

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - TELECONFERENCE  
MEETING

3712 Jackson Avenue, Building 6  
3rd Floor, Room 323  
Austin, Texas

Tuesday  
February 25, 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

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

TxDOT PARTICIPANTS:

- Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
- Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Division Director, PTN
- Kelly Kirkland, PTN
- Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN

INDEX

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Approval of the minutes from November 26, 2013 meeting	4
Safety briefing by Bobby Killebrew	4
Item 3, Division Director's report - Eric Gleason	6
Item 4, Texas Transportation Plan - Michelle Conkle	8
Item 5, Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning - Steve Wright	52
Public Comment:	
Lyle Nelson - CARTS.	82
Motion by Glenn Gadbois - Steve Wright 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.	91
Second by Brad Underwood	92
Motion Passed	98
Confirm date of next meeting	100
Adjourn	100

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MS. BLOOMER: All right. We have a quorum, so we'll  
3 go ahead and call the Public Transportation Advisory Committee  
4 meeting to order. The second item on the agenda is approval  
5 of the minutes from the November 26, 2013 meeting. Do I have  
6 a motion? Oh, sorry, Bobby. We'll do this first, then we'll  
7 go back.

8 Do I have a motion for approval of the minutes?

9 MR. GADBOIS: So moved.

10 MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion.

11 MR. SALAZAR: Second.

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

14 (Chorus of ayes)

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

19 MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you, Michelle.

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

1 MR. GADBOIS: Very good.

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

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

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

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

25 So if there's no questions, appreciate you listening.

1 MR. UNDERWOOD: What if the cabin pressure changes.  
2 Oxygen's not provided.

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

5 MR. GADBOIS: This is why they separated us.

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

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

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

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

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

23 We are expecting federal apportionments --

24 (Pause for construction noise)

25 MR. GLEASON: Anyways, later this week, sometime next

1 week, is when we expect to receive fiscal year '14 federal  
2 apportionments.

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

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

17           MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions for Eric?

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

21           MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

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

25           MR. GADBOIS: Y'all do; do we?

1 MR. GLEASON: -- track that -- do you? No, you have  
2 not gotten that yet. Would you like to receive that as part  
3 of an update?

4 MR. GADBOIS: Please.

5 MR. GLEASON: All right.

6 MR. GADBOIS: I'd love to.

7 MR. GLEASON: We will add that to our list, yes.

8 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, to clarify, San Antonio, the  
9 MPO doesn't have any toll credits?

10 MR. GLEASON: That is correct.

11 MR. GADBOIS: They don't generate any.

12 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

13 MS. BLOOMER: They don't generate any, so they don't  
14 go to MPO first, they come to TxDOT.

15 MR. GLEASON: That's right. That's correct.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Neither does Corpus.

17 MR. GLEASON: That's correct. Yeah, so these will be  
18 coming out of the statewide portion with which we have a \$15-  
19 million pot if you will.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh. Any other questions for Eric?  
21 If not, we'll move on to Item 4 on the agenda, the  
22 presentation/discussion of TxDOT's Texas Transportation Plan,  
23 Number 4.

24 MS. CONKLE: Good afternoon. My name is Michelle  
25 Conkle and I work for Transportation Planning and Programming,

1 a Division of TxDOT. I met most of you at the last meeting  
2 and saw some of you again at the Bicycle Advisory Committee  
3 and I'm going to give you an update on our progress on the  
4 Texas Transportation Plan.

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

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

24 (Pause - construction noise; drilling)

25 MS. CONKLE: You know, the great thing is a screw is

1 only so long, right, so they've got to eventually stop. Is  
2 that we had -- we had -- what we lacked in the number of  
3 participants at the meetings, we made up for quality in terms  
4 of the ideas they gave us for the development of a plan.

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

16           Again, I think that -- I told you when I came back  
17 that it looked like we were going to have some really good  
18 news for public transit bicycle and pedestrian, and we do. If  
19 you look at the survey results and I'm particularly talking  
20 about commute from home to work, we have -- we're showing a  
21 little bit more or seven percent of our respondents are  
22 actually, that's their primary mode of transportation. So  
23 seven percent of the folks responding to the survey at this  
24 point are taking public transit, using their bicycles or  
25 walking to school or work.

1 I think that another really important -- yeah okay,  
2 maybe going back and forth between them is not working so  
3 well. Can we go to --

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

5 MS. CONKLE: Josh?

6 MR. RIBAKOVE: Want the next one?

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

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

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

23 (Pause - construction drilling)

24 MS. CONKLE: We need to prioritize transportation  
25 options for the elderly and disabled and really look at how

1 they travel and their unique needs. And I think I explained  
2 to you we have -- we really had people with special  
3 transportation needs were well represented in our first round  
4 of public involvement and had some very good input.

