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MS. BLOOMER: All right. We have a quorum, so we'll go ahead and call the Public Transportation Advisory Committee meeting to order. The second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the November 26, 2013 meeting. Do I have a motion? Oh, sorry, Bobby. We'll do this first, then we'll go back.

Do I have a motion for approval of the minutes?

MR. GADBOIS: So moved.

MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion.

MR. SALAZAR: Second.

MS. BLOOMER: And a second. All those in favor? Aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

MS. BLOOMER: The motion passes. I'm going to turn the meeting back over to Bobby. I apologize. I forgot and wanted to get straight to business, but Bobby's going to go ahead and give us our safety briefing today.

MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you, Michelle.

For the record, Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Director Public Transportation Division at TxDOT. This is not on your agenda today, members, but a quick safety briefing for this building. We are having construction in this building and the contractor has already very recently knocked into the lines on the fire system and set the fire alarms off.
MR. GADBOIS: Very good.

MR. KILLEBREW: So, let me give a safety briefing.

And by the way, in future meetings we're going to add this as a standing item on the agenda because we do have the public as well as yourselves in our buildings and we want you to be safe while you're here.

But today, should the fire system be activated, we need to evacuate the building, there's three exits on this floor that we can head to, and I'm going to be pointing, so the elevators what you came up on is a stairwell, right beside the elevators; just to the south side of the building across from the elevators if you were to work on the other side of the building there's another stairwell over here, and to our east over here is a third stairwell. Any of those stairwells are probably equidistance from this room. The safest, closest stairwell would be what we use to evacuate.

We'll actually go out towards the back of the building, the south parking lot, and we'll congregate there and wait further instructions. There will be folks dressed in safety vests and flashlights to assist, so if you see someone and you need assistance in an evacuation, certainly contact one of them or you can follow some of us TxDOT people straight out of the room and we'll certainly help you the best we can.

So if there's no questions, appreciate you listening.
MR. UNDERWOOD: What if the cabin pressure changes. Oxygen's not provided.

MR. KILLEBREW: Could someone check what Brad has in his bottle over there.

MR. GADBOIS: This is why they separated us.

MR. UNDERWOOD: That's exactly right, Glenn.

MR. GLEASON: I will take care of my system first and then I will assist those who need assistance.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you. Moving on to Item 3, Division Director's report.

MR. GLEASON: All right. For the record, my name is Eric Gleason, Division Director of Public Transportation. The Director's report, members, that you have is fairly straightforward today. We're into kind of a low activity time with items for the Commission.

This February the Commission is in Laredo, later this week. There is one item on the agenda that will be distribution of transportation development credits to both Corpus Christi and VIA in San Antonio. This will help them support their fiscal year '13 §5310 program of projects. Under the new MAP-21 they are the designated recipient for that program in their area.

We are expecting federal apportionments --

(Pause for construction noise)

MR. GLEASON: Anyways, later this week, sometime next
week, is when we expect to receive fiscal year '14 federal apportionments.

Most of you know, Executive Director Phil Wilson, former Executive Director Phil Wilson, has taken another job. He's working for the Lower Colorado River Authority, which I understand CARTS has a relationship with respect to their communication system, so I expect you all to continue on that relationship with former Executive Director Wilson.

And Scott Haywood as well has tendered his resignation. We are in to MAP-21 program implementation. We've had a statewide effort on the 5310 program on the way. Most of you or many of you have been engaged in that in your area locally. And then finally, continuing to sort of follow the safety and asset management conversation at the federal level, as rules for those programs come forward. So that is my report.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions for Eric?

MR. GADBOIS: Hopefully just a quick one. So we -- we talked about having sustained level of commitment on the development credits towards transit.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Do we get any sort of tracking as to, you know, how that's tracking?

MR. GLEASON: Yes. We do. We --

MR. GADBOIS: Y'all do; do we?
MR. GLEASON: -- track that -- do you? No, you have not gotten that yet. Would you like to receive that as part of an update?

MR. GADBOIS: Please.
MR. GLEASON: All right.
MR. GADBOIS: I'd love to.
MR. GLEASON: We will add that to our list, yes.
MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, to clarify, San Antonio, the MPO doesn't have any toll credits?
MR. GLEASON: That is correct.
MR. GADBOIS: They don't generate any.
MR. GLEASON: Yeah.
MS. BLOOMER: They don't generate any, so they don't go to MPO first, they come to TxDOT.
MR. GLEASON: That's right. That's correct.
MR. GADBOIS: Neither does Corpus.
MR. GLEASON: That's correct. Yeah, so these will be coming out of the statewide portion with which we have a $15-million pot if you will.
MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh. Any other questions for Eric?
If not, we'll move on to Item 4 on the agenda, the presentation/discussion of TxDOT's Texas Transportation Plan, Number 4.
MS. CONKLE: Good afternoon. My name is Michelle Conkle and I work for Transportation Planning and Programming,
a Division of TxDOT. I met most of you at the last meeting and saw some of you again at the Bicycle Advisory Committee and I'm going to give you an update on our progress on the Texas Transportation Plan.

I guess unfortunately for the group that's on the phone, what happened was I gave Kelly a copy of a presentation that would have been timely at the end of January when the meeting was supposed to occur and we've actually gone on and taken some further action on the development of the plan, so what I'm literally doing sitting here at the table is I'm going to go through both presentations so that the folks that are on the phone if you have the one that you received originally, we're going to track through both of them. I think I can give you the same good information and I'm sure that at some point you'll get a copy, if you don't already have one, of the presentation that I can actually see on the screen.

To give a quick update, our -- the last -- last we met, I told you that we had, you know, good participation, stakeholder participation. There is actually in the original packet a table that shows participation in terms of the people that attended in person. Again, there's not -- there doesn't seem in numbers to be a whole lot, but again, like I told --

(Pause - construction noise; drilling)

MS. CONKLE: You know, the great thing is a screw is
only so long, right, so they've got to eventually stop. Is that we had -- we had -- what we lacked in the number of participants at the meetings, we made up for quality in terms of the ideas they gave us for the development of a plan.

Again, where we are in -- on the schedule is we're at the end of February, so we're moving in to -- we're still collecting data via the survey that I told you about last meeting. We're also -- we have taken the draft goals and objectives to our internal TxDOT Technical Advisory Committee. That is the main change in the difference in the two presentations, is that the Technical Advisory Committee met in -- actually on January 29th and we went ahead and we adopted the draft goals that I presented to you in the previous meeting, plus an additional goal which I'll talk about here momentarily.

Again, I think that -- I told you when I came back that it looked like we were going to have some really good news for public transit bicycle and pedestrian, and we do. If you look at the survey results and I'm particularly talking about commute from home to work, we have -- we're showing a little bit more or seven percent of our respondents are actually, that's their primary mode of transportation. So seven percent of the folks responding to the survey at this point are taking public transit, using their bicycles or walking to school or work.
I think that another really important -- yeah okay, maybe going back and forth between them is not working so well. Can we go to --

MR. KIRKLAND: I don't have it. Josh has it.

MS. CONKLE: Josh?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Want the next one?

MS. CONKLE: I'm sorry, just next. We're on the schedule. Again, now I can get this back on track. What we have here is the summary of the comments and we -- safety was the largest concern across the state, bicyclists and pedestrians telling us in no uncertain terms that they're people too and their transportation needs need to be met.

The other critical message that we got was that when we started to explain to folks about the size of the actual system and what we needed to maintain it and expand it, a lot of people came around to the way of thinking that we don't need to build any -- we don't need to expand the system until we're sure we can take care of what we have. That was another critical message we heard.

Modal options again and connectivity are important in both the urban and rural areas, and that we need to prioritize transportation for --

(Pause - construction drilling)

MS. CONKLE: We need to prioritize transportation options for the elderly and disabled and really look at how
they travel and their unique needs. And I think I explained to you we have -- we really had people with special transportation needs were well represented in our first round of public involvement and had some very good input. And then the last mile of the non-highway trip for passenger or freight, the multimodal/intermodal connections are the most important. And then they reiterated what we've been trying to say all along is that communicating with the public, gathering the feedback and being honest with them in terms of the money we have and what we're going to be able to do for them was very important. Next.

Okay. Here we go, survey results. So no matter which presentation you're looking at, 6.9 percent of the folks that have answered the survey again are public transportation, bicyclist or pedestrian, and that's a much higher number. It was less than three percent for the last plan. Doesn't seem like a lot, but it's double or at least double the folks that we've had answer previous surveys.

Also --

MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I'm sorry, but I don't see 6.9. Where is it?

MR. SALAZAR: She's adding several together.

MS. CONKLE: 2.6, 3.4 and .09 is -- they're --

MS. BLOOMER: If you add up public transit, bicycle and pedestrian, you get 6.9?
MS. CONKLE: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So that's total multimodal option?

MS. CONKLE: Yeah -- well, it's not multimodal, because it doesn't include ferry boat and airplane, it's -- that's -- that is 6.9 percent is literally public transit, bicycle and pedestrian.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: It just seems shocking that public transit is 2.6 percent and bicycles are 3.4.

MR. SALAZAR: I think everybody that rides a bicycle responded.

MS. CONKLE: Yeah, and again, I think that I said, too, again, this is not -- we're not representing -- this is not representative of the traveling public. This is representative of people who are getting actively involved in the development of the plan.

MR. SALAZAR: Right.

MS. CONKLE: Which is another plus, because it's like I told you at the last meeting, it's like when we take this, we're going to -- when we take the results of everything we've done for the Texas Transportation Plan to our commission, we may not be able to say it's representative, but what we can say is the folks that you represent have been more active and have given us input into the plan in a way that they never
have, and they're if you will demanding a voice in some of
their transportation options and choices.

And so what they do with that I have no control, but
I'm encouraged because again, it's twice as many folks as we
got involved last time and it's still -- it -- it's also your
group and the bicycle and pedestrian groups are better that we
can see at spreading the word and getting people to come in
and get involved with it.

So again, while not representative, it's still an
increase from last time and in transportation, we just get
excited anytime we can move our numbers up and get, you know,
folks involved in what we want to do.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Plus, I wonder how many of those
double dip? How many people put their bike on a bus, go where
they're going, get their bike off and ride? So how would they
consider they're getting to work?

MR. GADBOIS: It's -- so what I heard is they're
looking to respond to their customers and their customers'
interest and their customer defined by those are getting
active and participation in the planning process.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: This isn't a beauty contest, this isn't
a scientific poll, don't get too wrapped around the numbers.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure. The next one I think is the
better chart.
MS. CONKLE: Yeah, I want -- that's --

MR. UNDERWOOD: That's the one we should be talking about.

MS. CONKLE: That's the one that should get you absolutely delighted because these were all of the respondents, including the 90 percent that said they drive their personal vehicle, and that is if they had $100, because we scaled it down I think I told you, that was one of the questions, where would you spend it on a -- or not where, but on what type of facility, and essentially again, and I'm looking specifically at the improving public transit and improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities, that's $25 and that is roughly 25 percent of their $100.

Now that to me is astounding because that is -- what I can say is that 25 percent is representative of the entire group. And again, if the entire group, 90 percent of the respondents said they drive their personal vehicle, that is pretty -- that has some statistical significance. Of the respondents.

MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I would even say reducing congestion on highways is supportive of that because, you know, you're getting all kinds of evidence these days, the best way to do that is to manage drive-along behavior.

MS. CONKLE: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: Which means give people options.
MS. CONKLE: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: Transit, et cetera.

MS. CONKLE: And since they're not transportation, you know, professionals or transportation, you know, they're not -- they don't work in transportation, you could certainly make that assumption, but that goes to mode choice or alternative and they don't understand that as well as we do. So you're absolutely correct, the assumption would be there that they were considering that as something different when really, they're all integrally related. But we were happy about that.

