Bobby.

12 MR. KILLEBREW: Okay. As Eric was mentioning,  
13 last week was a busy week for us. We had lots to do in  
14 getting prepared for our division meeting, then we had a  
15 semiannual meeting with the operators, then we had a  
16 workshop meeting, three days of fun and joy, and it really  
17 was a good time. I think the operators appreciated us  
18 taking time out of the normal agenda to talk about MAP-21  
19 again, we can't talk about this enough. And we all  
20 understand that the more we talk about it, the more we  
21 learn, and FTA continues to give us additional guidance,  
22 sometimes they change previous guidance, so stay tuned for  
23 whatever is stayed today because it might change tomorrow.  
24 It's kind of like a moving target.

25 But we are going forward. We can't wait for

1 the world to catch up with us because then we'll be way  
2 behind schedule, so we reached out. We did conduct a  
3 webinar earlier in January that talked about the transit  
4 programs, at least, a very general discussion about MAP-21  
5 to kind of acclimate people out in the industry to the  
6 most important parts that we could think about to put in  
7 front of someone's face. And that also got people up to  
8 speed so that on January 16 when we came together as a  
9 group, then they already had some comments in their head.

10 And as Eric said, during that meeting on the  
11 16th, we took 90 minutes -- which is a long time for a  
12 group -- to talk about some specific programs, and these  
13 are the same ones that we had mentioned PTAC at your  
14 November 8 meeting, and that was the 5310 program, the  
15 5311 program, the new 5339 program which is kind of like  
16 the old capital replacement program or state of good  
17 repair, whatever you want to call it, and then we lumped  
18 two programs together, one was transit asset management  
19 and the other was safety plans. So we wanted to focus on  
20 those because those are the things that we see as most  
21 critically facing us that we probably need to invest some  
22 time and energy in, you as a committee, the industry as a  
23 group, and the TxDOT staff. And so on the 16th we talked  
24 about those programs and we gathered comments from the  
25 general group at large.

1           The next day we broke into little workshops and  
2 we had those same little workshops, and we had two  
3 sessions that morning so that people could jump workshops  
4 so if they attended for the first half of the morning the  
5 5310, they could attend 5311, for example, in the second  
6 half. So they were able to move around within the  
7 workshops.

8           I know Michelle and J.R. and Brad and some of  
9 your staff participated either in the first day or both  
10 days, so thank you very much for taking time out of your  
11 schedules, and your staff as well.

12           So what you see in your packet -- and Rob,  
13 that's the thing that was emailed on Friday -- is a  
14 summary from those workshops. We had lots of TxDOT staff  
15 using their abilities as facilitators and scribes to take  
16 down exactly what was said. We did not draw conclusions  
17 from those workshops. We wanted to report back to this  
18 group exactly what was said as if you were there in  
19 person, and some of you were, so we didn't try to draw any  
20 summaries or conclusions or take down what was, I guess,  
21 the feelings in the room or what was going on in the room,  
22 if people had facial expressions or stormed out or were  
23 waving their hands. We tried to be neutral about this as  
24 best we could.

25           MR. GADBOIS: You didn't do body language

1 analysis?

2 MR. KILLEBREW: We didn't do body language  
3 analysis. That's a good way to put it. That was a  
4 struggle for some, Glenn.

5 MR. GLEASON: They were all busy.

6 (General talking and laughter.)

7 MR. KILLEBREW: So we didn't do that. And what  
8 we told the group is this is just the first of many  
9 opportunities, as we see it. Eric kind of laid out we're  
10 going to take time while making these rules to make any  
11 changes we need to do to make sure those changes are  
12 appropriate and correct. We have other avenues that we  
13 can use to solicit additional feedback, and I would  
14 advocate to the group that we probably do need to do other  
15 workshops throughout the state. This was collected from  
16 the group that was there that moment. Not everybody gets  
17 to make it to these meetings, not everybody could stay  
18 over the extra day on the 17th, so this was the group that  
19 was there.

20 In the past we've also used TxDOT's internet to  
21 get feedback on various rulemakings, and so we have those  
22 abilities to do that as well. So I would bring that up to  
23 the committee's attention that that's something that we  
24 can pursue going out into the areas of the state and also  
25 using internet, webinars, other type media to get

1 conversations started on this.

2 So as we're looking at this, and again, we  
3 focused on just these programs, we're interested in the  
4 committee's overall feedback and what you think the  
5 direction should be in regards to a rulemaking process if  
6 we need to do one. As Eric said, we have rules in place  
7 today that we can make work.

8 So with that, I will probably open it up to the  
9 committee to discuss and any questions or comments of me.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: Can I make a comment about  
11 Thursday, the 17th? This is the first time that I've been  
12 involved in a workshop breakout session the day following  
13 the semiannual. I'm not sure who came up with it or whose  
14 idea, but it was terrific. I thought that was one of the  
15 most beneficial things that we have done in a while of  
16 just being able to get ten or fifteen of us in a room and  
17 go: what about, could we not, what if we did this, what  
18 if we did that. I mean, it was a really, really good  
19 discussion, I thought. And from just looking at some of  
20 the things in the meetings I attended, this was exactly  
21 what was being said, if I remember correctly, last week,  
22 and this was it. I know it took a lot of work  
23 but I thought each session that I attended, the staff was  
24 very professional, they weren't leading us into any ideas,  
25 it was just tell us what you want, period. And I thought

1 it was handled very, very well, and I appreciate it as a  
2 provider. I thought it was great, I liked it. I think we  
3 should do it more often about other things that we are  
4 facing in the industry, just being able to let people  
5 talk.

6 MR. SALAZAR: And this is J.R. I agree with  
7 what Brad said, and I can tell you that I sat in on the  
8 5310 meeting, and when we started it did get off to a  
9 little bit of a slow start because we really didn't know  
10 what we were going to do or say, and then once somebody  
11 threw out an idea, it just started rolling, and then next  
12 thing you know, we're an hour, an hour and a half into it.

13 And so I agree with Brad's comments that it was very  
14 beneficial.

15 The only concern that I had with that is  
16 sometimes the people with the most opinions or whatever  
17 speak more than maybe some of the -- I shouldn't say --  
18 quieter people, but that strong kind of presence and what  
19 overtakes some meetings sometimes and we need to be aware  
20 of that as well. But overall, I thought that the meeting  
21 went very well.

22 So when you ask about questions, Bobby, are you  
23 talking about a specific -- are we going to focus on one,  
24 or any question on anything, 5310, 5311?

25 MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. I think maybe

1 it's twofold. First of all, thank you for the comments  
2 and the compliments. The staff worked very hard and they  
3 had a real short turnaround to get this cranked out for  
4 today's meeting. So some of the staff are sitting on the  
5 sidelines over here, so I know they appreciate the  
6 compliments as well. So two things: one, were we heading  
7 in the right direction trying to solicit the feedback from  
8 the industry, are we hitting the right things.

9 I know our meetings don't typically focus on  
10 all the transit providers, some of the non-traditional  
11 transit providers don't typically come to our semiannual  
12 meeting. We didn't necessarily have the centers for  
13 independent living there which also probably are  
14 stakeholders in this process as well, so we think we  
15 probably have some outreach that we need to do still even  
16 further beyond this. So part of the process question is:  
17 where do we need to go now, where do we need to focus our  
18 outreach efforts, what would you see as probably the next  
19 steps in this whole process.

20 More specifically, as we're looking at the  
21 individual programs, but also interested in then looking  
22 at one program at a time, hopefully, your thoughts as a  
23 committee on maybe some of these programs. I know you  
24 were there the first day at the semiannual meeting with  
25 the 5311 program, for example, and there was one comment

1 that seemed to be echoing throughout the audience and I  
2 think it's on your paper: leave it alone. So we would be  
3 interested in your feedback in those general summary type  
4 level things about some of these programs and specifics.