5           And then the last mile of the non-highway trip for  
6 passenger or freight, the multimodal/intermodal connections  
7 are the most important. And then they reiterated what we've  
8 been trying to say all along is that communicating with the  
9 public, gathering the feedback and being honest with them in  
10 terms of the money we have and what we're going to be able to  
11 do for them was very important. Next.

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

19           Also --

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

22           MR. SALAZAR: She's adding several together.

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

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

1 MS. CONKLE: Yes.

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

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

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

18 MR. SALAZAR: Right.

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

1 have, and they're if you will demanding a voice in some of  
2 their transportation options and choices.

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

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

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

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

21           MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

24           MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure. The next one I think is the  
25 better chart.

1 MS. CONKLE: Yeah, I want -- that's --

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

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

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

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

24 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Which means give people options.

1 MS. CONKLE: Right.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Transit, et cetera.

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

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

21 I think that when we got down to specific solutions  
22 for improving travel between cities, we saw things -- when we  
23 saw bus travel, we saw certain things jump up as well, because  
24 that's the way that some people do travel between cities. And  
25 again, representative of the people that we were talking to.

1 So, if you -- when you look at the original, you can see the  
2 actual; we have the N=114/115, because again, some people  
3 didn't answer all the questions. Some skipped over. But  
4 really, the number at the time that we really concatenated  
5 this data was 120 respondents. And since then, I believe we  
6 have up over 140 within a month. So people are learning about  
7 the survey, they're going out there and they're responding to  
8 it. And again, we hope that you're going to promote that for  
9 us. Next slide.

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

25           And if people were filling out the surveys there,

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

19           These -- this -- I'm lucky here because this slide is  
20 in both packets. These are the draft goal areas that we  
21 presented to the public in the first round of meetings as  
22 you'll see. What we've done here is we've taken just a -- to  
23 members of the committee that are new, we've taken TxDOT  
24 strategic goals on the top line, we've taken the MAP-21 goal  
25 areas on the bottom line, and we've merged them in to six

1 draft TTP goal areas.

2           Again, I want to point out that all of these goal  
3 areas, they are -- we consider them relevant to all modes. We  
4 consider them relevant to people and freight. So when we come  
5 up with strategies and targets, we're not going to just be  
6 developing those for the highway side. That is our intent is  
7 to cover all of the draft goals for all modes. Next slide.

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

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

21           Asset management is decrease the number of  
22 structurally deficient bridges, achieve a state of good repair  
23 for all pavement assets, achieve a state of good repair for  
24 all transit and multimodal assets which is again interesting  
25 because the public is at a point in their education about

1 transportation where they can make that distinction. You  
2 know, they're not just looking at terms we use and they're  
3 able to consider those assets as separate and apart from, you  
4 know, the highway system. And again, they even dedicated  
5 money in their own scenario to that very goal.

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

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

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

20           MS. CONKLE: TxDOT, that is -- again, I think we  
21 talked a little bit at the last meeting about how we're trying  
22 to have this effort dovetail into an effort at the  
23 administrative level to develop performance measures under  
24 MAP-21. That is something that is being handled by our  
25 administration, because it is very hard to set a target,

1 that's a very sensitive subject. I mean, I know we want -- we  
2 do report numbers and every year we come out and we say our  
3 hope is that we'll have fewer and we can say we have, but to  
4 actually put a target on that is -- I'm personally glad I am  
5 not the person that is setting the target for this particular  
6 performance measure, because I don't know how you -- I don't  
7 know what is a good number. I mean, we would clearly like to  
8 reduce those types of incidents to zero, but we have to set a  
9 target under MAP-21. So hopefully, by the time that you meet  
10 your next quarterly meeting, they will have set that target.  
11 Because that's under another division, it's under Traffic Ops.  
12 But if I have it, I'll bring it to you.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

14 MS. CONKLE: But yes, there will be numbers, because  
15 again, what we're -- at this point we're at the objectives.  
16 Objectives will lead to targets and targets at that point will  
17 --

18 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

21 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

22 MS. CONKLE: So in terms of our draft TTP goal of  
23 addressing congestion, again, we -- we're basically wanting to  
24 reduce peak demand and improve operations, increase passenger  
25 and freight travel time reliability and increase options for

1 accessibility for elderly, disabled and disadvantaged  
2 populations. And again, with a focus on increasing multimodal  
3 capacity.

4           And I will say that we heard a lot of -- a lot of  
5 folks that were at the meeting were telling us well, you have  
6 the one mode you need, but it's that last mile. Because like  
7 you said, it's putting the bike on the bus and then getting to  
8 campus, locking the bike up and walking into the building.  
9 And so one of the reasons we're adopting a second version of  
10 the survey is we realize we've got a little bit more to do to  
11 connect those ideas up with people and really get better, more  
12 complete answers in terms of having them understand that a  
13 multimodal trip -- again, if you say you take your bike, is  
14 getting them to understand at some point you're going to lock  
15 that up and walk, put it on a bus, whatever it is you do.  
16 Next slide.