If you have the original presentation, you see a lot of bar charts that -- you see a lot of bar charts that actually take the information, the survey results, and they break them out by the questions. And they're -- they'd be very hard to read if I had them up on the screen, but I think the takeaway here again is that bicycle and pedestrian safety, congestion, and limited public transportation service are all -- were ranked very important. In other words, solving those problems were ranked as critical or important.

I think that when we got down to specific solutions for improving travel between cities, we saw things -- when we saw bus travel, we saw certain things jump up as well, because that's the way that some people do travel between cities. And again, representative of the people that we were talking to.
So, if you -- when you look at the original, you can see the actual; we have the N=114/115, because again, some people didn't answer all the questions. Some skipped over. But really, the number at the time that we really concatenated this data was 120 respondents. And since then, I believe we have up over 140 within a month. So people are learning about the survey, they're going out there and they're responding to it. And again, we hope that you're going to promote that for us. Next slide.

Potential solutions we looked at. Again, based on the data that we received from our survey, things that we heard from our TAC, and also just comments, written comments that were provided for us as a result of the public involvement process, for potential solutions on how to solve these problems are adding shoulders to existing road, improving pavement and bridges. Capacity expansion and operational improvements were also highly rated. But, what again was very significant is we had a question, "how would you rate these potential solutions for improving public transportation," and what we got back was add or extend light or commuter rail lines between the highest number -- was one of the highest ratings as critical and reducing fares, this is what we found interesting, is reducing fares received the highest number of ratings as neutral or not important.

And if people were filling out the surveys there,
what we found is that, you know, historically you'll see sometimes that things will be predicated in fare increases. That is just not important to people who are actually reliant on public transportation. Having the option at all, I mean, of course I guess if you charged them exorbitantly that might be, but at this point if they were having to pay a nominal amount of money in upgrade in fare, they were not concerned with that. So we find that as we like to -- we like to carry that forward as we're not going -- we can't use that as a reason to exclude transit options because that's not where people are focused. They want them, they want those options, and they want us to look at -- they've even been given money if you will, to be able to put it on certain areas of the system, maintenance and expanding the system. And what they said was at least 25 percent if we just go strictly with what they said and not again reducing congestion, want it over on public transportation and bike and ped projects. So again, we see that as highly significant. Next slide.

These -- this -- I'm lucky here because this slide is in both packets. These are the draft goal areas that we presented to the public in the first round of meetings as you'll see. What we've done here is we've taken just a -- to members of the committee that are new, we've taken TxDOT strategic goals on the top line, we've taken the MAP-21 goal areas on the bottom line, and we've merged them in to six
Again, I want to point out that all of these goal areas, they are -- we consider them relevant to all modes. We consider them relevant to people and freight. So when we come up with strategies and targets, we're not going to just be developing those for the highway side. That is our intent is to cover all of the draft goals for all modes. Next slide.

Again what is different, what has changed since the last time that we were able to speak to one another is that we have the internal TAC has approved the draft goal areas to go forward based on comments that we received from the public and they've also approved objectives for those goals. Because initially we had goals, then you have objectives, and then we're going to have targets to meet those objectives.

And basically, what we've come up with, we've come up with five areas under safety. Again, reducing fatal and serious crashes, improving at-grade rail crossings, increasing bicycle and pedestrian safety through education and design enhancements, educating the public on the dangers of high-risk driving, and reducing incident response times.

Asset management is decrease the number of structurally deficient bridges, achieve a state of good repair for all pavement assets, achieve a state of good repair for all transit and multimodal assets which is again interesting because the public is at a point in their education about
transportation where they can make that distinction. You
know, they're not just looking at terms we use and they're
able to consider those assets as separate and apart from, you
know, the highway system. And again, they even dedicated
money in their own scenario to that very goal.

Identify new funding resources and innovative
financing techniques. That's going to lead us to the
additional goal area we picked up in just a moment. And we
have address congestion, the objectives that were adopted were
capacity enhancement, implementing alternative strategies that
reduce peak demand and improve operations. And increasing
travel options and accessibility for the elderly, disabled and
disadvantaged populations.

We really did, I can't stress enough, we had a lot of
respondents from those customers. Yes, sir.

MR. GADBOIS: Michelle, at any point do you actually
put numbers beside these? For example, fatal serious injuries
and crashes, we have historical data on what's there. What do
you want to reduce that by?

MS. CONKLE: TxDOT, that is -- again, I think we
talked a little bit at the last meeting about how we're trying
to have this effort dovetail into an effort at the
administrative level to develop performance measures under
MAP-21. That is something that is being handled by our
administration, because it is very hard to set a target,
that's a very sensitive subject. I mean, I know we want -- we do report numbers and every year we come out and we say our hope is that we'll have fewer and we can say we have, but to actually put a target on that is -- I'm personally glad I am not the person that is setting the target for this particular performance measure, because I don't know how you -- I don't know what is a good number. I mean, we would clearly like to reduce those types of incidents to zero, but we have to set a target under MAP-21. So hopefully, by the time that you meet your next quarterly meeting, they will have set that target. Because that's under another division, it's under Traffic Ops. But if I have it, I'll bring it to you.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: But yes, there will be numbers, because again, what we're -- at this point we're at the objectives. Objectives will lead to targets and targets at that point will --

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: -- either be qualitative or quantitative, so that's really the next step.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: So in terms of our draft TTP goal of addressing congestion, again, we -- we're basically wanting to reduce peak demand and improve operations, increase passenger and freight travel time reliability and increase options for
accessibility for elderly, disabled and disadvantaged populations. And again, with a focus on increasing multimodal capacity.

And I will say that we heard a lot of -- a lot of folks that were at the meeting were telling us well, you have the one mode you need, but it's that last mile. Because like you said, it's putting the bike on the bus and then getting to campus, locking the bike up and walking into the building.

And so one of the reasons we're adopting a second version of the survey is we realize we've got a little bit more to do to connect those ideas up with people and really get better, more complete answers in terms of having them understand that a multimodal trip -- again, if you say you take your bike, is getting them to understand at some point you're going to lock that up and walk, put it on a bus, whatever it is you do.

Next slide.

Connect Texas communities. The objectives that we adopted to carry forward were providing access to jobs, transportation choices, and services for all Texans, no matter what mode they choose to travel by. Provide safe and convenient travel choices, and again, with a focus on the complete trip, because we know that we need to stress that, you know, when they're looking and answering questions, we need to get them thinking in the mode of the complete trip, if it takes more than one mode.
Supporting multimodal/intermodal planning project development investments and improving connectivity between urban, suburban and rural areas and between travel modes. Because again, there -- there's a surprising variety of ways that people will travel, you know, between cities. You think you would get in your car, but if you don't own a car, you're still possibly using para-transit. You're still getting someone else to carpool, vanpool, getting you to both -- or between cities and places you need to be. So again, in meeting some folks out on the road, it gave us some interesting questions we wanted to put on version 2 of the survey so we could get people's intent down a little better.

And then we had to become -- next slide -- become best-in-class agency. Again, under stewardship, we came up with identifying sustainable funding sources and leveraging resources wisely to maximize the value of investments, improving the project development process, linking transportation planning with land use, reducing project delivery delays, coordinating with all planning partners and stakeholders on project planning and delivery. That mostly came up -- that -- we talked about that and I remembered a specific example that caused us to put this on here.

One city was doing sidewalks at the same -- at -- or -- at a time when TxDOT was also going to be doing ADA ramps and the person was like well, why didn't they just get
together, close off the street one time. Instead, they closed
-- it's a man who was traveling by wheelchair. They closed it
off one week and two weeks later they came and closed it again
and cut the curb. And I said, well, you know, that -- I may
not think about that, but I can see where that would be a
problem. And he was just basically saying, you know, within
three weeks, maybe you could have combined and even saved
money on equipment rental and all that. So I said we'll take
that forward. That's a very good point.

And then on the customer service side, again, collect
and integrate customer feedback using innovative, engaging
techniques. We're using survey monkey, we're handing these
out, we're handing these out at all of the meetings that we go
to, these surveys is what I'm referring to. We're also going
to start using Twitter to try to get it out to younger crowds
and we have since -- like I said, we've brought in a college --
why is it I always for -- intern, an intern, an unpaid
intern, to come and give us some ideas on how he would get
that out to other people. And he's talking about how he
networks with friends of his at other universities, uses
Facebook. So we're going to -- for round two, we're going to
ty to use as many of -- these things have been around,
they're not new things, but if you're someone my age, I don't
necessarily claim to know exactly how Twitter catches fire,
but in 143 characters you can evidently light up the world.
So we're hoping that the college students are going to get the word out, get people to our meetings, and get the survey, you know, out there to other folks.

We want to improve information accessibility through relatable communication techniques. I know we're moving -- the Department is moving towards having everything out on the internet, you'd be able to search key words and find out everything about this project. That is certainly our goal as well and we have the materials that we present at the public meeting out there on TxDOT's website for you to see at any time.

And then again, educate the public and stakeholders on transportation funding availability and tradeoffs, because we think that's very important. Again, usually when we ask the question what would you like for the system, everybody would say well, we want more. We want you to expand it, until we explain that we have to delay maintenance, which is more expensive.

When we started explaining to those people, that's where we came to that part where they said -- some people were actually telling us we shouldn't add anything to the system until we're sure we can maintain what we have. And that is something -- that is a c-change for me as a planner. I've never heard, it's always we want -- we need something or we want something more, but without due consideration to
maintaining what we have.

And then next slide, this is -- this was the additional draft goal that our internal technical advisory committee adopted. This was suggested while we were out on the road at public involvement and that goal was to identify and sustain funding sources for all modes. And they were very -- we were very -- this message was loud and clear. This wasn't to go out and find additional funds to do highways, this was to go out and find additional funding sources, sustainable funding sources, that match up with the unfunded mandates that we have legislatively and the goals and objectives we have for other modes. But the inability under our Texas Constitution to fund those, people were saying we'd like to take -- we'd like you to take back to the people that make the decisions the idea that we need to look at something different, something different than we already have and not just a onetime, you know, shot in the arm of federal funds or even state funds, but sustainable funds that allow us if we were actually able to build some of these projects to maintain them and connect them, because they do understand that one standalone project doesn't get us where we need to be no matter the mode, get us where we need to be in terms of seamless connectivity, and that we're not going to be able to -- that it was -- it's not exactly a fair assessment going out to them, saying we're setting goals and objectives without
looking at the fact that we're saying we have less money. They want us to -- if you're going to give us goals and objectives, and you want to do this, we also want you to look at how you're going to pay for it and bring that back out to us for consideration. So --

MR. GADBOIS: Michelle, this recommendation was from the TAC, the Technical Advisory folks, correct?

MS. CONKLE: No.

MR. GADBOIS: Oh.

MS. CONKLE: The recommendation to add the goal actually came out -- came while we were out in public involvement. We took it to the TAC on January 29th and they voted as a TAC to add it as an --

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: -- additional draft goal.

MR. GADBOIS: In -- I'm hoping to frame this as fairly as possible. There is nobody that's been more strident in interpreting the constitutional dedication to construction operation, maintenance and enforcement, more narrowly defined than has TxDOT traditionally.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: But what we're seeing from some of these other goals and research is you can actually invest in things a little more broadly, public transit, things that'll reduce the demand on the system --
MS. CONKLE: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: -- that then actually has real maintenance and operation advantages.

MS. CONKLE: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Are you seeing any inclination within the Department to think more broadly about the defining of the constitutional declarations on Fund 6?

MS. CONKLE: I don't -- I honestly -- I don't think it's -- it's not something I would see within the Department. And again, we're -- we are again in transition at this point with our administration, and I don't ever speak for them. What I can say is that the public is telling us they want us to present the commission and the department with the notion that they understand it's being narrowly defined and they would like to have things looked at in a way other than the way we're currently looking at it.