5 MS. BLOOMER: And I think, Bobby, what I'm  
6 hearing, sort of the three things, maybe the biggest one  
7 is the issue of do we agree or not that we need to go  
8 through a rulemaking process is what I heard, and then  
9 sort of feedback on the outreach process. And I agree  
10 with Brad and J.R., I think to date the outreach has been  
11 fantastic. And then if we do go through a rulemaking  
12 process, how do we continue to communicate at the same  
13 level we've been communicating so folks are involved all  
14 the way throughout the process, when we get to the end  
15 they can't realistically say: I didn't know we were doing  
16 rulemaking, what did you do? They still will but we can  
17 go back and go --

18 And then at the semiannual we did talk about  
19 you had mentioned sort of online and maybe FTA just did a  
20 dialogue if there's something where maybe those folks who  
21 weren't at the semiannual or weren't able to stay for the  
22 workshops or sort of the quieter folks in the room or the  
23 centers of independent living could be invited to  
24 participate in an ongoing discussion so we can make sure  
25 that we've given everybody every opportunity. Whether they

1 choose or not to participate, we've given everybody  
2 multiple means to participate, I think that would be good  
3 to helping us reach consensus.

4 And then maybe the third step would be to get  
5 into the programs but at a very high level, not we want to  
6 tweak this detail, but at a high level what are some of  
7 the big picture things about the 5310, 5311, 5339, safety,  
8 security and asset management.

9 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. In a very simple  
10 way of thinking about it, the 5311 program, the biggest  
11 difference is it's bigger. There's more money in it than  
12 there was before. The allocation formula itself is set up  
13 to handle that because it works based on percentages, so  
14 literally, the allocation formula can stay as it is and  
15 the amount distributed by formula will grow. Ninety  
16 percent of the new money will go out by formula, either  
17 based on population and land area or revenue miles, and  
18 the other 10 percent will grow too but it's only 10  
19 percent of the new money. So the commission's  
20 discretionary pot really doesn't all that much bigger. So  
21 some people were saying yes, it's more but the allocation  
22 way we have now is fine, so don't mess with it.

23 Now, we've also accumulated over the years a  
24 couple of other areas of interest in the formula that we  
25 might want to look at. The performance portion of it, we

1 have felt for a while that rather than it being just an  
2 annual comparison, that we need to develop some sort of a  
3 three-year rolling average for it to kind of smooth out  
4 some of the peaks and drops that can happen from one year  
5 to the next, because you can generate some pretty good  
6 swings.

7           You had an example one year where there was  
8 some construction going on and you ran a shuttle for it  
9 and you just busted the barn down in terms of some of your  
10 performance indicators shot right up. It was just an  
11 opportunity that was there for a year or two, they took  
12 advantage of it, and now it's gone.

13           MR. SALAZAR: That's right.

14           MR. GLEASON: You could lose a Medicaid  
15 contract one year and your performance indicators go into  
16 the trash barrel, and then you get it back next year or  
17 maybe you've had it the last two years. So some sort of  
18 averaging over, say, a three-year time frame would tend to  
19 sort of mitigate some of those extremes, and one of the  
20 main things we know we need to send is a stable, certain  
21 signal to the folks so they can do multi-year planning.  
22 So that was one.

23           The other area that we have struggled with is  
24 when counties decide that they want to leave one system  
25 that they're with and join another, or when two systems

1 become consolidated, those actions tend to end up having  
2 negative consequences on performance, and they're totally  
3 unintended.

4 In the case of the system consolidation, we had  
5 Spartan out in West Texas, South Plains, and they absorbed  
6 Cap Rock. When they did that, and it was a good thing  
7 they did that, Cap Rock's performance was less than  
8 theirs, and just by going with one less system -- any time  
9 you're a member of a performance program, everybody gets  
10 something from the performance program, so if there's 39  
11 of you, you all get something, and if now it's 38, that  
12 chunk that that one got doesn't necessarily stay with the  
13 larger system.

14 So it's an unintended thing, but it tends to  
15 work against system consolidation and it tends to penalize  
16 counties and others who are trying to do what's right for  
17 their citizens and are looking somewhere else for their  
18 service, it tends to penalize them for those actions. I'm  
19 not sure what the solution is, we don't need that today,  
20 but that's one area that we should think about whether  
21 it's appropriate for the Administrative Code to address.

22 MR. GADBOIS: So from what I'm hearing, I would  
23 be cautious to recommend rulemaking at this point because  
24 there are some big questions that I hear out there, some  
25 of which you implicate. In just briefly looking through

1 these, there are a number of these comments about  
2 priorities, we should have state priorities, what about  
3 making this a priority. I would suggest -- well,  
4 actually, let me start with I want to third everybody  
5 else's absolute pleasure with you setting up a workshop  
6 and doing that discussion and having it early. Good for  
7 you. Thank you for doing it.

8 I would suggest that you consider following  
9 that up with some high level planning conversations about  
10 priorities: how can we as a state start developing  
11 priorities that would make sense for transit, how does  
12 that reflect itself in performance measures. Stabilizing  
13 funding may well be a huge priority for everybody, but  
14 let's get them telling us that, not just pronouncing it.

15 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely. No, no. What we're  
16 trying to do is kind of place some boundaries, if you  
17 will, around each of the areas and talk about what we do  
18 want to accomplish generally.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And my only point is in listening  
20 to that, that's fruitful ground for conversation and  
21 building consensus with the larger transit providers.

22 MR. GLEASON: Yes, absolutely.

23 MR. GADBOIS: Not just the people who were  
24 there, but everybody. You could frame that discussion  
25 point, do it online, give people a chance 24-7 to fill it

1 out and get even more response back.

2 MR. GLEASON: Right. So that's the 5311  
3 program, it's mostly about getting bigger, from a MAP-21  
4 standpoint, it's mostly about getting bigger. We've got  
5 some issues we'd have with or without MAP-21 that we might  
6 want to look at, and we can look at those issues and  
7 decide to leave the formula well enough alone.

8 5310, that's probably the big one here, because  
9 it's different in a lot of ways. You know, TxDOT  
10 previously under SAFETEA-LU and all preceding  
11 authorizations that I'm familiar with, TxDOT received the  
12 entire 5310 program amount for the state and we proceeded  
13 to administer a statewide program in all areas to spend  
14 that money. So under MAP-21 we no longer get all the  
15 money, we get the portion of the funding which is for the  
16 rural and the small urban systems. Large urbanized areas  
17 have a choice to make. They get the money directly, they  
18 have to determine who the designated recipient for that  
19 program is going to be in the large urbanized areas, and  
20 so they're going through that now.

21 The issue that it represents for us is we have  
22 a history of program decisions looking at the entire area  
23 with one pot of money. Now we have possibly in many areas  
24 of the state we have a large urbanized area with some  
25 money, we have TxDOT, we have a historic program that

1 didn't necessarily always carve up the money that way when  
2 it made program decisions on where the projects would be,  
3 and at a minimum, we've got to figure out how to  
4 transition to this new time frame. We could find some  
5 significant disconnects between level of investment and  
6 now how much money one of the two parties might be  
7 getting.

8           The second thing is the 5310 can now be used  
9 for operating, and in their wisdom, though, they placed  
10 some ceilings on percentages which, if I know FTA, they'll  
11 manage at our level, TxDOT's level for the rural and the  
12 small urban areas, so that when they say that you can  
13 use -- is it 45 percent?

14           MR. KILLEBREW: It's 45 percent, and those are  
15 two different pots in FTA's eyes, and they're not  
16 necessarily interchangeable, small urban and rural, so  
17 good luck on that. But it is at a statewide level for  
18 what TxDOT manages, at the large urban it's by large  
19 urbanized areas is that 45 percent available for  
20 operating, 55 percent for traditional capital expenses.

21           MR. GLEASON: And they consolidated the New  
22 Freedom program into it, and so there's sort of an  
23 expanded scope for it as well. And so that's the one  
24 that, you know, I think is the most complicated and has  
25 the greatest potential for impact on how we do things.

1           MR. UNDERWOOD: And to me, we're staring down  
2 that gun because in the spring, late spring, early summer,  
3 we would start traditionally doing our district 5310  
4 meetings for next year's funding. Well, we're coming upon  
5 that, and looking the way that some of the districts lay  
6 out, we may show up and there may be four providers for  
7 \$24,000, where we traditionally had a hundred something  
8 thousand dollars, so that's a big difference.

9           MR. GLEASON: We could still do that, we could  
10 do that for the amount we have. So the rules still work.

11          It's awkward and in some places it may not make any sense  
12 because you get all these people showing up, as you say,  
13 for \$25,000.