17           Connect Texas communities. The objectives that we  
18 adopted to carry forward were providing access to jobs,  
19 transportation choices, and services for all Texans, no matter  
20 what mode they choose to travel by. Provide safe and  
21 convenient travel choices, and again, with a focus on the  
22 complete trip, because we know that we need to stress that,  
23 you know, when they're looking and answering questions, we  
24 need to get them thinking in the mode of the complete trip, if  
25 it takes more than one mode.

1            Supporting multimodal/intermodal planning project  
2 development investments and improving connectivity between  
3 urban, suburban and rural areas and between travel modes.  
4 Because again, there -- there's a surprising variety of ways  
5 that people will travel, you know, between cities. You think  
6 you would get in your car, but if you don't own a car, you're  
7 still possibly using para-transit. You're still getting  
8 someone else to carpool, vanpool, getting you to both -- or  
9 between cities and places you need to be. So again, in  
10 meeting some folks out on the road, it gave us some  
11 interesting questions we wanted to put on version 2 of the  
12 survey so we could get people's intent down a little better.

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

23            One city was doing sidewalks at the same -- at -- or  
24 -- at a time when TxDOT was also going to be doing ADA ramps  
25 and the person was like well, why didn't they just get

1 together, close off the street one time. Instead, they closed  
2 -- it's a man who was traveling by wheelchair. They closed it  
3 off one week and two weeks later they came and closed it again  
4 and cut the curb. And I said, well, you know, that -- I may  
5 not think about that, but I can see where that would be a  
6 problem. And he was just basically saying, you know, within  
7 three weeks, maybe you could have combined and even saved  
8 money on equipment rental and all that. So I said we'll take  
9 that forward. That's a very good point.

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

1 So we're hoping that the college students are going to get the  
2 word out, get people to our meetings, and get the survey, you  
3 know, out there to other folks.

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

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

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

1 maintaining what we have.

2           And then next slide, this is -- this was the  
3 additional draft goal that our internal technical advisory  
4 committee adopted. This was suggested while we were out on  
5 the road at public involvement and that goal was to identify  
6 and sustain funding sources for all modes. And they were very  
7 -- we were very -- this message was loud and clear. This  
8 wasn't to go out and find additional funds to do highways,  
9 this was to go out and find additional funding sources,  
10 sustainable funding sources, that match up with the unfunded  
11 mandates that we have legislatively and the goals and  
12 objectives we have for other modes. But the inability under  
13 our Texas Constitution to fund those, people were saying we'd  
14 like to take -- we'd like you to take back to the people that  
15 make the decisions the idea that we need to look at something  
16 different, something different than we already have and not  
17 just a onetime, you know, shot in the arm of federal funds or  
18 even state funds, but sustainable funds that allow us if we  
19 were actually able to build some of these projects to maintain  
20 them and connect them, because they do understand that one  
21 standalone project doesn't get us where we need to be no  
22 matter the mode, get us where we need to be in terms of  
23 seamless connectivity, and that we're not going to be able to  
24 -- that it was -- it's not exactly a fair assessment going out  
25 to them, saying we're setting goals and objectives without

1 looking at the fact that we're saying we have less money.  
2 They want us to -- if you're going to give us goals and  
3 objectives, and you want to do this, we also want you to look  
4 at how you're going to pay for it and bring that back out to  
5 us for consideration. So --

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

8 MS. CONKLE: No.

9 MR. GADBOIS: Oh.

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

14 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

15 MS. CONKLE: -- additional draft goal.

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

21 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

1 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

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

4 MS. CONKLE: Yes.

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

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

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

19 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

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

1 to be?

2 MS. CONKLE: It is too early to tell.

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

4 MS. CONKLE: It will be a conversation item.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

24 So we think that -- we think that we're off to an  
25 excellent start here. We think we're hearing things we've

1 never heard before, but we think this tool is going to  
2 absolutely support what we're hearing.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

25 To consider all funding sources to fill the needs to

1 revenues gap and that is -- again, that will be putting -- we  
2 will be looking at best practices in other states and things  
3 that other states are doing. Time will tell what the  
4 administration you know, what our administration and our  
5 commissioners are, you know, willing to -- to -- I guess to  
6 consider in terms of filling those gaps, but we're going to  
7 present everything that the public says that they would like  
8 us to consider.

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

19           And then they -- another objective that was defined  
20 was improving the predicted capabilities of revenue  
21 forecasting for long-term needs assessments. Because again,  
22 we have a Unified Transportation Program that goes out ten  
23 years and the best example I can give you is what happened in  
24 the downturn in 2008. It's like, you know, we plan for  
25 projects and try to have things in the pipeline that we can

1 build and then you have an economic downturn, and that wipes  
2 away two, three, four years of forecasting, and so people are  
3 saying there -- that's still very fresh on their mind and they  
4 realize that transportation funding dipped way down in 2008  
5 and they were basically asking us how would we avoid that in  
6 the future.