And again, that's part of -- that's all part of the second survey because again, that's kind of open-ended.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MS. CONKLE: Well, we -- we don't want to fund things the way we have, but they didn't really tell us how, and we didn't really give them an option. And another thing that I think I told you at the last meeting was that --

MR. GADBOIS: So just to make sure I heard that, so it's too early to tell what the Department's response is going
MS. CONKLE: It is too early to tell.

MR. GADBOIS: But that will be a conversation item.

MS. CONKLE: It will be a conversation item.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: It's been suggested again in written comments, but again, when I came to the last meeting, I talked to you about an investment tool, a tradeoff tool that our consultants were developing to take out in Round 2. We want to make sure that people have a hands on experience to back up what they think they're saying in the survey, so we're going to present them again with some money to scale for them to spend along with in this computer application they're going to get funding scenarios in the manner and at the funding levels, percentages that TxDOT does spend funding, and they're going to get to play planner, programmer, engineer, and tell us now that when you see that you take money off to do this and you see that maintenance goes up exponentially this amount, would you still do that. Would you -- if we had additional money and we could move it as you said, if we were to make some operational improvements that saved us on the maintenance side and actually netted additional money, then would you consider other mode choices or other projects.

So we think that -- we think that we're off to an excellent start here. We think we're hearing things we've
never heard before, but we think this tool is going to
absolutely support what we're hearing.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: Because we're going to say when these
people do, when they take the investment challenge, we're
saving all of those scenarios, we're capturing what they say
would do if they were actually in charge of the money, and
we're not constraining them to any -- we're constraining them
to there's a scenario where they look at the way TxDOT spends
money and then where it's unconstrained. This is the amount
of money and where would you spend it if there weren't any
legislative restrictions on that. And that's going to be very
interesting to see if the, you know, the types of scenarios
that they come up with when they can see it, when they can see
the numbers and quantify, support what they believe they want
in theory on the survey.

So, and that again, we -- the TAC adopted this
additional goal and all the things you just said, identify and
document cost to meet the state's future transportation needs,
and we have plenty of -- we have plenty of good, analytical
and academic data out there on what we need to maintain the
highway system. But we really want to be able to write a
needs assessment for the other modes. That's the purpose
here.

To consider all funding sources to fill the needs to
revenues gap and that is -- again, that will be putting -- we will be looking at best practices in other states and things that other states are doing. Time will tell what the administration you know, what our administration and our commissioners are, you know, willing to -- to -- I guess to consider in terms of filling those gaps, but we're going to present everything that the public says that they would like us to consider.

Evaluate the feasibility of innovative financing options. And again, we've heard innovative finance for a while, but we also realize -- I realized in talking to the public like SIB loan, state infrastructure bank loans and things we consider innovative finance are not anything they're familiar with. When they were saying innovative finance, they were talking about, you know, creative uses of the money that we have or coming up with dedicated funds. So we realize we have a gap in understanding and education there, so we're going to try to fill that gap.

And then they -- another objective that was defined was improving the predicted capabilities of revenue forecasting for long-term needs assessments. Because again, we have a Unified Transportation Program that goes out ten years and the best example I can give you is what happened in the downturn in 2008. It's like, you know, we plan for projects and try to have things in the pipeline that we can
build and then you have an economic downturn, and that wipes away two, three, four years of forecasting, and so people are saying there -- that's still very fresh on their mind and they realize that transportation funding dipped way down in 2008 and they were basically asking us how would we avoid that in the future.

(Conference call message interruption)

MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle, let me go back to needs and revenue gap for just one second.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: The way those have been historically done is you're projecting out the -- the, you know, each one of the districts and each one of the cities and each one of the counties are projecting out this is the travel behavior we've had, we need these roads or these whatever to supply that. We predict that'll grow with population, you know, over the future, and therefore, we -- roughly we predict our need.

For transit, it is, you know, looking at what we're doing now, what we're not meeting costs on, and predicting what we might need in the future based on our past and projecting forward on that. And you know, and that is what it is.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: If, however, we're talking about shifting that equation at all, then the question to the
transit folks, to the highway folks, needs to be we're shifting away from any assumptions of new construction, what are your operational needs.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: We're shifting away -- for the transit folks, we're shifting away from your estimates on passengers based on historicals and now setting a new target for that, whatever that might be.

MS. CONKLE: Correct.

MR. GADBOIS: Are you preparing to have that second conversation with folks in your needs assessment and gap -- needs and revenue gap assessment?

MS. CONKLE: Absolutely there needs to be a conversation about not just taking needs as a whole and trying to compare apples to apples if I believe -- I'm trying to understand exactly -- I think I understand what the second conversation needs to be from your point of view. I think that -- I think again, that is something that is going to be driven -- that's going to be driven by -- by folks having input into the plan and what they want our commission to do.

I personally hope that there -- that some of the information that we're gathering out of the public brings up several second conversations on many levels about how we do planning and programming and tying what we say our goals are to the types of projects that we construct, be that highway or
transit.

So I --

MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I'm not talking about so much about the goals and priorities as --

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: -- when you do the analysis of needs and revenue gap --

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: -- that's a technical step that you all are taking based on information.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: And you can either do historical in what people have been planning or programming out over years or you can say you know, transit right now is at 2.6 percent and we need it to be at five percent.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: What are the revenues you would need to get it to five percent? But you got to ask that question first, right?

MS. CONKLE: Well, we do have to ask that question and too, let me be very clear. I will always try to answer any questions you all have as straightforwardly as I can with --

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

MS. CONKLE: -- my understanding, you know, of -- of
where you think that question or that discussion's going to
go. What I can't answer right now is a lot of that, because
transit is an MPO for the most part in Texas, except for
paratransit, I don't -- you know, but is -- their needs are
identified in their MTP and then Kelly could probably talk to
you a little bit more about -- they're collecting data for us
as well in terms of how this is going to be -- how this is
going to be couched in terms of needs and where we think the
targets are going to be. Because again, the division that I
work for isn't setting targets for public transportation,
that's probably going to have a lot to do with the type of
data that we get in terms of what MPOs are saying their needs
are and then some data reflecting for the rural areas.
And again, that to me is a very scary prospect.
Anybody trying to set a target, you know, for any mode of
transportation, ridership, meeting needs, given the funding
scenarios and climate we have is -- that's a daunting task.
So, it's not that I don't want to answer the question or
what's going to be rolled up into that, it's just that I don't
know yet, because again, we have to take -- part of the
planning process is that we don't do parallel processes with
people who actually handle, you know, these modes or predict
these needs or come up with the revenues forecast to do those
things. So, I think again, by the next meeting, with your
question in mind, hopefully we'll be at the point in the
process where I can bring things back again.

PTN is collecting, is in the process of collecting some data for us to analyze and give to our consultants to look at need. I will say that we heard quite a bit from folks that are in -- are subject matter experts in public transportation that whatever we get you cannot take that back to TxDOT and do an apples to apples comparison. I am enough of a planner to know that.

I mean, we're not talking -- we don't assess needs the same way, we don't look at cost benefit the same way. But I'm simply going to have more data in hand before I can answer that particular in question. And then when we carry up, again it'll be -- it will be very much up to our administration and commission as to what they do with that going forward.

MS. BLOOMER: And I just want to make a comment, too. While I think the metropolitans play a significant role in public transportation and they certainly -- you see the numbers, but we can't forget that the other entities out there providing transportation throughout the state.

MS. CONKLE: Sure.

MS. BLOOMER: And while their numbers may not be in the range of the MTAs, that what they do is just as important, or more important, because they're the only option that's out there. So I think it's important to keep that fact. And while the MPOs may be doing public transportation planning for
the metros, TxDOT can't forget that TxDOT has a division that
does that and TxDOT should be setting the statewide goal of
what do we want all public transportation to look like,
including the metros and the non-metros.

MS. CONKLE: No, absolutely. Let me be very clear
that we don't do -- we're tr -- we don't do parallel processes
with those metros, but if I didn't say it loud enough, we know
we have a responsibility out in the rural areas. We know we
have a responsibility in urban areas that are not, that are
less than 200,000, and we have been getting comments. But
again, we don't have all the data we need to answer that
question. That data is being gathered right now and we should
have that in the next few months to be able to look at that.
And I'll go back again to the human aspect of this; we heard
in no uncertain terms out there that that's very --
paratransit options, transit options, modal options, for folks
that are not -- cannot use motorized vehicles is very
important. And we -- again, we bring that back to you to say
that we're not -- we're not at all saying that that's being
marginalized. We're just trying to look at a way going
forward when we're trying to develop -- when the -- as a
department trying to develop statewide performance targets for
some of these areas where we have to take into consideration
planning processes and needs assessments that aren't being
done by the department. That's why I said it's somewhat
perilous, because a few of the performance measures under MAP-21 require us to set statewide measures and then they require metropolitan areas to set their measures, and in some cases, they haven't set measures yet, but we're expected to come up with statewide measures.

We certainly can't do that without taking into consideration what those individual measures would be. And there is a little bit of a time lag if you will, between what they're doing and what we're doing. By the time we come to adopting whatever that's going to be for the department including in this plan, those -- we will have data to be able to answer those questions. We're just not there for me to able to do that at this meeting.

And I guess, like I said last time, we've presented you with the initial draft goal areas that were adopted to carry forward to our commission by our technical advisory committee. Our technical advisory committee has adopted an additional goal area that I haven't heard anybody that's been opposed to that, finding, you know, sustainable revenue sources. Our freight folks are pretty excited about that as well. But we're still -- we're still in the process of collecting comments from groups such as this group, so if you have other proposed goal areas that we miss, I will tell you, you know, like I told you last time, please do give those to us. And if you take this home or take it away and you look
and there's additional objectives that we miss, because you put a fine point on some things that we state at a very high level, I might suggest that you consider maybe sending that to us as an objective so that we can more finely tune that. Because we are at, you know, the 30,000 foot level with the statewide plan. And please free to do that.

So, I will leave the group with we -- we've made some good progress, we've got objectives, we're working our way towards targets and those will be forthcoming. Next slide.

Our next steps, again, is to fin -- we will be finalizing goals and objectives based on the TAC. We plan to take those -- right now we're also in transition with our Division Director, so we have to brief him. We had hoped to already be to a point to take -- getting ready to take goals to the Commission, but we need to take a step back and bring in some of the new folks that are coming in to TxDOT and let them know where we're at in the process.

So probably within the next month or two these draft goals and objectives are going to be presented to the Commission to -- for a way forward. If not the Commission, it's really up to the executive leadership at TxDOT whether that needs Commission action. It would certainly be something that's going to be presented to them at some point to get their buy off. We expect to do that in the next couple months.
Again, we talked about developing performance measures. That's really an ongoing process that's being handled by TxDOT's administration in cooperation with the TxDOT districts and metropolitan planning organizations and councils of government.

Again, we're going to estimate unconstrained needs for all modes. I can't answer a lot of questions about that now based on the conversation we've had, because those needs are being assessed right now. We're going to be getting certain modal needs from the freight side. We'll be getting some from our rail division on the passenger side, and then we're expecting some data through our partners at PTN.

We'll forecast reasonably available revenues for all modes, and a bullet that's not in there is if we do adopt -- if we do adopt as a goal for the statewide plan to look at sustainable revenue sources, that would be an additional bullet, because we can forecast reasonably available revenues, but that could happen whether or not we were actively seeking other revenues or not, and that's what we want to do as one of our goals. And then prioritize investments under the constrained funding.