14          MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

15          MR. GLEASON: But technically, we could do it.  
16 the large urbanized areas have to go through and name a  
17 designated recipient, and we are one of the potential  
18 options for them to choose. So you know, Dallas-Fort  
19 Worth could choose to have TxDOT continue to be the  
20 designated recipient for that program. Now, I picked  
21 Dallas-Fort Worth because there wasn't a snowball's chance  
22 in you-know-what that they would do that.

23          MR. UNDERWOOD: I was looking at Michelle.

24          (General laughter.)

25          MR. GLEASON: But for example, CAMPO in Austin

1 has concluded that they would like us to administer the  
2 federal fiscal year 2013 large urbanized program dollars  
3 that we've already got the apportionment for, we've got  
4 about half of this year, and then presumably the second  
5 half, when it comes, would be with whomever they select as  
6 the designated recipient for the program on an ongoing  
7 basis. Now, you know, we strongly encourage large  
8 urbanized areas if their vision is to take it on  
9 eventually, we think it makes the most sense for them to  
10 just do it now. But some of them are making different  
11 decisions for whatever reasons, so it's likely that we're  
12 going to end up with at least one and possibly as many as  
13 three that I'm aware of right now who are thinking that  
14 they might have us, in an interim capacity at least,  
15 continue to be the designated recipient

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: I guess where I get concerned  
17 is you can say this has changed, the bridge is out, it's  
18 not what you think it's going to be, but until June comes  
19 and you show up at that meeting and then you get the phone  
20 call the next day going how am I supposed to run my  
21 program on \$24,000, what are you going to do? I think  
22 that's when it will really kind of hit home when they sit  
23 in those district meetings, like we've done for years, and  
24 go: Well, I didn't know they were talking about us, we're  
25 only going to get \$24,000 for our entire district. And

1 then you have to sit around and go: Who needs it the most  
2 because none of us can do anything capital-wise with  
3 \$24,000.

4 And so if anything, I'd like to see us kind of  
5 keep some momentum in what we've done. We've kind of got  
6 it on people's minds with the webinar, we've had the  
7 semiannual, we've had the workshop. I think we need to  
8 be, especially for 5310, expedient in what we're doing so  
9 that it does give us some amount of time to say we're not  
10 doing district meetings in June but this is the change,  
11 this is the process, this is what's going to happen.  
12 Because if not, I think a lot of people will forget about  
13 it and go: Oh, yes, I know they had something online  
14 about it but I didn't read it, I'm just going to my 5310  
15 meeting and going to get my money that I usually get. No,  
16 you're not. I think it's going to be a big wake-up call.

17 MR. GLEASON: Right. And one of our interests  
18 is continuity as well, and we want to try and do whatever  
19 we can to ensure that as large urbanized areas select  
20 other designated recipients that there's a transition, if  
21 need be, from the service that had been there for years  
22 and years and years, and when they come up with a  
23 different set of decisions and outcomes, we want to make  
24 sure that there's a transition and that nobody gets left  
25 out unexpectedly or unintendedly from a service

1       standpoint.

2                   MR. UNDERWOOD: I completely agree.

3                   MR. GADBOIS: Are there coordination efforts  
4 that are happening regionally, an opportunity to push  
5 forward those discussions about transition to see if they  
6 can't have them, settle them out you all involved in that  
7 conversation and get that settled earlier rather than  
8 later?

9                   MR. GLEASON: That can be, but the regional  
10 basis for the coordination plan is not the TxDOT district  
11 boundary, and so that's a complication.

12                   MR. GADBOIS: Well, it's a little bit of a  
13 complication, but it's a complication they've already kind  
14 of worked through on other things.

15                   MR. GLEASON: At a very general level, yes.  
16 The 5310 program was the only program that we actually  
17 through a formula allocated and through a process did at  
18 the TxDOT district level.

19                   MR. GADBOIS: District by district.

20                   MR. UNDERWOOD: And districts don't line up  
21 with planning regions.

22                   MR. GADBOIS: Right.

23                   MR. SALAZAR: It was bad on the rural side,  
24 Glenn, where the rural programs, as Brad mentioned -- just  
25 to give you an example, the Brownwood District received

1 like \$120,000 last year, this upcoming year that figure is  
2 going to be \$50,000 between two or three providers there,  
3 and that won't buy a bus for any of us, and so we're left  
4 to decide what are we going to do with that money now.

5 And to my issue, Michelle, I do agree with  
6 outreach, I do agree with letting everybody know, I'm  
7 concerned about those traditional non-providers that are  
8 now going to come into the game and say: You know what, I  
9 can get 50 percent of operating under the 5310 program,  
10 now I want in on the game. And I just worry about that  
11 process there.

12 MR. GADBOIS: And there's less game.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Right. So I think the issue of  
14 the operating assistance being available, it's nice in  
15 that it offers flexibility, but there's also the other  
16 side of the coin that it's also going to be even more  
17 interesting to more individuals because now operating is  
18 available.

19 But one of the questions I think that  
20 consistently came up for items for discussion is do we  
21 continue to program the money at the district level, do we  
22 look at it statewide, and I think that's one of the things  
23 that we need to tackle. Maybe it isn't the district  
24 level, maybe it's the regional planning level, and then  
25 what does that look like, and then if you address the

1 large urbanized areas, then how does that play into it  
2 too.

3 Is there a time frame for the large urbanized  
4 areas to designate their designated recipient.

5 MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. The only time  
6 frame that has been set, the line drawn in the sand, so to  
7 speak, is that all these type of changes go into effect  
8 with the FY 2013 funds, so anything FY 2013 and forward,  
9 if anyone is looking to apply for those monies, the  
10 process has to be through. So in those large urbanized  
11 areas that have to name a designated recipient, that has  
12 to be accomplished in order to make your application in  
13 team. So it's kind of if you want your money, you've got  
14 to get it done.

15 At TxDOT, since we have to organize this effort  
16 and communicate this to FTA, we've not drawn a line in the  
17 sand. We recognize that local processes are different  
18 across the state and we respect those local processes, so  
19 we've not actually drawn a line in the sand, although  
20 pretty soon we're probably going to have to be pretty firm  
21 on you need to get this to us by this date if you expect  
22 us to take any action with FTA anytime soon.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So the items going to the  
24 commission in January to take action on the program  
25 projects for the 5310 program, is that everybody

1 statewide, including the large urban, or are those guys  
2 taken out?

3 MR. KILLEBREW: The 5310 program in January is  
4 the first half of the 2013 funding, and that's just the  
5 rural and the small urban piece because that's all that's  
6 administered by TxDOT at this point.

7 And also on the 5310, and I always forget, it  
8 was a long time ago on November 8 when we talked about all  
9 these programs in any level of detail, but the 5310  
10 program is the only program that's still requiring that  
11 coordinated planning effort with the public transit,  
12 health and human service coordinated plan. It's still  
13 required in 5310, it's not required in the other programs.

14 That did come up, I know, in the discussions in the  
15 workshop that Chris was hosting that maybe regional  
16 planning boundaries would be appropriate because that's  
17 where the coordinated plan is.

18 MS. BLOOMER: And I think from just reading  
19 through the comments, one says, like number 5 says  
20 incorporate low income because that's in the formula, and  
21 then number 6 says don't incorporate it.

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: Are you looking at 5311 or  
23 5310?

24 MS. BLOOMER: I wasn't citing a specific page,  
25 just in general. Okay, yes, page 4 under 5311, number 3

1 is low income should be a formula factor because that's  
2 not included in the formula that FTA uses, the comment  
3 right below it is low income should not be a formula  
4 factor. And so the good news is that we got comments, the  
5 confusing is we have both sides of the coin. So I guess  
6 my big question is: Okay, we have comments, I think  
7 that's great, it's going to get us started, but where do  
8 we go from here and what do we want to do? Do we want to  
9 open the rules; do we just want to open certain items for  
10 discussion first, like tackle 5310 first, leave 5311  
11 alone; what do we want to do?

12 MR. GADBOIS: Before I get to a what, I  
13 actually think that these comments beg more questions than  
14 they answer, and what I'd like to see is a way to see if  
15 there's more consensus. So you point to somebody saying  
16 count low income, don't count low income, well, is there a  
17 way to decide priorities or at least have a good  
18 discussion about what priorities might be such that we  
19 have better information to use.