7 (Conference call message interruption)

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

10 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

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

23 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

24 MR. GADBOIS: If, however, we're talking about  
25 shifting that equation at all, then the question to the

1 transit folks, to the highway folks, needs to be we're  
2 shifting away from any assumptions of new construction, what  
3 are your operational needs.

4 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

9 MS. CONKLE: Correct.

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

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

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

1 transit.

2           So I --

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

5           MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

8           MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

11          MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

16          MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

20          MS. CONKLE: Well, we do have to ask that question  
21 and too, let me be very clear. I will always try to answer  
22 any questions you all have as straightforwardly as I can with  
23 --

24          MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

25          MS. CONKLE: -- my understanding, you know, of -- of

1 where you think that question or that discussion's going to  
2 go. What I can't answer right now is a lot of that, because  
3 transit is an MPO for the most part in Texas, except for  
4 paratransit, I don't -- you know, but is -- their needs are  
5 identified in their MTP and then Kelly could probably talk to  
6 you a little bit more about -- they're collecting data for us  
7 as well in terms of how this is going to be -- how this is  
8 going to be couched in terms of needs and where we think the  
9 targets are going to be. Because again, the division that I  
10 work for isn't setting targets for public transportation,  
11 that's probably going to have a lot to do with the type of  
12 data that we get in terms of what MPOs are saying their needs  
13 are and then some data reflecting for the rural areas.

14           And again, that to me is a very scary prospect.  
15 Anybody trying to set a target, you know, for any mode of  
16 transportation, ridership, meeting needs, given the funding  
17 scenarios and climate we have is -- that's a daunting task.  
18 So, it's not that I don't want to answer the question or  
19 what's going to be rolled up into that, it's just that I don't  
20 know yet, because again, we have to take -- part of the  
21 planning process is that we don't do parallel processes with  
22 people who actually handle, you know, these modes or predict  
23 these needs or come up with the revenues forecast to do those  
24 things. So, I think again, by the next meeting, with your  
25 question in mind, hopefully we'll be at the point in the

1 process where I can bring things back again.

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

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

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

20           MS. CONKLE: Sure.

21           MS. BLOOMER: And while their numbers may not be in  
22 the range of the MTAs, that what they do is just as important,  
23 or more important, because they're the only option that's out  
24 there. So I think it's important to keep that fact. And  
25 while the MPOs may be doing public transportation planning for

1 the metros, TxDOT can't forget that TxDOT has a division that  
2 does that and TxDOT should be setting the statewide goal of  
3 what do we want all public transportation to look like,  
4 including the metros and the non-metros.

5 MS. CONKLE: No, absolutely. Let me be very clear  
6 that we don't do -- we're tr -- we don't do parallel processes  
7 with those metros, but if I didn't say it loud enough, we know  
8 we have a responsibility out in the rural areas. We know we  
9 have a responsibility in urban areas that are not, that are  
10 less than 200,000, and we have been getting comments. But  
11 again, we don't have all the data we need to answer that  
12 question. That data is being gathered right now and we should  
13 have that in the next few months to be able to look at that.  
14 And I'll go back again to the human aspect of this; we heard  
15 in no uncertain terms out there that that's very --  
16 paratransit options, transit options, modal options, for folks  
17 that are not -- cannot use motorized vehicles is very  
18 important. And we -- again, we bring that back to you to say  
19 that we're not -- we're not at all saying that that's being  
20 marginalized. We're just trying to look at a way going  
21 forward when we're trying to develop -- when the -- as a  
22 department trying to develop statewide performance targets for  
23 some of these areas where we have to take into consideration  
24 planning processes and needs assessments that aren't being  
25 done by the department. That's why I said it's somewhat

1 perilous, because a few of the performance measures under MAP-  
2 21 require us to set statewide measures and then they require  
3 metropolitan areas to set their measures, and in some cases,  
4 they haven't set measures yet, but we're expected to come up  
5 with statewide measures.

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

14           And I guess, like I said last time, we've presented  
15 you with the initial draft goal areas that were adopted to  
16 carry forward to our commission by our technical advisory  
17 committee. Our technical advisory committee has adopted an  
18 additional goal area that I haven't heard anybody that's been  
19 opposed to that, finding, you know, sustainable revenue  
20 sources. Our freight folks are pretty excited about that as  
21 well. But we're still -- we're still in the process of  
22 collecting comments from groups such as this group, so if you  
23 have other proposed goal areas that we miss, I will tell you,  
24 you know, like I told you last time, please do give those to  
25 us. And if you take this home or take it away and you look

1 and there's additional objectives that we miss, because you  
2 put a fine point on some things that we state at a very high  
3 level, I might suggest that you consider maybe sending that to  
4 us as an objective so that we can more finely tune that.  
5 Because we are at, you know, the 30,000 foot level with the  
6 statewide plan. And please free to do that.