So, that's where we are with the Texas Transportation Plan. Again, we have version two of the survey. We hope to have it up -- my hope is that we have it up by middle of next month. We're still inviting anybody at anytime to take the
survey that's there, it's all good data, but we want to get --
want to put a finer point on some of those questions and find
out what people are -- are really thinking and where they
would go based on the answers to the initial survey.

MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, just to process, this
draft plan and final plan boxes in months September and
October.

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: Is that -- it would go to Commission as
a draft plan one month and then be approved by Commission the
following month or is that something else?

MS. CONKLE: No, that's -- that -- that's -- what
would happen is we would have the draft plan that we would --
we would develop taking in -- that's actually the entire
compendium of work we've done on it, put it into a draft plan,
we would put it out for 30 days for what we call final public
review, that's the public review done for public hearing
instead of just collecting information at public meetings, and
then after that 30 days, it would go to the Commission for
final approval.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: But let me be very clear, they will have
already seen it. It won't be a surprise for them. They will
get it as a briefing item as soon as we have the draft
available.
MR. GADBOIS: Well, and that's where I was going. Is there slated to be any discussion item at the Commission on this plan before draft and briefing and formal decision?

MS. CONKLE: I don't -- the honest answer is I don't know. That would be something that would be decided by our Division Director and we have a new Division Director. Again, we'll be briefing him here in the next few weeks. He's from -- it's Mr. James Koch, K-o-c-h. He was the former Transportation Planning Director in the Houston District. So while he's familiar, you know, at a district level with our efforts on the TTP-2040, we need to bring him up to speed because now he will be, you know, in an executive level if he so chooses to take that to the Commission.

I will not be -- I'm not of sufficient rank to take it and discuss it with the Commission, but, Commission will get everything we've heard from the public, anything you turn in to us, anything that Mr. Koch wants to take forward. And again, a lot of that is predicated on not what staff says, but what we get from, you know, outside entities telling us what that discussion needs to be. So I encourage you, if that's what you would like to see happen, you're invited to comment as such and we'll make sure it gets to who it needs to go to.

MR. UNDERWOOD: What is that closing date for comments?

MS. CONKLE: We'll be taking comments -- it's --
there's -- understand that when we come up, when we -- we're
taking comments all the way through the process I guess is
what I'm trying to say.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: At some point those comments will be
relative to the development of the content of a plan, and then
at some point they cut off when we do the draft and then
they're only relevant to -- we don't like this. I mean, it's
a different kind of comment if you can think of -- you're
giving input right now to the content. Once we get to the
point where we're getting ready for public hearing, this will
just be -- those comments will -- they're still very important
to us and they'll be taken into consideration, but at that
point it will be less about changing the content and more
about documenting what was liked or not liked about the plan
content. Does that make sense?

MR. UNDERWOOD: So maybe around May time frame?

MS. CONKLE: Yes, I would say that if it -- relevant
comment and inputs into the plan we will be moving -- well no,
after that, because we're actually going out for round 2 in
late May and June, so I would say up through July time frame
comments, substantive comments on the actual content of the
plan are -- are welcome, and we would be able at that point to
incorporate those and have them be part of the development. I
would say after July we're pretty much pulling everything
together and getting ready to go to that public hearing. So that's going to be a final draft.

I mean, if there's a burning issue, we'll certainly back down off of that. We can take this out a little further. But that's really the difference in those two opportunities to comment, is you're getting an opportunity to develop the content now whereas you'd be commenting on a final document at that point.

MR. UNDERWOOD: You're going to have another round of open houses in June/July time frame?

MS. CONKLE: Yes, they -- we hope to start last week in May. We're going to be out all of the month of June and possibly into July, because we're going to every district.

MR. UNDERWOOD: To discuss?

MS. CONKLE: To take out the planning, the tool, the application we talked about.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: We're going to have -- it's going to be the same format, we'll have a stakeholder meeting. Stakeholder meetings are typically attended by folks like yourself who are actually in a decision making or in an advisory capacity. And then later on in the day, public involvement, which stakeholders are also invited. So, we will -- we'll basically have 50 meetings. We'll have 50 stake -- 25 stakeholder meetings and 25 public meetings, with that tool
available for people to give us their input.

    MS. BLOOMER: Yes, Eric.

    MR. GLEASON: This is Eric Gleason. If I can, I think we will work closely with Michelle and administration to make sure that we engage this Committee at an appropriate time or times in this time frame through July for you to be as effective as you can be in influencing the draft. I think, you know, I want to respect this Committee as a, you know, the -- advising the Commission on issues of policy significance and I think we need to make sure that we get information in front of you that allows you to do that in a way that allows you to be effective in this process before we get to the end game.

    And so we will work with Michelle and we will figure out a time table. I think we are regularly scheduled to meet again next month in March and then another in May and I think we have a discussion later on in this meeting about March, given today's meeting. So, I think there's some opportunities. Clearly, I think we need to hang on to the May meeting because that would likely be a significant time, perhaps just preceding the next round of open houses.

    MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

    MR. GLEASON: So we could look at what was being considered for those open houses. But clearly, I think May is a watershed time frame for this Committee to shape the, you
know, handful of significant policy considerations. For example, Glenn, your comment and the implications of that.

MR. GADBOIS: And I appreciate that and don't mean this to belittle that at all. But my real focus is I want to make sure staff, you all, are helping -- I mean, it --

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: -- seems like we're at a unique moment in planning, given what planning has heard such that if they get good information from public transportation that's not just needs in --

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: -- revenue assessments based on, you know, what we haven't gotten funded in the last five years, but in fact what we need to grow this, they will be able to do their job better. And so what I'm most concerned about, I'm happy to come back and meet and track and talk about this, but what I'm most concerned about at this point is that the public transportation side, you all and the MPOs and everybody else, are getting them as good of information as they can so that when they go out to the public and they're starting to weigh and balance scenarios, they actually have good information on what could be done with public transportation if that investment were just made.

MR. GLEASON: I also heard you say though that get a description of that based on a performance target not set on,
you know, traditional trends --

MR. GADBOIS:  Right.

MR. GLEASON:  -- as much as a up-front statement of this is what we need transit to be able to do --

MR. GADBOIS:  Right.

MR. GLEASON:  -- for us to be successful. And that's not necessarily a statement that is industry driven as much as it is from a policy standpoint.

MR. GADBOIS:  Well, but it -- but it's -- you know, underlying that is going to be industry. If I go to Brad and say Brad, what's it going to take for you to be able to provide service to twice as many people.

MR. GLEASON:  Yes.

MR. GADBOIS:  Brad can give you that answer.

MR. GLEASON:  He can.

MR. GADBOIS:  Right? Whereas, we -- you and I sitting here, would have a hard time coming up with that without Brad.

MR. GLEASON:  That's exactly right. My point is who tells you that it's twice? What's the process? What's the conversation that takes place that results in that statement being made?

MR. GADBOIS:  Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON:  What have we done to allow us to reach a conclusion that that's what we need Brad to do? And I
think, you know, and I'm sure you recognize, I mean, there is no answer today to that question, and it's a fundamental paradigm shift if you think it all the way through in terms of how we plan across all modes, including highways, for what we need for an effective transportation system in this state.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. So --

MR. GLEASON: And we're --

MR. GADBOIS: I mean, so I would be prepared with a - - at a minimum, a multiplier so that, you know, you -- somebody comes in and, you know, the administrative folks come in and say, you know, we need to reduce it by 40 percent in urban areas --

MR. GLEASON: Reduce --

MR. GADBOIS: -- 30 percent --

MR. GLEASON: -- congestion or whatever idea.

MR. GADBOIS: -- 20 percent. If you've got five percent, you can assume at a planning level at a minimum you can multiply that by to get to your number, right?

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: But if you're not prepared with even that --

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: -- then you have no answer.

MR. GLEASON: Correct.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I've got a PowerPoint if you want
your answer what it's going to take to double our service,
but, you know -- I can give that to you today if you'd like.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah, but it may not be in the right
places.

MR. GADBOIS: We need that times, what is it, 36
rural operators and -- no, it's more than that, but, you know,
we need it multiplied by rural operators, small urban
operators in metro areas.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Perfect.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. To close out the discussion, can
I just ask, back on the slide that has the how would you spend
your $100?

MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: So $14 of the 100, so that's 14
percent. What's TxDOT's biennium budget?

MS. CONKLE: TxDOT's biennium budget. Okay. Would
you like transportation expenditures, would you like operating
everything that --

MS. BLOOMER: Well, the $100.

MS. CONKLE: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: What does the $100 equal to that TxDOT
spends in a two year period?

MS. CONKLE: It has absolutely no relation to it
whatsoever.

MS. BLOOMER: I know it doesn't, but --
MR. GADBOIS: She --

MS. BLOOMER: -- if we're going to prioritize investments under constrained funding based off what the people say, I'm trying to get at how --

MS. CONKLE: It was a --

MS. BLOOMER: -- much would -- how much is 14 percent or 25 percent of the money spent, so what's 14 --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Two and a half billion.

MS. BLOOMER: Billion.

MR. UNDERWOOD: B.

MR. GADBOIS: Is -- that's --

MS. BLOOMER: I can't do percents that high.

MR. GADBOIS: That's without leverages. That --

MR. GLEASON: No, that's the $10-billion TxDOT budget, which includes bonding and all that kind of stuff.

It's not five percent. I mean, it's a -- on the one hand it's a simple calculation, on the other it's incredibly complicated.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MS. CONKLE: It's -- but you have to -- but you --

MS. BLOOMER: That's something probably significantly more than the 50-whatever we're at now in the biennium, 50 --

MR. GLEASON: In a biennium is 60-million.

MS. BLOOMER: 60-million.

MR. GADBOIS: So you -- the appropriation -- the
annual or biannual appropriations is?

MR. GLEASON: The biannual would be closer to 20.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And then that could --

MS. CONKLE: And I'm sorry, I have a different --

appropriation is different to me than revenue, so --

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MS. CONKLE: -- it's -- so --

MR. GADBOIS: I was just trying to break it down to a

number we can -- you know, we could all look at and --

MS. CONKLE: That's -- but that's exactly what we're
going -- the reason that we did that is to get -- we wanted a

back of the envelope what people were thinking, $100 is just

enough to be significant to them, to see what their intent

was. How it relates to what that question did is it's helping

us to develop the tool that is going out and asking them, you

know, when we do give them something representative of our

actual budget, you know, how they would spend that money. I

mean, we couldn't -- we couldn't even put 20-bil -- you know,

that -- we just had to get something that was significant to

them to find out what their intent was if they were able to do

so something to scale. We're using that information, it has

absolutely no direct correlation to what we're doing with the

tool other than to say that okay, we need to be sure of that

because people are saying they would spend this much over

here, that we don't just ignore airports or we don't just
ignore transit. It's not that we would have, but again, programming and coding goes into an application that allows you to decide where you'd spend money and we need to make sure that that's adequately explained to them. If we give that as an option, that they show some -- indicated some -- that that's of some significance so we know how much, you know, effort to put into that. If that makes any sense at all.

We needed to know where they're going and where they're thinking in developing this -- this scenario tool, how sophisticated and robust it needs to be. Because again, if everything was skewed towards highways, we're -- we needed to do a lot more education before we had somebody sit down in front of a tool and expect to get any relevant answers out of them. And evidently, they are much further along than spending money just on highways, that's what we found out.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. UNDERWOOD: As compared to people using it.

That's what's interesting to me, the amount of people that actually use it, as opposed to said they would just pay for it.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you very much.

MS. CONKLE: Thank you. I appreciate your time and thank you, Eric.

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MS. CONKLE: For allowing us to come and present
again.

MR. GLEASON: Anytime.

MS. CONKLE: Appreciate it.

MS. BLOOMER: We'll move on to Agenda Item 5, which is the presentation discussion of the Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning.