20 Now, in addition to that, and I'm not sure  
21 we've got clarity, but the same for performance measures.

22 MAP-21 is emphasizing performance measures, but what I  
23 don't know is whether FTA is coming out with any guidance  
24 on what performance measures they're going to want to see  
25 and whether those line up or don't line up with our

1 performance measures. I would think we need to have some  
2 way of getting to settling those and/or building some  
3 agreement with the providers and the industry before we  
4 actively engage in rulemaking.

5 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is a shot in the dark, so  
6 it's just a brainstorm. When I look at the 5310, there  
7 was two separate meetings that went on, there was a first  
8 set of group and there was a second set of group, and even  
9 in our second set of group there were times when someone  
10 would say, like what you said, include the low income, and  
11 there would be two or three people look at each other and  
12 go -- you know, that's just the nature of any group  
13 dynamics.

14 And so could it be possible to take something  
15 like 5310 and we have these 19 different things, could we  
16 have something online that would say you would go to this  
17 one that says funds should go to the largest number of  
18 persons with disabilities, can we say something like I  
19 agree with that or disagree with that or N/A or neutral?  
20 Sort of like a SurveyMonkey, I guess, but you know what  
21 I'm saying, it's like either I agree with that statement,  
22 I disagree with that statement, or neutral.

23 To me, that would be a quick way that we could  
24 get some instant feedback of 75 percent of the people that  
25 took this said they agree it should go with that. Is that

1 kind of what you're feeling?

2 MR. GADBOIS: Yes. So let's take this very  
3 specifically, 5310, we come up with the questions we want  
4 to ask about priorities, some of which may be talked about  
5 here, some of which you may need to come up with to make  
6 sure we're getting a good list of important priorities.  
7 This is your job, you know them better than I do. But  
8 that could then be done in a SurveyMonkey, go to  
9 SurveyMonkey and vote yes/no/don't give a flip. And then  
10 you have some serious of response on how those things rank  
11 out and where there's support. That's an easy way to find  
12 where there's agreement.

13 MR. UNDERWOOD: Do you remember when we did  
14 that with the compliance issues? Did we use SurveyMonkey  
15 for that where you went online and it said I think TxDOT  
16 has so much compliance in this area, and we hit either  
17 yes, no or neutral? And that way we were able to look at  
18 that in that group and go: 75 percent of people across  
19 the state said that or this.

20 MS. BLOOMER: And I think that's generally  
21 good, let's establish the priorities of the program and  
22 let's all agree on what those priorities are. Because you  
23 can say the sky is up, the sky is down. I think people  
24 are looking at it from their individual perspective, if we  
25 include low income individuals, what does this do to my

1 funding, versus okay, what should the program be and then  
2 let's get down to the details later of if we can all agree  
3 that the program should do these three things, then we can  
4 put the details to those three things to make it happen.  
5 And we can say, Well, we made this change because it  
6 addressed this priority we all agreed to.

7           Because any time somebody's funding increases,  
8 somebody's is going to decrease, and those folks below the  
9 line are not going to be happy with whatever we do, but if  
10 we can all agree that our three priorities in  
11 administering this program are X, Y and Z, then at least  
12 we've established that base and we have consensus there.

13           MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, the reason why I like the  
14 online option, similar to what we did with the compliance,  
15 is it lets everybody in the quiet of their own office to  
16 go through and decide how they really feel. I guess I'm  
17 afraid if you go back out across the state, had six or  
18 seven different meetings, you'll have a list that looks  
19 sort of like this, and some of the meetings are going to  
20 say yes, include low income, no, don't include low income,  
21 and I don't know that we're going to be any better. I  
22 think, if anything, it gives everyone the opportunity,  
23 because we have the main list of everybody that gets  
24 money. Right?

25           MR. KILLEBREW: What I might offer, although

1 I'm a big fan of SurveyMonkey, the problem is we only send  
2 it out to our distribution list, and so we miss some of  
3 the stakeholder groups that might be out there. What we  
4 have done in a previous rulemaking process -- and I know  
5 at least one other person in this room is as old as I am  
6 and has been through this -- we identified -- and it was a  
7 fairly extensive rulemaking process, it was to the 5311,  
8 the first time we did performance, a couple of PTACs ago,  
9 actually -- we identified, PTAC as a group and the  
10 department, like five major changes that we were going to  
11 do in 5311, some of these were statutory type direction  
12 that we had received. And based on those five major  
13 items, we held specific workshops out in the hinterlands  
14 of Texas so we could get people to participate, and they  
15 were well attended workshops.

16 The other thing we did was the online and it  
17 was through the internet, so it wasn't a SurveyMonkey that  
18 was sent to a specific group, it was available to anybody  
19 who wanted to sign on to TxDOT's internet and through a  
20 portal they could actually comment basically on those five  
21 items. And then we published those comments on the  
22 internet which allowed people to comment on comments  
23 because everybody got to see the other person's comments.

24 And we did that for a two- or three-week  
25 period, and that was the feedback we brought back to PTAC

1 to see did those five items flesh out well, did they not  
2 flesh out well, what was the feedback. But it was kind of  
3 focused on five items versus throwing up a long list or  
4 throwing it out just to a specific group, we tried to  
5 target everybody. And we did target different times of  
6 the day because we had county judges also participating,  
7 and some board members as well, to reach out to those  
8 folks we don't normally get to talk to.

9 I would advocate that might be something we  
10 could do. Again, I'm a big fan of SurveyMonkey, but our  
11 problem with that, if we distribute it on an email  
12 distribution list, I don't know if our email distribution  
13 list is that widespread other than the traditional  
14 providers that we always give money to.

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: But anybody that gets money  
16 from TxDOT, whether it be a traditional or non-traditional  
17 provider, has an email address. Right? I mean, we all  
18 have to communicate via email.

19 MS. BLOOMER: But we're trying to get it out  
20 not just to the folks that receive money, we want it to go  
21 even further, to the folks that are involved in our  
22 regional coordination activities, our stakeholders, our  
23 users, partner agencies.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Well, but so you have lists of  
25 those folks and those folks have their own lists, and if

1 you position it as a bounce this to your folks message,  
2 then everybody should be treeing or rooting, whichever it  
3 is, that out to a much wider list than you have. Put a  
4 prize, you know, you get an iPad for the person that  
5 brings the most people in to respond for this survey, give  
6 everybody an ID code. You don't have to, but it's easy to  
7 get the survey bounced around, and what the survey  
8 electronically can do is get you thousands of responses  
9 tabulated easily rather than the maybe hundreds that you'd  
10 get in meetings.

11 MS. BLOOMER: And I think you can sort of do  
12 the thought of the workshops throughout the state and in  
13 the hinterlands you can sort of do that online with the  
14 dialogue idea without actually physically having to go  
15 there, and anybody that knows about it, so it would be how  
16 you get the word out, can participate in the dialogue.

17 But is the purpose of this to come up with the  
18 core concepts to administer each program, is that what  
19 we're thinking, versus the detail of what changes we might  
20 make?

21 MR. KILLEBREW: And that was our thought this  
22 whole time, we're going to have to whittle down this list  
23 to those core areas or those core thoughts that we're  
24 thinking about on these programs, and not necessarily pull  
25 out the Administrative Code and say line by line, word by

1 word this is what we need to change. Some people can do  
2 that, some people can't do that, some people just say,  
3 Well, I just know this needs to change because of this.  
4 So they can talk in a global perspective but they wouldn't  
5 be able to iterate exactly in the code what to change, nor  
6 would we expect them to.

7 The good thing about SurveyMonkey it does  
8 tabulate, the one downside is you can't solicit just like  
9 a text box and say give me your thoughts because that  
10 makes the tabulation kind of a moot issue.

11 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm not arguing for  
12 SurveyMonkey or any particular technology, but it seems to  
13 me that there are three, four, five issues, transition in  
14 how that happens, priorities, performance measures,  
15 whatever they are for 5310, and what you want to be able  
16 to do is give your comments or concerns or a way you'd  
17 like to see this settled out, and then a way to vote on  
18 those. And you can even do it the way South by Southwest  
19 does their panels: now send around all your friends  
20 telling them to vote for your idea. Right? And it works  
21 amazingly well, because J.R. thinks he's brilliant and  
22 he's going to make sure all of his friends vote for his  
23 suggestion. Right?