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

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

18           So probably within the next month or two these draft  
19 goals and objectives are going to be presented to the  
20 Commission to -- for a way forward. If not the Commission,  
21 it's really up to the executive leadership at TxDOT whether  
22 that needs Commission action. It would certainly be something  
23 that's going to be presented to them at some point to get  
24 their buy off. We expect to do that in the next couple  
25 months.

1           Again, we talked about developing performance  
2 measures. That's really an ongoing process that's being  
3 handled by TxDOT's administration in cooperation with the  
4 TxDOT districts and metropolitan planning organizations and  
5 councils of government.

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

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

22           So, that's where we are with the Texas Transportation  
23 Plan. Again, we have version two of the survey. We hope to  
24 have it up -- my hope is that we have it up by middle of next  
25 month. We're still inviting anybody at anytime to take the

1 survey that's there, it's all good data, but we want to get --  
2 want to put a finer point on some of those questions and find  
3 out what people are -- are really thinking and where they  
4 would go based on the answers to the initial survey.

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

8 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

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

21 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

22 MS. CONKLE: But let me be very clear, they will have  
23 already seen it. It won't be a surprise for them. They will  
24 get it as a briefing item as soon as we have the draft  
25 available.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and that's where I was going. Is  
2 there slated to be any discussion item at the Commission on  
3 this plan before draft and briefing and formal decision?

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

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

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

25 MS. CONKLE: We'll be taking comments -- it's --

1 there's -- understand that when we come up, when we -- we're  
2 taking comments all the way through the process I guess is  
3 what I'm trying to say.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

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

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: So maybe around May time frame?

18 MS. CONKLE: Yes, I would say that if it -- relevant  
19 comment and inputs into the plan we will be moving -- well no,  
20 after that, because we're actually going out for round 2 in  
21 late May and June, so I would say up through July time frame  
22 comments, substantive comments on the actual content of the  
23 plan are -- are welcome, and we would be able at that point to  
24 incorporate those and have them be part of the development. I  
25 would say after July we're pretty much pulling everything

1 together and getting ready to go to that public hearing. So  
2 that's going to be a final draft.

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

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

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

14 MR. UNDERWOOD: To discuss?

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

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

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

1 available for people to give us their input.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, Eric.

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

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

22 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

23 MR. GLEASON: So we could look at what was being  
24 considered for those open houses. But clearly, I think May is  
25 a watershed time frame for this Committee to shape the, you

1 know, handful of significant policy considerations. For  
2 example, Glenn, your comment and the implications of that.

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

6 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

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

11 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

24 MR. GLEASON: I also heard you say though that get a  
25 description of that based on a performance target not set on,

1 you know, traditional trends --

2 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

5 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

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

13 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

14 MR. GADBOIS: Brad can give you that answer.

15 MR. GLEASON: He can.

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

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

23 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

24 MR. GLEASON: What have we done to allow us to reach  
25 a conclusion that that's what we need Brad to do? And I

1 think, you know, and I'm sure you recognize, I mean, there is  
2 no answer today to that question, and it's a fundamental  
3 paradigm shift if you think it all the way through in terms of  
4 how we plan across all modes, including highways, for what we  
5 need for an effective transportation system in this state.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. So --

7 MR. GLEASON: And we're --

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

13 MR. GLEASON: Reduce --

14 MR. GADBOIS: -- 30 percent --

15 MR. GLEASON: -- congestion or whatever idea.

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

19 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

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

22 MR. GLEASON: Right.

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

24 MR. GLEASON: Correct.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: I've got a PowerPoint if you want

1 your answer what it's going to take to double our service,  
2 but, you know -- I can give that to you today if you'd like.

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

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

9 MR. UNDERWOOD: Perfect.

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

13 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

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

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

19 MS. BLOOMER: Well, the \$100.

20 MS. CONKLE: Okay.

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

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

25 MS. BLOOMER: I know it doesn't, but --

1 MR. GADBOIS: She --

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

5 MS. CONKLE: It was a --

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

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: Two and a half billion.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Billion.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: B.

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

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

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

14 MR. GLEASON: No, that's the \$10-billion TxDOT  
15 budget, which includes bonding and all that kind of stuff.  
16 It's not five percent. I mean, it's a -- on the one hand it's  
17 a simple calculation, on the other it's incredibly  
18 complicated.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

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

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: 60-million.

25 MR. GADBOIS: So you -- the appropriation -- the

1 annual or biannual appropriations is?

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

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

4 MS. CONKLE: And I'm sorry, I have a different --  
5 appropriation is different to me than revenue, so --

6 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: I was just trying to break it down to a  
9 number we can -- you know, we could all look at and --

10 MS. CONKLE: That's -- but that's exactly what we're  
11 going -- the reason that we did that is to get -- we wanted a  
12 back of the envelope what people were thinking, \$100 is just  
13 enough to be significant to them, to see what their intent  
14 was. How it relates to what that question did is it's helping  
15 us to develop the tool that is going out and asking them, you  
16 know, when we do give them something representative of our  
17 actual budget, you know, how they would spend that money. I  
18 mean, we couldn't -- we couldn't even put 20-bil -- you know,  
19 that -- we just had to get something that was significant to  
20 them to find out what their intent was if they were able to do  
21 so something to scale. We're using that information, it has  
22 absolutely no direct correlation to what we're doing with the  
23 tool other than to say that okay, we need to be sure of that  
24 because people are saying they would spend this much over  
25 here, that we don't just ignore airports or we don't just

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

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

16           MR. GADBOIS: Right.

17           MR. UNDERWOOD: As compared to people using it.  
18 That's what's interesting to me, the amount of people that  
19 actually use it, as opposed to said they would just pay for  
20 it.