MR. WRIGHT: Hi. Good to see you all. My name is Steve Wright, I'm with the Public Transportation Division. A very brief update from the report that I shared with you all at the last PTAC meeting. As I mentioned at that meeting, a statewide working group representing diverse interests in geographic areas was convened last summer and fall to develop recommendations to the Public Transportation Division on future direction for the regional planning effort in the state of Texas.

This resulted in a final report with recommendations, at least that's part of your handouts the -- this report and the proposed recommendations have been shared with any number of stakeholders. It’s been shared with each of the lead agencies in the 24 planning regions across the state, and their respective stakeholders. I know that a number of the regions had this as a discussion and agenda item at their respective monthly or quarterly regional stakeholder meetings. A presentation was given at the January semiannual meeting of the transit operators in the state. All of the various
stakeholders were encouraged to provide public transportation division additional input.

As I mentioned, you have several handouts that include that report, and I -- I believe some other information as -- as well. Of course, these are recommendations. They have been provided to the Public Transportation Division, which we are taking under advisement. And we will develop guidelines, taking these recommendations into account. That is kind of a -- a quick recap for you on what’s transpired since December, and I’ll be glad to expand on any of that, or answer any questions.

MR. GLEASON: Do you want to mention the semiannual meeting for the operators? Or did you?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: Oh, okay. I missed that.

MR. WRIGHT: The --

MR. GLEASON: I wasn’t listening.

MR. WRIGHT: If -- I might have gone over that too quickly. But the -- we did make a full presentation at the January semiannual meeting with the transit operators, concerning the report and the recommendations and the next steps, and those -- those issues. And at that forum, as well, we -- we strongly encouraged folks to -- to give us any feedback or input that they might have.

MS. BLOOMER: And did you get any feedback on --
MR. WRIGHT: We did --

MS. BLOOMER: For this?

MR. WRIGHT: We received feedback from three agencies in the state, as far as formal input, you know, a written letter with -- with comments.

MR. SALAZAR: Do -- do we have that? Have we --

MR. WRIGHT: I did not include those in the packet. And actually, I didn’t even bring them with me. I can certainly go get them and provide copies. And I know off the top of my head generally what they say. I can share that with you, and maybe give you copies later. Maybe I -- after my presentation, I can go up and bring them back.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay. It --

MS. BLOOMER: Can you summarize generally --

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: -- what the comments were?

MR. WRIGHT: Sure. There were comments received from three agencies, North Central Texas Council of Governments, El Paso County, and Panhandle Regional Planning Commission. All three of those agencies are long-time lead agencies for their respective planning regions. The comments were generally -- not generally, I thought the comments were clearly very supportive of the regional planning effort. They express support for the effort.

One of them in particular gave several examples of
success. One of the three gave some constructive suggestions specifically about recommendations that were proposed. Two of the three did not specifically address specific recommendations, but it was more general consent. One offered some -- some constructive comments and suggestions on certain ones of the recommendations.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So what is the next step now? I think we had asked at the last PTAC meeting that you were currently in the -- TxDOT was currently in the process of working with this group to come up with the recommendations, to take those out to the semiannual meeting, and then to prepare sort of a strawman of where we go from there. So is somebody going to present that piece?

MR. WRIGHT: The next step is that -- now that we have the recommendations from the working group, and now that we have input from other stakeholders, we’re prepared to start crafting guidelines. And our working time line on that is to have some guidelines prepared by the end of May is, at this point, what we’re aiming for. And then of course, once we have those, we will have opportunities to share those guidelines with lead agencies and other stakeholders, and provide appropriate orientation and that sort of thing. So those are the immediate next steps.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I’m -- I’m having trouble wrapping my mind around this process. And we talked about
this a little bit last time. My concern is that we went out -
- I think -- roll back -- Eric, PTAC; what’s our role?

MR. GLEASON: We view this as a -- an area where we
would give real emphasis and significance to the feedback from
this committee on how to shape this program. So while we
don’t necessarily view it as advising the Commission on a
policy matter, we do, and we would, look for guidance from
this Committee on their view on how to move this program
forward.

What you have in front of you is the result of a fairly
inclusive effort, engaging stakeholders, and attempting to
solicit comments, particularly from the transit community.

And, you know, honestly, we did not get comments from
the transit community on this, and I was I thought fairly
aggressive at this in the annual meeting in attempting to
solicit comments, knowing full well there’s a range of
opinions of this effort within the transit community. So I’m
-- I’m a little disappointed at that, and I think, you know,
our efforts to develop a strawman would have come from more
specific comments on the work that had been done.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think at the last meeting we had
talked about and hoped that we would apply a similar process
to the formula revisions to this. This is an item that is on
PTAC’s work plan to take up, regional coordination. We need
to re-take up the work plan. But I -- you know, and maybe
it’s we didn’t get a lot of comment, but what we found with
the formulas when we threw stuff out there, the good, the bad,
and the ugly, especially if you throw in some things that are
a little far to the right and a little far to the left, you’ll
get feedback from folks.

So I’m kind of -- I don’t know. I -- I don’t feel
like PTAC has been involved. I mean, we got a briefing last
time. This seems to be a fairly large decision impacting
public transportation going forward, and I think we need to
make sure that we get the public transportation providers’
input, some way.

And I’d like, you know, we could talk about how we’d
do that. I don’t know if -- I mean, last time, we had
recommendations, we had thrown around some other ideas that
folks at this table had thrown out and talked about
developing, okay, where are we going? I think now we’ve been
doing this for six years, seven years, regional coordination.
I think a lot of folks feel like it’s time to go back and look
at it again, and what we’re really trying to accomplish, and
put our mind to it. It’s just kind of gotten into automatic
mode. It may be we haven’t -- we’ve spent I can’t remember
what the dollar amount is in money, how much significant
impact have we really made? If we had put that money into
service, would that have been better? You know, going back
and looking at what we’ve done, and where we want to go in the
MR. GLEASON: If -- if I may? I don’t know where a lot of those folks are. I -- I agree with your statement about the concerns with the program, because I’ve heard them. But I am not seeing those folks come to the table in this discussion and voicing the kinds of concerns that you’ve just raised, Michelle. And so while I would agree with you that there are those concerns out there, they’re not coming forward. So it’s -- and honestly, when -- when I look at the range, and the -- and the scope, and the quantity of the recommendations coming from the stakeholder group, the lead agency group, I would have to say that it would, you know, that I’m inclined to look for a relatively small number of those that I think represent moving the effort forward, from a -- a guidance standpoint.

I mean, I’m a little overwhelmed myself at the number of different kinds of recommendations, and the scope of the areas of the recommendations coming from people obviously very committed to the program, and want to make it better. We are not hearing in this process from those individuals who are tremendously dissatisfied with it. We’ve had some public comment at this meeting, yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: But when we attempt to ask the question to the general audience, we’re not hearing from them.
MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Now, maybe we’re asking the question in the wrong way. As you suggest, maybe we need to throw something out there and let people react. And we can certainly consider that. What I was hoping to hear, up until now, is some level of feedback that would allow us to go back and say, here are all the things that folks intimately engaged in the conversation think we should do with this program, and then here are some things we’ve heard, that we could put those two together and -- and shake the guides.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: I -- we don’t have yet that here are those things we’ve heard.

MS. BLOOMER: In addition to the semiannual meeting, have we sent an email out to not only the lead agencies, but all the transit providers, asking them, letting them know that this is going on, that, you know, we want to hear their input about how the process is working for them, do they have any suggestions going forward? Other than the semiannual, because if you weren’t able to attend the semiannual, would you know that this is going on, and that TxDOT is wanting to hear your concerns, if you have any?

MR. GLEASON: The answer to that -- if you did not attend, the answer to that, I believe, is -- is yes. Now, have we on multiple occasions gone out independent of the lead
agencies who we fundamentally hold responsible and accountable for engaging their stakeholders, not just transit providers, but all folks in their regions, have we made a -- a separate effort? No. I don’t think you would see, if you went back through the history, you wouldn’t see two or three or four separate efforts, outside of the lead agencies themselves, to engage the stakeholders --

MR. GADBOIS: We -- it --

MR. GLEASON: -- beyond the semiannual and a followup of the semiannual where people got information that was presented.

MR. GADBOIS: May I jump in on this topic, Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: So -- so Eric, a fundamental assumption may need to be questioned a little bit.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MR. GADBOIS: If there -- if there is a problem in the lead agents -- and -- and you’re not hearing it because you’re going to the lead agency, it may be that the lead agency either doesn’t recognize the problem, or nobody wants to say -- talk about it in that context. In which case, you may not be able to use that basic process, and you may want to look at doing something like a focus group. Pick some areas, pick people that you know come from different perspectives, and get them into the room in a designed discussion, rather
than simply going to the lead agency and saying, you know, is everything working?

MR. GLEASON: Yeah. Now, in fairness, the effort we just went through is much more than just lead agencies coming up with this list of recommendation.

MR. GADBOIS: No, I --

MR. GLEASON: There was a collection of --

MR. GADBOIS: -- I -- I saw -- I saw the list.

MR. GLEASON: So yes, we could do more of that. You know, one of the challenges to this conversation is -- is that it is in some areas of the state that this provokes the most discussion as to, you know, not going in the right direction, not doing the right thing. We have other areas of the state that this is percolating along reasonably well on, and everyone’s engaged, and great things are happening. So it’s a really difficult program from a statewide perspective to label. And -- and so, you know, it’s just a very challenging --

MR. GADBOIS: Do we --

MR. GLEASON: And yes, we could selectively go in and put together focus groups to try and tease out those concerns.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and -- and what I mean -- because -- so when we originally designed this, we just designed it with maximum flexibility at the local level to -- to allow for it to work well where it’s going to. Your -- your -- the
issue you ought to be looking at addressing now is not, you
know, laying some rules to adjust what’s working well, but
what do we need to do, if anything, for the places it isn’t
working well? So focus, you know, on that, and -- and make
sure that the guidance doesn’t mess up the stuff that’s
already working well.

MR. GLEASON: I think one of the questions -- and
then I’ll be quiet, because this is committee discussion --
the question we have to ask ourselves, honestly, is when you
explore why it’s not working well, many times, the answer you
find is long established relationships that don’t work, either
personally or between institutions within that region --

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: -- and almost problematic.

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: And we have regions that for eight
years have struggled with those issues, and are no further
along in solving them than they were eight years ago.

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: It’s intractable. And so, you know --
and that’s just my -- my opinion of it. Without -- and -- and
we have not stepped in --

MR. GADBOIS: Or something you all don’t have a role
in solving.

MR. GLEASON: We -- no, there’s -- there’s no --
there’s nothing we can propose to do --

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- in the long run there.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Unless they solve it themselves. So it’s just very difficult. And many of the issues are rooted in that. So we have to sort through those that are rooted in that, and those that truly are related to making the program more effective and moving it forward. And it’s just -- it’s very difficult. And I -- I am all ears to this committee, you know, just sounding off and letting us know what your thoughts are. Because it’s -- it’s frustrating for us.

MR. UNDERWOOD: For me, I look at the purpose and what we’re doing with this money. I mean, before we had JARC and New Freedom funding. So if we met together as a lead agency and identified some priorities for the region, we had some -- some issues, some gaps in transit, some -- some areas that were under-served, we needed some specialized transit for this particular group or whatever, everyone came to the table, we talked about it, we got a project together. Typically, it was the lead agency’s responsibility to write that application out, this is the kind of project we want to see, this is what we want to go after. We submitted it, and you went through this process. That mechanism is gone now.

But yet, you still have people around the table
saying, let’s create this, and let’s do one of these, and what about this? That’s a great idea, but how are we going to execute that? And so I think we’re getting further and further away from actually putting more service on the street by perpetuating a process that really doesn’t have any end game.