24 So that then gets the bounce, but you just need  
25 those three steps: here are the big issue categories,

1 give us your ideas, now here's a way to vote on them.

2 Whatever technology you want to use, I'm agnostic.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: My only issue is I want us to  
4 keep momentum going and I'm afraid that if we were to say  
5 let's make a seven or eight stop around the state and do  
6 public meetings, we're looking at least a couple of  
7 months, then to bring those back, then let's kind of  
8 decipher what we said around the state, and I think we'd  
9 be sitting here in June going we really don't have any  
10 further than what we are except now we have more comments  
11 here.

12 I like a tool like SurveyMonkey because I can  
13 look at statistics: 70 percent of people like this, 10  
14 percent of people like this. When I'm given a list like  
15 this and go hey, Brad, what do you want to do, I'm a lot  
16 more apt to go I'm going to where the weight of it. I  
17 don't think we're going to please everybody. Everyone is  
18 getting less money, if you're a rural or small urban  
19 provider, you're getting less money, and I'm more for  
20 leveraging existing resources, not bringing in more  
21 resources to do different services.

22 And so for me, when I look at this list, it's  
23 pretty exhaustive, but you're right, not everyone was  
24 there, and I think there may be other comments we may be  
25 missing, but it seems like out of all of these things that

1 we have identified, to me, it could be that people should  
2 at least be able to go nothing on here is what I think.  
3 That's kind of far-fetched for me, I guess, unless it's  
4 like let's just do away with the whole program. I mean,  
5 you know, it's pretty much what I see. I just want to  
6 make sure that we're keeping -- I think our job here is to  
7 keep momentum and make the best decisions for the entire  
8 state, and I don't think we're doing that job if by June a  
9 provider that's been used to getting 5310 shows up and  
10 goes when do I get my 2013 5310? Oh, guess what, you  
11 don't. We can't plan a program that way.

12 MR. GADBOIS: It's not just keep momentum  
13 going, there's some urgency of need.

14 MR. UNDERWOOD: At least in 5310 because it is  
15 so different, and I don't know that people see that yet.  
16 I think people at the meeting didn't even see that so now  
17 they go you realize that you're not going to get \$90,000  
18 like you got last year, there's not that much money in it.

19 MS. BLOOMER: I don't think people realize that  
20 and I don't think folks in the large urbanized areas  
21 realize that they won't be getting their fiscal year 2013  
22 money anytime soon until the designated recipient issue is  
23 resolved because we're how many months into the 2013  
24 fiscal year.

25 And so I think part of the issue goes if we

1 could lay out -- and Eric listed off some of them, that  
2 sort of continuity of service, do we agree that continuity  
3 of service is a priority, and people can say I agree or I  
4 don't agree, and then we can move forward with the details  
5 of changes to the administrative rules based on those core  
6 principles, not how this change impacts this provider  
7 versus that provider. If we all agree that continuity of  
8 service, that we all agree performance measurements are  
9 important and should be factored in, and then leave it at  
10 that, and then we can get into the detail of, well, is it  
11 49 percent or 52 percent.

12           And do we all agree that a provider shouldn't  
13 be penalized if they're moving in a direction that  
14 everyone agrees is beneficial. You know, if it  
15 transitions from one provider to another, you shouldn't be  
16 penalized if that's the right thing to do, because we  
17 don't want to incentivize providers not to do the right  
18 thing because it's going to lower their performance and  
19 decrease their funding. If we should consolidate, we  
20 should consolidate, we shouldn't not consolidate because  
21 we'll get less money.

22           MR. UNDERWOOD: Let me ask this. This is kind  
23 of an ignorant question on my part. We adopt a rulemaking  
24 in the TAC, does that affect the large urbans? Because  
25 they're direct recipients from FTA now. Correct?

1           MR. KILLEBREW: You're talking about the 5310  
2 program. The 5310 program for the large urbans would not  
3 be in our Administrative Code. If they ask us to act as a  
4 designated recipient on their behalf, that would not be a  
5 provision we'd put in our Administrative Code. Quite  
6 frankly, on the ones that are considering to ask us, we'll  
7 be over and done with by the time we even get to a  
8 rulemaking process.

9           MR. UNDERWOOD: My point to that, Michelle, you  
10 were talking about the continuity of service, was we  
11 agree, yes, we should have continuity of service and so  
12 we'll say: Hey, guess what, large urban, we agree with  
13 continuity of service. I can think of at least a couple  
14 that will go: Thanks, appreciate the advice, but we've  
15 got our own way of doing it. You know what I'm saying?

16           MR. KILLEBREW: If I may, we did have a webinar  
17 specifically for the large urbans for the 5310 designated  
18 recipient status. Most of them participated or had their  
19 staff participate so they're aware of this. FTA was on  
20 that webinar as well, they also participated with us.  
21 They're also aware of our program of projects that we've  
22 already selected for this year, we made that available to  
23 them, they can use that program of projects for continuity  
24 of service, and they do not have to have a project  
25 management plan in place, they can take ours and still

1 award those projects.

2 We are meeting with every large MPO  
3 individually to talk about this to see if there's  
4 something unique about their situation that we've not been  
5 able to assist them with that we can make sure they do  
6 carry out what's necessary, just like we're meeting with  
7 every small 5307 systems to do the direct recipient status  
8 individually now, including all the prior meetings we've  
9 already had with them. So we're doing every effort we  
10 possibly can to make sure that someone doesn't drop the  
11 ball, so we are doing that as diligently as possible.

12 So I think continuity of service, at least from  
13 the selection of project perspective, they can continue  
14 with the projects they've already selected by TxDOT, even  
15 in those large urbanized areas. Now, there may be some  
16 MPOs that actually, you know, may say thank you, but no  
17 thanks. That is their discretion because it's one of our  
18 government managed programs.

19 MS. BLOOMER: But I think the issue of  
20 continuity of service is coming from the state-  
21 administered programs. It obviously applies in the large  
22 urban, but TxDOT doesn't administer those, so we would be  
23 speaking of continuity of service within the small urban  
24 and rural, given we now have this much money and how do we  
25 maintain continuity of service.

1           MR. GADBOIS: I would actually hope to frame  
2 our questions that we would ask more broadly than that  
3 because I actually think information is power. Even if  
4 we're not looking at rulemaking or we're using the  
5 information to decide whether there's a need for  
6 rulemaking, the MPOs and the large metro areas may look at  
7 that information and say, well, yes, we need to consider  
8 that because we've gotten so much response suggesting  
9 that's a really important issue. Right? So it doesn't  
10 have to just be about rulemaking.

11           MS. BLOOMER: And I think that goes to --  
12 sorry -- go ahead, Rob.

13           MR. STEPHENS: I didn't say anything, I'm  
14 listening.

15           MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think it goes back to a  
16 continuing conversation we've been having at the PTAC  
17 level of sort of a statewide strategic plan of do we think  
18 public transportation in the State of Texas should look  
19 like, and what are sort of those guiding principles that  
20 we don't really have. And so maybe that can be part of  
21 that discussion of setting that larger framework to then  
22 get down to more detail.

23           So Bobby, what do you want from us at the end  
24 of this meeting to move forward?

25           MR. GADBOIS: Can I make one suggestion to you?

1       And I think this group will be okay with it.  If you want  
2       to do some kind of polling, surveying, understanding  
3       better these five issues, and you want our help in  
4       reviewing, I would think we would be happy in looking at  
5       that by email and shooting you directly back a response,  
6       or whoever is in charge of it so that we don't disrupt our  
7       Open Meetings Act.  But I would think we're all very happy  
8       to review it; we obviously have some thoughts about it.

9               MS. BLOOMER:  But I think our biggest concern,  
10       at least I agree with Brad, is sort of the momentum and  
11       maintaining the momentum, maintaining the level of  
12       communication and coordination.  I think it's been  
13       excellent.

14              MR. UNDERWOOD:  Well, and just from a personal  
15       standpoint, how many of us adopted budgets for 2013 back  
16       in August or July, and under funding sources that you list  
17       as revenue you put 5310, traditionally what you could  
18       expect.  How many agencies have got that in their budget  
19       not knowing that you probably aren't going to get that  
20       this year, and are you aware of that?  I mean, as you're  
21       moving down that track, to me, I think we've got an  
22       obligation to do something expedient to at least correct  
23       the 5310 program.