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

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

24           MR. GLEASON: Sure.

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

1 again.

2 MR. GLEASON: Anytime.

3 MS. CONKLE: Appreciate it.

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

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

16 This resulted in a final report with recommendations,  
17 at least that's part of your handouts the -- this report and  
18 the proposed recommendations have been shared with any number  
19 of stakeholders. It's been shared with each of the lead  
20 agencies in the 24 planning regions across the state, and  
21 their respective stakeholders. I know that a number of the  
22 regions had this as a discussion and agenda item at their  
23 respective monthly or quarterly regional stakeholder meetings.  
24 A presentation was given at the January semiannual meeting of  
25 the transit operators in the state. All of the various

1 stakeholders were encouraged to provide public transportation  
2 division additional input.

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

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

14           MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

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

16           MR. WRIGHT: The --

17           MR. GLEASON: I wasn't listening.

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

25           MS. BLOOMER: And did you get any feedback on --

1 MR. WRIGHT: We did --

2 MS. BLOOMER: For this?

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

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

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

13 MR. SALAZAR: Okay. It --

14 MS. BLOOMER: Can you summarize generally --

15 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

16 MS. BLOOMER: -- what the comments were?

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

25 One of them in particular gave several examples of

1 success. One of the three gave some constructive suggestions  
2 specifically about recommendations that were proposed. Two of  
3 the three did not specifically address specific  
4 recommendations, but it was more general consent. One offered  
5 some -- some constructive comments and suggestions on certain  
6 ones of the recommendations.

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I'm -- I'm having trouble  
25 wrapping my mind around this process. And we talked about

1 this a little bit last time. My concern is that we went out -  
2 - I think -- roll back -- Eric, PTAC; what's our role?

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

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

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

21 MS. BLOOMER: And I think at the last meeting we had  
22 talked about and hoped that we would apply a similar process  
23 to the formula revisions to this. This is an item that is on  
24 PTAC's work plan to take up, regional coordination. We need  
25 to re-take up the work plan. But I -- you know, and maybe

1 it's we didn't get a lot of comment, but what we found with  
2 the formulas when we threw stuff out there, the good, the bad,  
3 and the ugly, especially if you throw in some things that are  
4 a little far to the right and a little far to the left, you'll  
5 get feedback from folks.

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

12           And I'd like, you know, we could talk about how we'd  
13 do that. I don't know if -- I mean, last time, we had  
14 recommendations, we had thrown around some other ideas that  
15 folks at this table had thrown out and talked about  
16 developing, okay, where are we going? I think now we've been  
17 doing this for six years, seven years, regional coordination.  
18 I think a lot of folks feel like it's time to go back and look  
19 at it again, and what we're really trying to accomplish, and  
20 put our mind to it. It's just kind of gotten into automatic  
21 mode. It may be we haven't -- we've spent I can't remember  
22 what the dollar amount is in money, how much significant  
23 impact have we really made? If we had put that money into  
24 service, would that have been better? You know, going back  
25 and looking at what we've done, and where we want to go in the

1 future.

2 MR. GLEASON: If -- if I may? I don't know where a  
3 lot of those folks are. I -- I agree with your statement  
4 about the concerns with the program, because I've heard them.  
5 But I am not seeing those folks come to the table in this  
6 discussion and voicing the kinds of concerns that you've just  
7 raised, Michelle. And so while I would agree with you that  
8 there are those concerns out there, they're not coming  
9 forward. So it's -- and honestly, when -- when I look at the  
10 range, and the -- and the scope, and the quantity of the  
11 recommendations coming from the stakeholder group, the lead  
12 agency group, I would have to say that it would, you know,  
13 that I'm inclined to look for a relatively small number of  
14 those that I think represent moving the effort forward, from a  
15 -- a guidance standpoint.

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

23 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

24 MR. GLEASON: But when we attempt to ask the question  
25 to the general audience, we're not hearing from them.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

23 MR. GLEASON: The answer to that -- if you did not  
24 attend, the answer to that, I believe, is -- is yes. Now,  
25 have we on multiple occasions gone out independent of the lead

1 agencies who we fundamentally hold responsible and accountable  
2 for engaging their stakeholders, not just transit providers,  
3 but all folks in their regions, have we made a -- a separate  
4 effort? No. I don't think you would see, if you went back  
5 through the history, you wouldn't see two or three or four  
6 separate efforts, outside of the lead agencies themselves, to  
7 engage the stakeholders --

8 MR. GADBOIS: We -- it --

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

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

13 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

16 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh. Yeah.