MR. GADBOIS: The way -- way -- so I actually thought that the original purpose of this was to get more money in the game, to look at ways to get the health and human services that pay for transportation, but don’t pay for it by adding -- adding funding to the overall system. They go out with somebody in contract; right? Helping to figure out a way that the transit people who talk one language can -- can get together with the human service folks who talk another language, and figure out how to work together as such that they might be able to use their money cooperatively, which would add more money. That was the original purpose of this, not to divide up programs that we already had in place. What you’re telling me is it’s evolved to that other, easier --

MR. UNDERWOOD: To me it’s done less of connectivity and less coordination, but it’s become more solid. So now we’ve funded a project here for this group, and we funded a project over here with this group. And instead of the transit provider really doing anything, any of those things, now we’re riding a -- we’re doing a more dedicated route for this, or a
more dedicated route for this. And then to answer the -- the
other piece, as far as someone sitting beside the table going,
hey, instead of spending that money on transportation, I know
you’ve been buying tickets for the last year, take that ticket
money, let’s put it here, and we’ll leverage this asset, a lot
of response is, I don’t have that kind of authority. You’ve
got to go to the state level for that.

MR. SALAZAR: And I can tell you, too, that -- two
things. One is -- is I was somewhat disappointed, too, at the
operator meeting where I thought, Steve, you’d be
fielding a lot of questions, and you really didn’t. And I
didn’t know if it was maybe because it wasn’t an appropriate
setting, or people were thinking maybe that wasn’t the most
proper time to do that. And so -- so I -- I do agree that I
think we need to do outreach, and I think we need to solicit
input, if we can.

The other thing I wanted to say is I agree with Brad
where we talk about the local plans where we need this, HHSC,
whomever it is around the table, they want this. But what
they’re tired of us saying is, we don’t have the money to do
that. We -- we simply don’t have the money to -- to continue
with that plan, or to fund that plan. And so I think that
they get frustrated or -- or maybe I should just speak from
where we’re at, that they get frustrated because we’re not
able to sustain anything. We’re not able to do anything.
It’s just a plan, and at some point we have to do something besides just have a plan in place.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And to me, number one, all of us have open board meetings where we have stakeholder groups, anyone that has issues with your transit provider. I’m going to hear from them anyway, where they’re -- I don’t have to wait until a board meeting. If someone has a problem, they’re probably going to call me. You know, you need -- we -- we need this, we’re having an issue with dialysis patients, we’re having an issue with this senior group, what -- what can we do? I think this money, this $12-million that we’ve spent in the last eight years would be better served for me saying, you know what, I do have an issue with dialysis patients. How can I make that better? I would rather have that money to spend -- some form of money to say, look, let’s look at my fixed route services, and let’s plan how we can fix and change those, and probably not cost my agency any money, if we just adjust this route to this street, this other route to this street, swing around at different time frames, we’d be able to fix that.

That’s what I see is true transportation planning, making a difference and adding to our -- to -- to the number of passengers on board per revenue mile, per revenue hour, that sort of thing. That’s what I see transportation planning as, not that we -- we dream up a lot of great projects that would really be great. We have no way to fund them.
Especially now more than ever, because there is no JARC or New Freedom money anymore.

That was kind of your experimental, let’s try it, see if it’ll work. If it works, we’ll continue to do it. We don’t have that anymore. It’s I have my formula funds. This is what I have. And technically, that’s not been increased for 15 years now. So I don’t have any more --

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and -- and this already gets, Brad, too specific, and so we would probably ought to have a conversation about this offline. But the -- the Health and Human Service folks want to pay per trip; right? And -- and so there’s --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Mostly by ticket. They don’t even want to pay for J.R. to go somewhere. They want to have a fan of tickets, and they can go 1Z, as you need it --

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MR. UNDERWOOD: -- 2Z -- it’s their way of control, I guess, is what I’m trying to say.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. But -- but that’s basically their way of tracking that one trip, and you know, and it’s a little misleading, because that’s not the -- the public fare ticket price necessarily; right?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: It -- it -- but the conversation that really needs to happen, supposed to happen at this table
around coordination and isn’t, is how do we get from that per
passenger trip that we have to make sure is appropriate for
that person, for that physician, at that time, for that
service, how do we get from there to having y’all carry that?

MR. UNDERWOOD: I think the difference is that’s at
the state level. That’s nothing that we’re going to solve in
Sherman, Texas, to figure out why DARS wants to buy tickets,
as opposed to supportive transit. Because you -- you ask them
that, they go, you know, this is what we’re allowed to
purchase.

MR. GADBOIS: You can -- I know of examples of
piloting and experimentation happening around this state at a
very local level. Yes, it may take bubbling it up to the
state to get final approval from TxDOT or HHS side --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: -- yes. But that’s something that
State, on TxDOT ought to be helping you to do, I would think.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: But that’s also something that you’re
around a table with your, you know, you name it program, ought
to be at least both agreeing this is how we can do it, this is
what a pilot might look like, now let’s push that up to the
state.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And I do not disagree with you on
that, but I don’t know that we need $12-million in eight
years, or 12 meetings a year to do that. That’s something you
call me up and go, you know what, we both agree to that, let’s
run it up both of our flagpoles and make it happen. That’s
where I go with that conversation.

MS. BLOOMER: Steve?

MR. WRIGHT: I was just going to share, to underscore
the opportunities that transit providers have had for input,
almost half -- I think it’s 11 of the 14 lead agencies are
transit providers. So all of the extra effort to reach out to
the lead agencies, half of those are transit providers. So I
just wanted to let you know that, as well. And then also,
much of the discussion that you’ve been talking about is
underscored by the recommendations from the working group.

In particular, the -- a strong set of recog --
recommendations was the recognition of the need for state
level collaboration, which there has been some to date, but
there’s so much more to do.

That’s -- that’s one of the items that was
recognized, as well as the need -- or the recommendation, the
need according to the working group’s perspective, for some
sort of metrics or performance measures, so that we can, when
asked the question, what can you point to data wise, to -- to
demonstrate the success, or the return on the investment of
these past six years of, you know, however many million
dollars, so that we could do that.
So I’m -- I’m -- what I’m hearing you guys say I
think is captured in many of the recommendations --

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MR. WRIGHT: -- from the group.

MR. GADBOIS: -- well then, Steve, the only -- the
only thing I’m going to -- and -- and I’ll quit pushing this
afterwards, but the thing I was trying to say to Eric is, lead
agencies have an investment in the way they’ve been doing
things, and the -- those ways looking successful. So if the
only thing we’re doing is going and talking to them, you’re
going to get one image of what’s been happening in their area.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: Whereas you may hear bubbling up or,
you know, rumor mill or wherever, that there’s dissatisfaction
that’s unidentifiable if the only ones you’re talking to are
the lead agencies.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, and that raises my question.
How many lead agencies fund staff positions out of -- out of
this program?

MR. WRIGHT: None of the agencies fund staff
positions per se from this grant. It would be inadequate for
that. The way that this grant works is it’s deliverables
based. So the folks base their -- we base the budgets and the
contracts based on the cost to produce a given deliverable; a
report, a plan, a study, a survey. And there’s a cost
associated with that. And --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Someone at the staff level has to prepare those things.

MR. WRIGHT: -- so built into that is somebody’s number -- their time that they put into that, and that -- that contributes to the cost of that deliverable. But it’s not fully funding a staff position, per se.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, you need the coordinated plans to comply with federal funding, as well. In which case -- right?

MR. WRIGHT: That’s correct.

MS. BLOOMER: And --

MR. GADBOIS: And -- in -- in which case --

MR. UNDERWOOD: At -- it’s the state has to have it, not every region. Because in the state of Oklahoma, it’s actually done at their DOT.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Every five years.

MS. BLOOMER: -- what we need to go back to, is the goal and the intent of the program to satisfy the federal requirement, or is that something that obviously we have to do, but isn’t the primary goal that we’re trying to achieve.

Are we trying to achieve something more here than checking off the box that says, yes, FTA, we have a regional plan.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, there’s also a state statute that
we have to comply with that calls for, generally speaking, and
I’m not quoting verbatim, but generally speaking, it calls for
us to carry out efforts to specifically do a more efficient --
to more efficiently meet the public’s transportation need in
Texas. When you combine that with the federal mandate, it
specifically brings in an emphasis on human service
transportation needs. But the way we have approached that in
Texas is that there is an emphasis on human service
transportation needs, but it’s by -- in no way limited to
human service transportation needs. So we have both state and
federal statutes.

    MR. GADBOIS: What you --

    MS. BLOOMER: And I -- I’m not arguing that we have
to meet the federal and the state statute. I’m asking if our
intent here is to check yes, we met the state requirement,
yes, we met the federal requirement --

    MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

    MS. BLOOMER: -- or are we trying to get to something
beyond that --

    MR. WRIGHT: Right.

    MS. BLOOMER: -- which we can check off those two
boxes, but we go above and beyond, because we’re trying to get
here. And all -- I -- I feel like we’ve gotten to the point
where we’re just checking off, yep, we meet that requirement,
yes, we meet that requirement. We’re doing plans that aren’t
getting implemented. Why do them? Well, because there’s a state and a federal statute that requires that we do them. It requires that we have stakeholder groups that get together, but what’s the -- I mean, the original intent was to bring HHSC to the table. Have we brought HHSC to the table? Maybe we go back to what the original intent was, and how do we bring HHSC to the table?

I’m just having a hard time, because we have recommendations when we haven’t really decided or determined, at least not clearly for me, what we’re trying to accomplish. So how do you know the directions when you don’t know where you’re going -- where you’re trying to get to? That’s where I’m --

MR. WRIGHT: When you don’t --

MS. BLOOMER: -- confused.

MR. WRIGHT: -- metrics or --

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MS. BLOOMER: I’m not talking metrics. I’m talking just what are we trying to achieve? Not --

MR. WRIGHT: The goal, the purpose.

MS. BLOOMER: -- not the, you know, X percent of this, or any of -- any of that yet. Just big picture, 10,000 feet, or 30,000 feet, million feet, however high a plan --

MR. WRIGHT: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: -- or on the moon, what are we trying
to accomplish? And if we don’t know that, then how can we sit here and have recommendations to do X, Y, and Z, and establish metrics, and do this, when we don’t even know what we’re trying to accomplish? But --

MR. GADBOIS: Well, you --

MS. BLOOMER: -- and --

MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle, my reason for pointing out the state and federal funding was to -- to make sure everybody remembers the reason we’d originally invested is to help people figure out how to develop plans, and then to do the planning.

Now, I’m all for revisiting, you know, is that really working, is there a better way to invest that money, but at least we need to recognize where we’ve been, and why. What I would ask, just to make sure I haven’t missed it, because I think this is what Michelle’s asking for, is the statewide working group, this slide, purpose, the first bullet point is, assess existing efforts. But I see no assessment here. Is there an assessment that I’ve missed?

MR. WRIGHT: No, that's a good observation. The working group did at their first meeting spend some time assessing what worked well to date, and there was a good amount of discussion and several items identified concerning data collection and outreach and stakeholder engagement and different ones pointed out, certain tactics or strategies that
worked very well from kind of a best practice perspective on that. But clearly, the -- and Brad was on that working group, the bulk of their work, and it was a lot of work over the course of three, four months, was on future direction.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: So you're correct, in that observation.

MR. GADBOIS: I -- what -- I actually want to agree with Michelle or at least what I understand Michelle to be asking for. We need an assessment to define the problem we're trying to fix before we'll be able to much understand these recommendations and whether they make sense or not. Is that fair?

MR. GLEASON: Let me ask the clarification again. So there's what you just said, find the problem we're trying to fix. What I also heard Michelle say was define what we're trying to do, you know, how can we -- you know, what are we trying to accomplish with this -- this program. And I think, you know, those two fit together.