24              MR. KILLEBREW:  Michelle, to your question of  
25       what might be expected of today's meeting, what I was

1 hoping for today is as we look at the list and the  
2 comments we received so far, obviously we've got to pare  
3 down the list, and I think you're right on track, the  
4 committee is right on track, we need to name three to  
5 five, perhaps, items per program, if appropriate, that we  
6 need to toss back out to the industry at large to get an  
7 additional round of feedback, and I do agree the momentum  
8 needs to continue because we don't want to lose that.

9           What we would like to have help with is to  
10 identify those three to five items, you know, again  
11 probably looking at these most critical programs we've  
12 kind of put front and center of the committee, knowing  
13 that, yes, there are definition changes that were brought  
14 about in MAP-21, we can handle definition changes, we've  
15 got some other little cleanup things that we can handle,  
16 but these are really the most critical ones that we  
17 probably need to have some assistance with.

18           How the committee wants to give us that  
19 feedback, yes, I prefer to have it as a committee giving  
20 us the feedback as opposed to throwing something back at  
21 you, but however I can get that feedback would be great.

22           MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, Michelle, it's 2:35, can  
23 we maybe take a ten-minute intermission or comfort break  
24 and have a better chance to digest some of these? And  
25 come back and pick this up and maybe give some feedback.

1 Would that be possible?

2 MS. BLOOMER: A ten-minute break would put us  
3 back here at 2:45.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Would that be okay?

5 MS. BLOOMER: Can we take a five-minute comfort  
6 break?

7 MR. STEPHENS: I vote yes, five minutes.

8 MS. BLOOMER: We have a motion and informal  
9 second. We'll take a five-minute comfort break which puts  
10 us back at 2:40.

11 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

12 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. We're going to  
13 go ahead and reconvene the meeting. Are you with us? We  
14 still have a quorum, so we'll go ahead.

15 MR. GADBOIS: So in going through this list on  
16 5310, I see four issues at least: transition and how  
17 transition happens, which I put under that coordination,  
18 cooperation between rural and metro, how that might  
19 happen; priorities, are there statewide priorities, and if  
20 so, what, are there metro priorities, are there regional  
21 priorities; partnerships seems to be a big issue with some  
22 people and how those work out; and then just generally  
23 funding issues. Those are kind of the issue groupings  
24 that are pretty straightforward here.

25 MR. STEPHENS: We're back on?

1 MS. BLOOMER: We're back on. We just made a  
2 decision, you missed it.

3 (General laughter.)

4 MS. BLOOMER: What we're doing is we're going  
5 to take each program and run through them and have each  
6 member give their top one area of concern related to that.  
7 Bobby is going to take all of those, sort of consolidate  
8 them for each program, listing the top four to five areas  
9 we think we need to address, and then shoot those back out  
10 individually to each PTAC member, and then we can go from  
11 there to put more detail to those core or key areas. So  
12 right now we're walking through the 5310 program, and if  
13 there's any burning issue related to that that you would  
14 like to see addressed as part of this process, think about  
15 that, and we're moving on to Brad.

16 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Brad.

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: Under the 5310 program, and I  
19 need to pick one off this page. Is that correct?

20 MS. BLOOMER: No, it doesn't have to be off  
21 this page.

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay, Glenn talked, what's his?

23 MS. BLOOMER: Transition, coordination,  
24 priorities, partnerships and funding issues.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: I think it's funding issues for

1 me. Are we voting or just add to that?

2 MS. BLOOMER: No. We're just adding.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: Just adding. Okay.

4 MR. GADBOIS: So if you've got something  
5 besides those.

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: Mine is funding issues, which  
7 allocation probably falls underneath that as far as how  
8 we're determining the funds are being allocated, the  
9 process in which they're being allocated, and then to me,  
10 we should evaluate whether this should be a statewide  
11 piece or keep this at the local level. And that may all  
12 fall under funding, I guess it could, but that's my  
13 biggest issue.

14 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. J.R.

15 MR. SALAZAR: I agree with Brad, I think it's  
16 the funding issue, and the thing that I -- I know I'm  
17 going to take some flack over this -- the process of  
18 eligibility when it comes to seniors, and obviously those  
19 people with disabilities qualify under ADA and a fixed  
20 route system, and I understand that, but just because  
21 you're a senior doesn't necessarily qualify you for  
22 service in a lot of the service area, and so I think that  
23 that needs to be looked at.

24 And to just give you an example, the system  
25 that I run, everybody qualifies, it doesn't matter if

1 you're 85 or makes no difference, but that is a big  
2 difference in the State of Texas, and so just because  
3 you're in an urbanized area doesn't mean that you're going  
4 to get service.

5 MR. GADBOIS: So eligibility, you're adding an  
6 item.

7 MR. SALAZAR: Right.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Rob?

9 MR. STEPHENS: I agree with all of my  
10 colleagues. I don't know if planning, enhanced planning  
11 features, something a little more substantial. I mean,  
12 there are some significant changes in these programs,  
13 there's additional monies here. I don't know if we're  
14 already down to the recipient level. This influx of  
15 funding that's coming in, I think there should be an  
16 enhanced element for planning, how are you going to spend  
17 those funds, either how are you going to deal with not  
18 having them, or how are you going to deal with having a  
19 lot more of them. That's my take.

20 Process and priorities are the other two areas,  
21 you know, institutionalizing a process that makes sense.  
22 Some of the process works for some folks, some groups love  
23 it and some don't. I mean, I can give you lots of  
24 examples of how that's all taken place, where it works for  
25 some people and where it doesn't work for others, so I

1 think maybe some attention to process, how we administer  
2 these programs, and then establishing priorities, how do  
3 we do that, how do we filter through and get down to the  
4 core of what we need to be doing and how are we going to  
5 do it.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, if I could add one  
8 more. It may be listed under funding, it may not, but one  
9 that's a very big one for me is leveraging our existing  
10 resources. I think that's got to be huge. Now that  
11 there's a funding shortage, or less than what we've been  
12 accustomed to, we've got to make that a priority. So that  
13 may fall under eligibility or duplication of service, but  
14 it's all about, to me, leveraging existing resources.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. You've had your three to  
16 five.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm sorry.

18 MS. BLOOMER: You took one of mine. I only  
19 have two: leveraging existing resources --

20 MR. GADBOIS: Sorry, we're out of time on this  
21 item.

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: CEOs use different math than  
23 most people, you said three; I heard seven.

24 (General laughter.)

25 MS. BLOOMER: -- leveraging existing resources,

1 and then I think it's also very important to support the  
2 leveraging existing resources is that there has to be some  
3 link back to the regional coordination plan. So those are  
4 my two big ones. And I completely agree with Brad on the  
5 funding issue and some of the other, but I think big two:  
6 leveraging existing resources, and then how it links back  
7 to coordination.

8 Okay, 5311.

9 MR. GADBOIS: You can go first this time.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, we'll let J.R. go first.

11 MR. SALAZAR: I think if I had to choose one,  
12 right off the top I'd choose the intercity bus, setting  
13 aside some funds for rural transit districts being the  
14 fact that the intercity bus people are cutting routes  
15 throughout the state and they're focusing in on the  
16 Dallas-Fort Worth-Austin area, and so that's one that I  
17 think needs to be looked at.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Is that allocation issues, or  
19 what's a way to broadly label that category?

20 MR. SALAZAR: I think that we talked about  
21 allocation process.

22 MR. KILLEBREW: You're talking about the  
23 comment that was raised at the semiannual -- no, it was  
24 the workshop, I believe.

25 MR. SALAZAR: It was at the workshop.

1 MR. KILLEBREW: And I caught the tail-end of  
2 that. The 15 percent set-aside for intercity bus is a  
3 federal statutory requirement, so that has to be done, but  
4 how those funds are assigned to projects, I believe the  
5 comment was that doesn't necessarily mean the funds have  
6 to go to an intercity bus provider, it has to go to  
7 intercity bus projects. And with some of the rural  
8 transit providers providing inter-lining and feeder  
9 service, the project funds should be just as eligible for  
10 those type of projects as to go to a provider like  
11 Greyhound.