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

1 than simply going to the lead agency and saying, you know, is  
2 everything working?

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

6 MR. GADBOIS: No, I --

7 MR. GLEASON: There was a collection of --

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

9 MR. GLEASON: So yes, we could do more of that. You  
10 know, one of the challenges to this conversation is -- is that  
11 it is in some areas of the state that this provokes the most  
12 discussion as to, you know, not going in the right direction,  
13 not doing the right thing. We have other areas of the state  
14 that this is percolating along reasonably well on, and  
15 everyone's engaged, and great things are happening. So it's a  
16 really difficult program from a statewide perspective to  
17 label. And -- and so, you know, it's just a very challenging  
18 --

19 MR. GADBOIS: Do we --

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

22 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and -- and what I mean -- because  
23 -- so when we originally designed this, we just designed it  
24 with maximum flexibility at the local level to -- to allow for  
25 it to work well where it's going to. Your -- your -- the

1 issue you ought to be looking at addressing now is not, you  
2 know, laying some rules to adjust what's working well, but  
3 what do we need to do, if anything, for the places it isn't  
4 working well? So focus, you know, on that, and -- and make  
5 sure that the guidance doesn't mess up the stuff that's  
6 already working well.

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

13 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

14 MR. GLEASON: -- and almost problematic.

15 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

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

19 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

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

23 MR. GADBOIS: Or something you all don't have a role  
24 in solving.

25 MR. GLEASON: We -- no, there's -- there's no --

1 there's nothing we can propose to do --

2 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

4 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

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

25 But yet, you still have people around the table

1 saying, let's create this, and let's do one of these, and what  
2 about this? That's a great idea, but how are we going to  
3 execute that? And so I think we're getting further and  
4 further away from actually putting more service on the street  
5 by perpetuating a process that really doesn't have any end  
6 game.

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

20           MR. UNDERWOOD: To me it's done less of connectivity  
21 and less coordination, but it's become more solid. So now  
22 we've funded a project here for this group, and we funded a  
23 project over here with this group. And instead of the transit  
24 provider really doing anything, any of those things, now we're  
25 riding a -- we're doing a more dedicated route for this, or a

1 more dedicated route for this. And then to answer the -- the  
2 other piece, as far as someone sitting beside the table going,  
3 hey, instead of spending that money on transportation, I know  
4 you've been buying tickets for the last year, take that ticket  
5 money, let's put it here, and we'll leverage this asset, a lot  
6 of response is, I don't have that kind of authority. You've  
7 got to go to the state level for that.

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

17 The other thing I wanted to say is I agree with Brad  
18 where we talk about the local plans where we need this, HHSC,  
19 whomever it is around the table, they want this. But what  
20 they're tired of us saying is, we don't have the money to do  
21 that. We -- we simply don't have the money to -- to continue  
22 with that plan, or to fund that plan. And so I think that  
23 they get frustrated or -- or maybe I should just speak from  
24 where we're at, that they get frustrated because we're not  
25 able to sustain anything. We're not able to do anything.

1 It's just a plan, and at some point we have to do something  
2 besides just have a plan in place.

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

20 That's what I see is true transportation planning,  
21 making a difference and adding to our -- to -- to the number  
22 of passengers on board per revenue mile, per revenue hour,  
23 that sort of thing. That's what I see transportation planning  
24 as, not that we -- we dream up a lot of great projects that  
25 would really be great. We have no way to fund them.

1 Especially now more than ever, because there is no JARC or New  
2 Freedom money anymore.

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

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

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

16           MR. GADBOIS: Well --

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

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

23           MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

24           MR. GADBOIS: It -- it -- but the conversation that  
25 really needs to happen, supposed to happen at this table

1 around coordination and isn't, is how do we get from that per  
2 passenger trip that we have to make sure is appropriate for  
3 that person, for that physician, at that time, for that  
4 service, how do we get from there to having y'all carry that?

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

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

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

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

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure.

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

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: And I do not disagree with you on  
25 that, but I don't know that we need \$12-million in eight

1 years, or 12 meetings a year to do that. That's something you  
2 call me up and go, you know what, we both agree to that, let's  
3 run it up both of our flagpoles and make it happen. That's  
4 where I go with that conversation.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Steve?

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

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

18 That's -- that's one of the items that was  
19 recognized, as well as the need -- or the recommendation, the  
20 need according to the working group's perspective, for some  
21 sort of metrics or performance measures, so that we can, when  
22 asked the question, what can you point to data wise, to -- to  
23 demonstrate the success, or the return on the investment of  
24 these past six years of, you know, however many million  
25 dollars, so that we could do that.