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah, my -- my focus would be more on the where do we think the program should be and how do we get it there. It's not -- okay, it's working in some places, it's not working in others. That's in the past, let's focus on where we want to go and how do we get there. And I think that's what we need in order to be able to see if the recommendations from the working group actually think -- we
think would get us there. But it's hard to weigh in on them -

(Conference call interruption)

MS. BLOOMER: It's hard to determine if the
recommendations will get us there when we don't know where
we're trying to go. So I think that -- that was my point. I think it's two sides of the same coin, just a different way to
-- instead of looking at the problem; yes, there's problems.
There's probably lots of problems. There's probably lots of
successes. But regardless of that, that's for the existing
system and the existing program. What would the new program
look like?

MR. GADBOIS: It -- and I'd rather see what the
problems are and what needs to be solved before I go to that
other, because we've, in the abstract, tried to do the where
should this go before. And you -- and that's going to be
really tough if we don't understand fairly well what's
happened, what hadn't worked, to the extent we can why it
hadn't worked and what has worked and why it has worked.

MR. GLEASON: So one of the things we've done over
the years routinely is showcased best practice efforts as a
way of giving folks a picture of the possibility for the
effort. And that's a little bit getting at where do we think
it should go.

We have areas that do things which, in our view,
represent best practices for this, that others who are struggling, should they choose to take the step and take the initiative, could look to for guidance. And that's one way in which historically we've attempted to respond to how do we move the complete body of work being done up and forward.

We've had -- but that, you know, there's -- how much accountability is there to that approach?

MR. UNDERWOOD: To me what's success? Is it going to be well, then that means we put more people on a bus, our passengers per revenue hour went up? Then you know what, that's success. Or, we create a really great plan but our passengers per revenue mile went down, well, that's what we asked them to do, so that's success.

To me I think we've got to define what success is for this program representing the public transit industry. And I think once we answer that question, a lot of things are going to go away.

MR. GADBOIS: I don't think it is --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Not -- program won't go away.

MR. GADBOIS: -- defined just by the public transportation industry. And that's part of the point.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah, we'll disagree.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, can I just share, one of our members was not able to be here today. Rob Stephens apologized, he was a little upset that we scheduled to meet on
the one and only day he could not make it.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Who would have thought we had ice last time, in Austin.

MS. BLOOMER: And accused me of doing it on purpose since he wasn't able to attend the last meeting either where this one came up.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: So, I promised Rob that I would share his thoughts on this item, but to summarize, he though -- he thinks the regional coordination item is very important, it's currently very frustrating from his perspective, and that we need to go in a different direction.

He brought up that, you know, the original intent was to bring HHSC to the table and get rid of the parallel systems operating public transit and HHSC public transportation or transportation systems, and that really hasn't happened, and that he believes it's time to move in a different direction, which would bring more innovation and creativity back into the process.

So, I wanted to share those on behalf of Rob. I committed to him that we weren't making any decisions today about it and that we would ensure that he would be at the next meeting and we'd discuss this in more detail.

MR. GLEASON: So he doesn't describe the different direction in his note to you?
MS. BLOOMER:  No.

MR. GLEASON:  Okay.

MS. BLOOMER:  That --

MR. UNDERWOOD:  He just says different direction.

MR. GLEASON:  Okay.

MS. BLOOMER:  And it was -- it was a rather -- it was a phone call, but I think what I had communicated to Rob is that we were at the point at PTAC of not -- I was hoping we would come today and we would have something to bounce stuff off of, and that we weren't really at that point where we were ready to take action and say this is the direction we were moving, so that if he had ideas, other options, there -- we were at the beginning process of this and that I would anticipate we would be moving forward and he'd have opportunity to provide those specific comments about what he is frustrated about, what he would like to see going forward. I didn't feel comfortable communicating that on his behalf. Are we losing you?

MR. GADBOIS:  Yeah, I needed to go 11 minutes ago.

MS. BLOOMER:  But -- okay, sorry. Will you --

MR. UNDERWOOD:  Before you leave, can I throw out just one quick thing to kind of wrap this up? I know at some point we're going to talk about next meeting dates and times and that sort of thing. It might be a wild hair, but we've talked about moving PTAC meetings around the state where --
that way more people would have the opportunity to attend. I
know we've got a TTA conference coming in April. I would --
I'd even think it might even be a good idea to have our P --
you know, skip a March meeting, have an April meeting and
maybe not a May meeting, and we could do it there in Fort
Worth at the conference, that way you're going to have all the
trans providers in the room. The ones that want to attend,
that's just -- I know Bobby's dying over there. He's
cringing. But anyway, that's just a recommendation. I don't
know if Mr. Gadbois would be able to attend something like
that in Fort Worth. I know he likes to be up in Tarrant
County anyways.

MR. GADBOIS: I -- I've been heard to travel before.

MS. BLOOMER: Bobby, is that something that's
possible?

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes? Okay. Bobby's shaking his head
yes.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And maybe we could take up this
particular action at that -- at that time to talk about it.

MR. GADBOIS: April what time?

MR. UNDERWOOD: I don't know. Something.

MR. KILLEBREW: We've been -- this is Bobby. We'll
find a date because we'll have to coordinate with the TTA
folks and their conference and location and so forth.
MR. UNDERWOOD: Maybe some afternoon or something we could have a room to meet and do our meeting.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And we could bring back this particular item.

MS. BLOOMER: Do we want to bring -- by this particular item, you mean this particular item, not the one you're pointing on.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah, let's discuss it, uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Which would focus around identifying -- to Glenn's point, finding what the problems are, finding what other -- what is working in some regions, what isn't working in some regions, and then having that discussion of where do we want the program to go and what would it need to look like to get us there.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yep.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. UNDERWOOD: That's just my recommendation. But I wanted to say it before you left, so --

MS. BLOOMER: Are you --

MR. UNDERWOOD: To see if you would be amenable to it.

MR. GADBOIS: I -- you know, I'm okay with April. Getting out of town in March would be even better, you know --

MR. GLEASON: I think it's going to be the end of
April.

MS. BLOOMER: Think it's April 26th --

MR. UNDERWOOD: It's the last week.

MS. BLOOMER: -- 25th, 26th --

MR. GLEASON: 25th -- it's the last week of April.

MS. BLOOMER: -- and 27th.

MR. GADBOIS: Is that F1 weekend? Because I'll go then, too; gladly.

MR. SALAZAR: Glad to be out of town for F1.

MS. BLOOMER: We do have one public comment from Mr. Lyle Nelson from CARTS. Is he still here?

MR. NELSON: Yes, he is.

MS. BLOOMER: On this item. Okay. And if we could limit our comments to no more than five minutes.

MR. NELSON: Considering you saw my comments, I bet I can. If everybody's going to leave, I'm going to limit it to about 40 seconds.

My name's Lyle Nelson. I am with CARTS. Certainly, the -- my comments were already presented by others in the room and I appreciate it. I -- we're attempting to in my mind perpetuate a broken system. What defines success by regions is going to be different. I mean, all these points were certainly raised. The provision of public transit is a unique animal that a lot of people don't recognize when they come to the table. The coordination efforts of the rural and smaller
transport providers is well documented.

I'm trying not to repeat some of the comments that have already been made. There is changes we can effect. We can certainly effect some administrative changes. We can't change anything in state law, we can't change anything from the federal mandates at this point in time. Let's change what we can, correct what we can, and let's do it now.

The expenditure of $12-million over eight years, it ain't doing what we want to do. Glenn brought up a really good point. The original intent was to identify those gaps and barriers, bring people to the table.

We've not only not adequately identified the gaps and barriers, we've increased the gaps and barriers through the recent census. And there are transportation deserts out there right now that no service, no service, is being provided. Nobody's even addressing those issues. And we need to address those issues.

I was properly admonished by Mr. Gleason for not bringing up some points at the semi-annual meeting. I think there is such a diverse interest in this process, there's such a diverse interpretation of what success is, that I think we - if we'd have entered into a conversation there in that large of a room, it would have been all over the place and probably a bar room fight at some point in time, because some people feel very strongly about the services that are being provided
out there and services that are not being provided out there.

So Michelle, I appreciate you stealing my comments by voicing them in a very clear and concise manner, and that's all I have.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you, Lyle.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Lyle.

MS. BLOOMER: What does the committee think? If we're going to go back to the Texas Transit Association in April, that gives us -- it's the end of April, so a month and a half. Because we don't want a bar fight at the semi-annual meeting, is to bring a --

MR. GADBOIS: Certainly not without the bar.

MS. BLOOMER: -- a working group together of say seven to ten transit industry representatives, because we've heard from the lead agencies, HHSC, et cetera, and get them to come up with what they think is and isn't working, basically do a lot of this work for us, what the program -- where the program should go, help identify some of those best practices or Steve may already have those, and then come up with suggested ways to define success. That when we go to TTA in April, we have something that they can provide feedback on. I'm not saying it's going to be the end-all, but I find you don't get a whole lot of people to comment if you don't have something out there for them to comment on. You know? And
maybe we throw a wild card up there that says we want to do X and people respond well, that's crazy. Well, great, then what do you think we should do, and we can start that conversation.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, I don't think that's a bad idea. I think we need to have at least one PTAC member or two if they want to volunteer on that -- in that group if you're going to form it.

MS. BLOOMER: Is that something that we can do between now and TTA? Bobby?

MR. UNDERWOOD: All things are possible with Bobby.

MS. BLOOMER: You know, Bobby, it'll either be the working group or it'll be TxDOT staff.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah. So, and I think you're almost forming a motion here, sounds like.

MS. BLOOMER: We -- I think we're getting ready to with the TTA. We'd like to take it to the Texas Transit Association as an item. We'd like TxDOT to pull together a working group of folks.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah. I think certainly as a committee you can make this -- when we get a quorum back in the room, you can make a motion and the committee can weigh in on that.

MR. UNDERWOOD: He's caucusing right now.

MS. BLOOMER: Isn't three -- we only have five
members. Oh no, we don't.

MR. KILLEBREW: There's six.

MS. BLOOMER: I can't count today.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah, so there's six members. So we need -- yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Can I suggest --

MR. KILLEBREW: I'm not sure how --

MR. GADBOIS: -- another way around?

MR. KILLEBREW: -- if we can pull this off by April, though.

MR. GADBOIS: And we could pull this part off; is get Steve to give us as much of an assessment as he has on what -- you know, what has he heard are the problems that need to be dealt with, get it to us. We come prepared to spend enough time at our next PTAC meeting to where we could develop some articulations of what we think this program and that $12-million ought to be invested in. And then we line up a group of transit folks or go into the room saying these are the things we think it ought to be, y'all tell us what you think about those, and now let's, you know, break out to figure out how those actually would break down into goals, objectives, whatever else we need. And make that a working meeting with them after we've done our work to put up a strawman.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I think that was --

MR. GADBOIS: Or a straw woman or a straw family.
MS. BLOOMER: Straw person.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Straw person.

MR. GADBOIS: Straw people.

MS. BLOOMER: That was sort of in the form of a motion, but just --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Will you reiterate that?

MS. BLOOMER: I will reiterate because J.R. was out. Is go ahead and ask Steve to provide an assessment to help us answer the question of what are the issues, what isn't working, what is working, provide that to PTAC in advance of our March twenty -- our March meeting. And that PTAC would come together and this would be the main item on the agenda for us to dedicate time to, to come up with what the program goals should be and how we should move the program -- or come up with the strawman --

MR. GADBOIS: March or April?

MR. UNDERWOOD: It's going to be in April.

MR. GADBOIS: We were talking about moving it to April.

MR. UNDERWOOD: April.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, TTA is in April, so if we want to have something to turn around to present at TTA --

MR. GADBOIS: So you want to meet before then?