12 MR. GADBOIS: And thank you for the  
13 explanation. To stay within the five minutes, I was just  
14 looking for a label. What do we call that category?

15 MR. KILLEBREW: Allocation.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Next.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes. Mine would have to be the  
18 formula, I guess you'd call it under formula. The  
19 majority of people that I was in meetings with and other  
20 brothers and sisters around the state I've spoken to  
21 really don't want it changed, and so it's my opinion that  
22 we need to leave it alone for 5311.

23 MR. SALAZAR: I second that.

24 MS. BLOOMER: J.R.

25 MR. GADBOIS: So allocation issues; formula

1 changes, do we need them or not and what do they look  
2 like. The two others I have: regional coordination and  
3 performance measures.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Rob?

5 MR. STEPHENS: I would have to kind of align  
6 with my colleagues. J.R., with intercity bus, I think we  
7 need to take a look at that. I'd like to see it opened  
8 up, as well, to other, maybe even an urban provider could  
9 be an eligible recipient of these funds if they've got an  
10 eligible rural project, because in some areas like West  
11 Texas, there may not be a rural provider that wants to do  
12 that. So I mean, I think leave it alone for the most part  
13 and focus on maybe the intercity bus factor, the  
14 allocation.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then Michelle, I have  
16 the two issues Eric mentioned, the sort of multi-year  
17 planning which I think goes back to performance measures,  
18 as well as sort of the unintended consequence issue. We  
19 should be encouraging folks to do the right thing and not  
20 necessarily taking into account how that impacts their  
21 performance, but I think there's a lot that we can do  
22 around performance measures.

23 If there are no other comments, moving on to  
24 Section 5326, transit asset management, and Section 5329,  
25 safety. Does anybody have any burning? These are the two

1 new sections that have compliance requirements attached to  
2 them but not necessarily any additional funding.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: That's correct, these programs  
4 do not come with funding, and FTA has not issued any  
5 guidance on these two programs other than what's in the  
6 federal legislation.

7 MR. GADBOIS: 5326, 5329 is what we're talking  
8 about.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. And I think what we heard a  
10 lot, we don't have a whole lot of guidance on these, but  
11 FTA has instructed the state sort of to not wait to move  
12 out, and a lot of the discussion at the semiannual meeting  
13 on these topics specifically, as well as other things, is  
14 let's sort of use what's already out there, do we have  
15 best practices, let's make them available to the industry.

16 So I think that would be the focus there is coming up  
17 with best practices, templates, et cetera, so not every  
18 rural or small urban transit district has to recreate the  
19 wheel.

20 MR. SALAZAR: I agree with that, and I think  
21 there was a conversation about the metropolitan people  
22 kind of helping us out on that, because I think a lot of  
23 them have some of this stuff that can apply to some of the  
24 smaller systems, so I agree.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: Can we say make Bobby do a

1 webinar?

2 MR. KILLEBREW: Sure, you can say that.

3 (General laughter.)

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: I just think we ought to learn  
5 from one another on this and do what we've got to do.

6 MR. SALAZAR: And especially since they haven't  
7 provided guidance for this.

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: I think one thing, in  
9 seriousness, about the transit asset management that  
10 really needs to be understood, and I think you've said it  
11 at semiannuals and I think we've talked about it on  
12 webinars under MAP-21, but there again, I think it's until  
13 they see it are they going to believe it. There is no  
14 more 5309, there is no more state of good repair. You  
15 have got to be responsible for replacing your fleet and  
16 running your business. I still think people don't get  
17 that.

18 MR. STEPHENS: That's a scary thought right  
19 there.

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: They think ARRA is coming back  
21 around, magic money out of the sky.

22 MR. SALAZAR: Well, and then to tap into what  
23 Brad is saying, how many people do you really think are  
24 doing that, Bobby? I mean, most of us are just using that  
25 for operating.

1 MR. UNDERWOOD: You're talking about revenue  
2 mile?

3 MR. SALAZAR: No. I'm talking about -- yes.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: I think it just needs to be  
5 understood, and I think that might be a valuable point  
6 about transit asset management plan is recognizing you  
7 have a plan now, if you're not following it, you're not  
8 following your plan. I think that might be the most  
9 valuable tool in that to make people understand: you're  
10 getting revenue mile, about three times the amount you've  
11 received, or twice the amount you've normally received in  
12 the past, you need to be responsible and do something with  
13 it.

14 MR. STEPHENS: Yes. That should probably be  
15 programmed for vehicle replacement or future vehicle  
16 replacement.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: But I don't advocate enforcing  
18 that, but I think it should be acknowledged that hey,  
19 there's no more money coming.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So I see or hear four kind  
21 of issue categories: best practices, what are people  
22 doing; criteria, there seems to be expression of need for  
23 clear criteria; performance measures; and plan  
24 development, how do you develop the plans for both asset  
25 management and safety.

1 MS. BLOOMER: And then how do you link that  
2 plan to your day-to-day operations. There's no use in  
3 having a transit asset management plan if it's just file,  
4 save as, and gets shelved. It should go into your funding  
5 decisions, your budgets and how do you use that.

6 MR. STEPHENS: As a 5307 operator, we already  
7 have to have a safety and security plan and we would have  
8 to certify annually that we're spending 1 percent of our  
9 apportionment to safety and security, to explain that in  
10 the grant administering process. So I mean, we can use  
11 some guidance and practices that are already out there for  
12 that one. We could do the same thing in the transit asset  
13 management plan, we could have providers certify they're  
14 doing something or allocating some portion of their  
15 funding, whatever, you determine a percentage or you  
16 determine some other way to figure that out, but have them  
17 certify they're using that to take care of asset  
18 management needs. That's just my opinion.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Moving on to Section 5339,  
20 bus and bus facilities, this is the \$1.2 million the state  
21 will get to address vehicle needs. Correct?

22 MR. KILLEBREW: There's two pots in this  
23 program as well: there's the rural pot which is the \$1.25  
24 million, and then there's the small urban pot which the  
25 small urban pot is going to be estimated to be about \$3.6

1 million or so, almost \$3.7 million. There's actually  
2 three pots, the large urbans get theirs directly, but for  
3 the State of Texas administered program, the small urban  
4 pot is about \$3.7 million and \$1.25 million for the rural  
5 program.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Does anybody have burning  
7 suggestions on how to address, or maybe back to Brad's  
8 comment on the asset management is now you're getting a  
9 lot more vehicle revenue miles, but again, we have the  
10 question of how do we distribute -- I think the big  
11 question is how do we distribute the funding, knowing it's  
12 not enough to formula allocate it to everybody because  
13 you'll get a third of a bus every year.

14 MR. UNDERWOOD: We could use that money to hire  
15 lobbyists to see if we could get more money. Is that not  
16 a good idea? It's just a joke.

17 (General laughter.)

18 MR. SALAZAR: Is there any way that the FTA is  
19 going reconsider? I think the answer to the question is  
20 no, but sometimes we look and we see that we did things  
21 wrong, and I mean, this to me just doesn't make any sense  
22 whatsoever. Is there any chance that FTA will look at  
23 that?

24 MR. KILLEBREW: I don't think this is in FTA's  
25 hands, I think this is a federal statutory fix that's

1 going to require an act of congress and the president to  
2 get this done.

3 MS. BLOOMER: So I think there's work the  
4 industry has to do outside of PTAC to address this issue.  
5 Our concern is this is what we have, knowing the needs,  
6 how do we best --

7 MR. GADBOIS: So is the issue distribution  
8 priorities, how do you prioritize distribution?

9 MS. BLOOMER: I mean, one of the comments on  
10 here was at the end TxDOT asked about facilities and the  
11 response was there wasn't enough money to go around to  
12 build facilities. It's for vehicles and for facilities.  
13 Do we want to try to take the money and spread it across  
14 because I think it's part of an allocation?

15 MR. STEPHENS: On the rural side what can you  
16 do with \$1.2- statewide?

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: Isn't it about \$30,000, Kelly,  
18 \$32,000?

19 MR. KIRKLAND: If it's equally divided.

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: If it's equally divided, the  
21 way that it would set up would be \$32,000 apiece.

22 MS. BLOOMER: So I mean, I think that gets back  
23 to not to solve the problem today but back to our biggest  
24 issue is going to be how do we allocate those funds and  
25 what are our options. There's a couple of options on here

1 that folks laid out, but really sort of coming up with  
2 maybe one to two options of how we can possibly do it.

3 MR. STEPHENS: It's either going to be formula,  
4 discretionary or competitive. Right?

5 MS. BLOOMER: I think those are the three  
6 options.

7 MR. STEPHENS: Those are three options, so what  
8 does everybody like? I mean, does a formula sound like  
9 it's going to work?

10 MS. BLOOMER: I mean, I think that's something  
11 we should probably go and throw out to the industry.

12 MR. GADBOIS: We're just advising on the way we  
13 ought to ask questions of the industry, not voting on what  
14 we want to see happen.

15 MS. BLOOMER: So probably the biggest is  
16 allocation, and then I guess it goes under allocation,  
17 split, is it 100 percent vehicles, or given you're getting  
18 a bunch more revenue vehicle miles, take care of your  
19 vehicles, combine that money, does it all go in there, or  
20 do we want to set aside more commission discretionary  
21 money and address the vehicle issue, or do it with your  
22 5311 money, your 5310 money. So I think the biggie is  
23 going to be allocation.

24 MR. KILLEBREW: I might also add that it's not  
25 necessarily for new purchases, it can also be used for

1 rehab and rehabilitation.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Does that take care of all of  
3 them, Bobby?

4 MR. GADBOIS: Sufficient guidance?

5 MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you for the feedback.  
6 You'll be getting an email from me, hopefully soon. Some  
7 of you may get more emails than others.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Let's not lose momentum here.

9 MS. BLOOMER: I think the other issue too, to  
10 get back to the momentum issue, is putting together a  
11 timeline of how we're going to keep this moving, both with  
12 the conversation with the industry and the stakeholders,  
13 and then just so we know where we're going so another two  
14 months or three months don't lapse and we're back here  
15 again as PTAC with the same issue of where do we go now.

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: So you want to talk about a  
17 time frame?

18 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. I'd like to see a time  
19 frame.

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: Bobby, what's realistic?

21 MR. GADBOIS: Can we give him a little time,  
22 and he could always put this in an email?

23 MS. BLOOMER: I'm thinking as part of the  
24 here's the three or four to six, here is a recommended  
25 timeline or how we see this progressing to meet our

1 concerns of maintaining the momentum.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: And this is Bobby. What I  
3 understand is you want to continue the dialogue and that's  
4 going to probably happen in different phases. One of the  
5 phases is the SurveyMonkey tool or an internet type  
6 conversations we will have with transit providers and so  
7 forth. I think some of those things are doable within the  
8 next month to continue that. Obviously, to get this group  
9 back together for another group discussion, we'll need to  
10 talk about that as well, because I think that may be the  
11 next piece that you want to see is the feedback from that  
12 first phase, and then what other phases we need to enter  
13 into. So I think we can keep the momentum going. I would  
14 say if I can promise a month and a half maybe to hopefully  
15 get us back together as a group. I'm getting some nods.

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: That's good.

17 MR. KILLEBREW: I'm sure Rob is giving me a nod  
18 even though I can't see him. I'll get Rebecca to work on  
19 that then. And if the members don't mind if I communicate  
20 with them individually as well, and I know one member is  
21 at least local, maybe I can really pick on him.

22 MR. GADBOIS: I'm happy to. You can even use  
23 my electronic survey account.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other discussion on  
25 MAP-21?

1 (No response.)

2 MS. BLOOMER: On to agenda item 7, any  
3 particular or specific conversation regarding the PTAC  
4 work plan and update of current activities? I think we've  
5 covered it all in the above items.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Did I miss it in the email, was  
7 there a work plan in the email?

8 MS. BLOOMER: No. It's our strategies, you're  
9 on a work group, you're working on 1 and 2, and work group  
10 2 is working on 2 and 3.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. The way you said that, I  
12 just thought I missed it.

13 MS. BLOOMER: You didn't read our 100-page work  
14 plan, Glenn?

15 The one question I did want to bring up, part  
16 of the review and discussion -- and I have heard from a  
17 number of PTAC members, and I think part of this is  
18 maintaining the momentum and continuing to move activities  
19 forward and have outputs and products is very important,  
20 and I think we all feel that.

21 One question I had is our meetings have in the  
22 past been sort of scheduled ad hoc, as needed, we can go  
23 one month, we can go three months. Is there any desire of  
24 the committee to maybe set up a more consistent schedule?

25 A lot of folks, because the meetings are scheduled ad

1       hoc, have already made commitments and can't attend  
2       because we're three weeks out in trying to schedule a  
3       meeting. Do we want to look at trying to set a schedule  
4       of we'll have at least one meeting every quarter, it will  
5       be a certain day, third day of the month or third  
6       Wednesday, or something to that effect, or do we want to  
7       continue as we've been going sort of meeting to meeting?

8               MR. UNDERWOOD: I think that's difficult to do  
9       with MAP-21 right now until we get some things moving in  
10      our direction. If we say we're going to meet again in the  
11      second quarter, I think we've missed the ship at that  
12      point.

13             MS. BLOOMER: Right. Well, we have the  
14      flexibility to meet more within that, but my goal would be  
15      to have in-person meetings no less than four times a year,  
16      and then we can have conference calls in between and/or  
17      in-person meetings in addition to that, but at a minimum  
18      we know these would be set meetings. But we know in about  
19      a month and a half we're looking at another meeting.

20             MR. GADBOIS: So I'm good with setting a  
21      standing meeting date, the third Wednesday, whatever it  
22      is, as long as we all agree that either than can be  
23      changed or we understand that we may set another meeting  
24      based on the urgency of workload. But getting something  
25      on the calendar on a regular basis will be helpful to some

1 members.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So Bobby, can we maybe  
3 look into and line up the next meeting about a month and a  
4 half would be the next cycle and then where would we go  
5 from there, so we can start to plan our schedules out.

6 My concern is we all have other jobs or lives  
7 and trying to make sure we can be here for these important  
8 conversations, as long as we know when they are, we can  
9 plan for them, and if something comes up, we have that  
10 option to make that choice if we attend or not based on  
11 what that other commitment is, versus now sometimes you  
12 already have another commitment and this meeting has been  
13 scheduled and you don't have that flexibility.

14 So if we can start looking at, what would a  
15 month and a half be, middle of March, let's say mid to  
16 late March, and then where would we go from there in order  
17 to keep this dialogue going, with the understanding that  
18 if we need to either have an in-person or conference call  
19 meeting in the interim, we have that flexibility to do  
20 that as well.

21 And just because we have a meeting doesn't mean  
22 if we have nothing to discuss that we all have to drive  
23 here to have the meeting, but that we would at least have  
24 it on our calendar as a standing date.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: If I may ask, does anybody have

1 standing meetings that would be in conflict now that you  
2 can let me know about before I ask Rebecca to do a poll?

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: My board meetings are the  
4 second Wednesday.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Fourth Friday of every month.

6 MS. BLOOMER: I think it would probably be  
7 easier to have us shoot Rebecca that information.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Well, actually Thursday  
9 afternoons or Friday mornings, but otherwise I'm good, so  
10 stay on Wednesday and we're good.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: Except for Brad's Wednesday.

12 MR. UNDERWOOD: Second Wednesday.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: I wrote down third Wednesday,  
14 and I'm avoiding our commission meeting as well.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Do we have any public comment  
16 today?

17 (No response.)

18 MS. BLOOMER: None, and we already discussed  
19 the next meeting date. We'll look about a month and a  
20 half out, so if we can try to keep our calendars as open  
21 as possible mid to late March, that would be good.

22 Are there any other items for discussion?

23 MR. GADBOIS: Move to adjourn.

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: Second.

25 MS. BLOOMER: All those in favor?

1 (A chorus of ayes.)  
2 MS. BLOOMER: Anybody opposed?  
3 (No response.)  
4 MS. BLOOMER: Meeting adjourned.  
5 (Whereupon, at 3:09 p.m., the meeting was  
6 concluded.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: Public Transportation Advisory Committee

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: January 23, 2013

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 92, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Transportation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Transcriber) 01/23/2013  
(Date)

On the Record Reporting  
3636 Executive Ctr Dr., G-22  
Austin, Texas 78731