MS. BLOOMER: I want to make sure we have enough time between when we meet to turn it around for TTA. So I would
say we keep our end of March meeting with the only item on the agenda being the regional coordination.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. My proposal was we do it all in one fell swoop, but that's fine.

MS. BLOOMER: Go to TxDOT -- go to TTA --

MR. GADBOIS: We go to April.

MS. BLOOMER: -- and?

MR. GADBOIS: We spend enough time in April to develop what -- articulations of what we think this program ought to be doing and what we ought to be investing in money. And I would think that we could do in, you know, 30 minutes to an hour; if we're prepared. And then we are prepared after our PTAC meeting to walk into a discussion with TTA, a small group or large group, to say this is what we think are options for this program and the expenditure of the money, what do you all think about it, how might it work, what do we need to change, and then we have all of that information and detail out into a recommendation at our next meeting.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think the only area we differ on is I was trying to use the regularly scheduled March meeting, but --

MR. GADBOIS: I'm fine. I'm fine.

MS. BLOOMER: -- if we think we can do that, move it to April since we -- this is what, February 25th.

MR. UNDERWOOD: We're basically in March as it is.
MS. BLOOMER: As far as scheduling goes, I think it'd be easier since we all have and we all know and we all committed to try to keep those open than to trying to find a date in April that we can all make. But I'm -- you made the motion, so --

MR. GADBOIS: And I think you made a -- I understand you to have made a friendly amendment.

MS. BLOOMER: An amendment. Okay. So assessment in advance, stick with the March meeting, and then take the strawman that PTAC develops at the March meeting to TTA for --

MR. UNDERWOOD: In April.

MS. BLOOMER: -- in April, for discussion, amongst the transit industry.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So we're going to take it for discussion in April?

MS. BLOOMER: To TTA.

MR. UNDERWOOD: That will be our meeting, right?

We're going to do a meeting, not just stand up and do an update, correct?

MR. GADBOIS: So -- just so -- my motion to make sure that every member understands this.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I'd just as soon have our meeting on location.

MS. BLOOMER: Oh. Brad's suggesting we have a PTAC meeting --
MR. UNDERWOOD: I just want to do the PTAC --
MR. GADBOIS: I know.
MS. BLOOMER: I didn't get that.
MR. GADBOIS: I got that in --
MR. UNDERWOOD: Just work through our agenda at the
meeting.
MS. BLOOMER: With this being the main item on the
agenda?
MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure. Anything else we need to clean
up from May or March.
MS. BLOOMER: I think we can do that but we -- we
don't have a meeting in April scheduled. Our next one would
be May. So, I think we need to meet prior to taking something
to TTA to know what we're going to take.
MR. UNDERWOOD: I don't want it to be rehearsed. I'd
just as soon let's just have it there. It gives everyone the
opportunity, they're all going to be -- I mean, most transit
providers are going to be at the conference. So it gives them
an opportunity at 2:00 we're doing a meeting, a PTAC meeting.
You've always wanted to come see one, you've always want to
join, but you don't want to drive to Austin to do it, it's
going to be right here with you. I'd just as soon work
through our agenda just like we normally would; our May items
and our March items. Obviously this will be one of them and
we do it all in April. I think it's fine. If nobody shows
up, I guess no one ever wants to come, but at the same time --

   MR. GADBOIS: Chair, can you live with that?

   MS. BLOOMER: I can live with that. I'm --

   MR. UNDERWOOD: It's in your backyard.

   MS. BLOOMER: -- just --

   MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

   MS. BLOOMER: -- need to get my head around what we're going to be --

   MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So let me try this in a motion and hopefully it'll clarify enough to -- where everybody --

   MR. UNDERWOOD: So you're withdrawing your other motion, Glenn?

   MR. GADBOIS: No. Actually, I'm simply not going to include the friendly amendment in my motion.

   MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

   MR. GADBOIS: As I state it. So my motion is that Steve and PTN staff work to develop a more refined assessment of what has worked and what has not worked with regards to the coordination program. And get that to us in ample time to consider what we might want to make in terms of directions going forward, recommendations on directions going forward for this program.

   We then meet in April, concomitant with the April TTA meeting in Fort Worth, and have a -- have our March meeting at that time. So switch from March to April. At that meeting,
we have scheduled enough time to have a serious discussion
about what we found in assessments and what we think the
program ought to be doing going forward, and how to make those
into statements that we can -- well, so make those into
statements.

We can then open up for public comment for any TTA
members that want to be there to add to that discussion. We
then also ask PTN staff to help us arrange for a meeting with
TTA, either full group or some key stakeholders, to talk with
them in more detail about these are the directions we want to
go, which -- would it -- what would the impacts be or what can
be predict the impacts would be, how might that be
implemented, et cetera, so that we can then develop as a -- as
a body a much more kind of consistent, holistic set of
recommendations. That's my motion.

MR. UNDERWOOD: That's the longest motion I've heard.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Well, trying to make it detailed
and descriptive --

MR. UNDERWOOD: More like a filibuster.

MR. GADBOIS: -- so everybody understands what
they're agreeing to.

MR. UNDERWOOD: It's a filibuster.

MR. SALAZAR: I won't ask you to repeat it.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, okay.

MR. GADBOIS: She can.
MS. BLOOMER: We have a motion.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I think everything I understood and wrote down, I will second that motion.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Can I ask a clarifying question? So this is in place of a working group?

MR. GADBOIS: Yep.

MS. BLOOMER: And then my other question and Lyle is gone, are we comfortable that we'll get the level of public -- or transit industry feedback that we're wanting since we didn't get it at the semi-annual? That -- that's going to be my only concern is that if folks didn't feel comfortable providing comment at the semi-annual, if we do it at a large TTA conference, then we're just -- we're going to get the same response.

MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Then so be it.

MR. GADBOIS: -- my intent with stating as part of my motion a request for PTN and representatives of TTA to help us arrange a meeting afterwards, is we arrange a meeting to where we can get good feedback, good and accurate feedback, from TTA members.

I don't know at this point whether that's large group, throw it out to everybody and let's just have a brawl, let's do it at a bar, you know, might as well for a bar room brawl. But or whether we arrange specific people to be in
there that we'll be good for that discussion. I'm not the one
in charge of that, TTA and PTN staff are the one -- there's --
that are going to help us arrange that.

MR. GLEASON: So let me ask if I may, clarifying
question. I need to understand how many formal meetings of
PTAC we're talking about here, because I think what I heard
was our next formal meeting for PTAC is actually --

MR. GADBOIS: April.

MR. GLEASON: -- at the TTA conference?

MR. GADBOIS: My motion it would be April, if
approved.

MR. UNDERWOOD: April at the conference.

MR. GADBOIS: Would be April.

MR. GLEASON: April at the TTA conference.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Then the follow-up meeting with a
smaller group of TTA membership to -- I think that's what
you're saying --

MR. GADBOIS: Well, so we can decide that as we're
having our discussion. We could either not adjourn and have
that --

MR. GLEASON: Oh, you're talking about the same day -

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- in Fort Worth?
MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, yeah. I want to -- you know --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Maybe just get on their agenda.

MR. GADBOIS: -- let's just have -- let's just work

for them to change for a little while.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. But so I'm putting this agenda
together for this April meeting, okay? I'm seeing this right

next to you here.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Trying to figure out what we're doing.

We have a -- we have an agenda that is inclusive of a open

invite meeting to listen and participate in a PTAC

collection on --

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: -- future directions of the regional

coordination program. And then the agenda does what? It goes

into -- it has a --

MR. GADBOIS: So we could have it as a discussion

item.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: With stakeholders from TTA --

MR. GLEASON: You bet. It's the second meeting I'm

struggling with, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, it -- well, so but it doesn't

have to be a second meeting. So at --

MR. GLEASON: Okay.
MR. GADBOIS: -- the meeting, you put on the agenda we're going to have -- we're going to have an item to decide, you know, strategy level recommendations.

MR. GLEASON: Yep.

MR. GADBOIS: On this program. And then you have as a second item discussion with TTA stakeholders on item number 1's outcomes.

MR. UNDERWOOD: To me that's just public comment, though.

MR. GLEASON: That sounds like public comment.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, but the -- you can define it that way as you want.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: But I'm being descriptive, we're going to have a discussion, if you need to define it as a discussion on the agenda I would define it as a discussion on the agenda.

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: So that there's no question about whether it's interactive or not. We can always decide if we're not going to get the conversation in that -- you know, we set up the agenda that way. Y'all then have a conversation with TTA, y'all, y'all, whoever y'all. If we decide we're not going to have the kind of interactive discussion and open discussion we want in that forum, then we can always decide afterwards we're going to adjourn that meeting at some point
and three of us are going to walk into this other arranged meeting for a two hour discussion, or two of us, right? We can always do that.

MR. GLEASON: That what you just described there is not a meeting of PTAC.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, I'm --

MR. GADBOIS: Right. The second one then would not be a second -- I'm under no scenario talking about two meetings of PTAC.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. That's what I wanted to hear. I couldn't tell the way you were speaking, whether that --

MS. BLOOMER: I think, yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: To clarify just so I understand; there's one meeting of PTAC in lieu of the March meeting, we're going to have an April meeting at TTA where we run through our regular PTAC agenda.

MR. GADBOIS: Yep.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: Then, in addition to that meeting, either as part of it or separately, and I would say I think it would be beneficial being separate, is that we have a conversation with the industry about the discussion at PTAC in more depth. It's not on the record, it's in a smaller group setting, that allows folks to really come and tell us what
they think about what we talked about.

    MR. GADBOIS: Well, and Michelle, we always have the
3 option to do that and arrange for that in advance. I'm
4 talking about making sure Eric can set up an agenda that would
5 allow us to have the discussion, as part of the discussion if
6 we decide we want to do it. And then we can always do the
7 other.

    MR. UNDERWOOD: Still sounds like the same motion on
8 the floor.

    MR. GLEASON: Yes.

    MR. UNDERWOOD: First and a second.

    MS. BLOOMER: A first and a second.

    MR. UNDERWOOD: Uh-huh.

    MS. BLOOMER: All those in favor?

       (Chorus of ayes)

    MS. BLOOMER: Motion passed.

    MR. GADBOIS: Thank you, all.

    MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

    MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you.

    MR. GADBOIS: Now I really need to go.

    MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Glenn. Sorry. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is --

    MR. KILLEBREW: Madam Chair?

    MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

    MR. KILLEBREW: We lost a quorum, so you actually
just need to --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. KILLEBREW: -- end the meeting.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Move to adjourn.

MR. KILLEBREW: You can continue a discussion, but when Glenn walks out we'll lose the quorum.

MR. GLEASON: Oh, what do you --

MS. BLOOMER: Well, and I was just going to say, too, I don't -- it's the review of the work plan. I think for our next meeting, we need to get the work plan out to folks because Glenn had to provide it.

MR. GADBOIS: I didn't.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, you did. You provided it, remember?

MR. GADBOIS: Oh.

MS. BLOOMER: I -- in my transition from COG to Catholic Charities, lost all my --

MR. GADBOIS: Temporary lost it, but we found it again.

MS. BLOOMER: -- whole documentation.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay, good.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, you provided it to me, that's how I found it.

MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay. Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: That we go ahead and get that back on
MR. GADBOIS: So I don't need to look for it. I don't need -- do we need to confirm a meeting date? Did we just do that with our?

MR. KILLEBREW: You just did.

MR. GADBOIS: With our vote?

MS. BLOOMER: April -- we did. For now say April 25th, 26th, and 27th on your calendar.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And Bobby will let us know or Josh will let us know a more detailed date and time. Thank you.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, all.

MS. BLOOMER: We can adjourn without a quorum, right?

(Proceedings concluded at 3:39 p.m.)
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