1           So I'm -- I'm -- what I'm hearing you guys say I  
2 think is captured in many of the recommendations --

3           MR. GADBOIS: Well --

4           MR. WRIGHT: -- from the group.

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

12          MR. UNDERWOOD: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

1 associated with that. And --

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

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

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

11 MR. WRIGHT: That's correct.

12 MS. BLOOMER: And --

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

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

17 MS. BLOOMER: And I think --

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: Every five years.

19 MS. BLOOMER: -- what we need to go back to, is the  
20 goal and the intent of the program to satisfy the federal  
21 requirement, or is that something that obviously we have to  
22 do, but isn't the primary goal that we're trying to achieve.  
23 Are we trying to achieve something more here than checking off  
24 the box that says, yes, FTA, we have a regional plan.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Well, there's also a state statute that

1 we have to comply with that calls for, generally speaking, and  
2 I'm not quoting verbatim, but generally speaking, it calls for  
3 us to carry out efforts to specifically do a more efficient --  
4 to more efficiently meet the public's transportation need in  
5 Texas. When you combine that with the federal mandate, it  
6 specifically brings in an emphasis on human service  
7 transportation needs. But the way we have approached that in  
8 Texas is that there is an emphasis on human service  
9 transportation needs, but it's by -- in no way limited to  
10 human service transportation needs. So we have both state and  
11 federal statutes.

12 MR. GADBOIS: What you --

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

17 MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

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

20 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

21 MS. BLOOMER: -- which we can check off those two  
22 boxes, but we go above and beyond, because we're trying to get  
23 here. And all -- I -- I feel like we've gotten to the point  
24 where we're just checking off, yep, we meet that requirement,  
25 yes, we meet that requirement. We're doing plans that aren't

1 getting implemented. Why do them? Well, because there's a  
2 state and a federal statute that requires that we do them. It  
3 requires that we have stakeholder groups that get together,  
4 but what's the -- I mean, the original intent was to bring  
5 HHSC to the table. Have we brought HHSC to the table? Maybe  
6 we go back to what the original intent was, and how do we  
7 bring HHSC to the table?

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

14 MR. WRIGHT: When you don't --

15 MS. BLOOMER: -- confused.

16 MR. WRIGHT: -- metrics or --

17 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

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

20 MR. WRIGHT: The goal, the purpose.

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

24 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

25 MS. BLOOMER: -- or on the moon, what are we trying

1 to accomplish? And if we don't know that, then how can we sit  
2 here and have recommendations to do X, Y, and Z, and establish  
3 metrics, and do this, when we don't even know what we're  
4 trying to accomplish? But --

5 MR. GADBOIS: Well, you --

6 MS. BLOOMER: -- and --

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

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

20 MR. WRIGHT: No, that's a good observation. The  
21 working group did at their first meeting spend some time  
22 assessing what worked well to date, and there was a good  
23 amount of discussion and several items identified concerning  
24 data collection and outreach and stakeholder engagement and  
25 different ones pointed out, certain tactics or strategies that

1 worked very well from kind of a best practice perspective on  
2 that. But clearly, the -- and Brad was on that working group,  
3 the bulk of their work, and it was a lot of work over the  
4 course of three, four months, was on future direction.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

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

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

1 think would get us there. But it's hard to weigh in on them -  
2 -

3 (Conference call interruption)

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

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

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

25 We have areas that do things which, in our view,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22           MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah, we'll disagree.

23           MS. BLOOMER: Well, can I just share, one of our  
24 members was not able to be here today. Rob Stephens  
25 apologized, he was a little upset that we scheduled to meet on

1 the one and only day he could not make it.

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

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

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah.

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

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

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

24 MR. GLEASON: So he doesn't describe the different  
25 direction in his note to you?

1 MS. BLOOMER: No.

2 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

3 MS. BLOOMER: That --

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: He just says different direction.

5 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

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

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

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: Before you leave, can I throw out  
22 just one quick thing to kind of wrap this up? I know at some  
23 point we're going to talk about next meeting dates and times  
24 and that sort of thing. It might be a wild hair, but we've  
25 talked about moving PTAC meetings around the state where --

1 that way more people would have the opportunity to attend. I  
2 know we've got a TTA conference coming in April. I would --  
3 I'd even think it might even be a good idea to have our P --  
4 you know, skip a March meeting, have an April meeting and  
5 maybe not a May meeting, and we could do it there in Fort  
6 Worth at the conference, that way you're going to have all the  
7 trans providers in the room. The ones that want to attend,  
8 that's just -- I know Bobby's dying over there. He's  
9 cringing. But anyway, that's just a recommendation. I don't  
10 know if Mr. Gadbois would be able to attend something like  
11 that in Fort Worth. I know he likes to be up in Tarrant  
12 County anyways.

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

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

16 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

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

21 MR. GADBOIS: April what time?

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

23 MR. KILLEBREW: We've been -- this is Bobby. We'll  
24 find a date because we'll have to coordinate with the TTA  
25 folks and their conference and location and so forth.

1 MR. UNDERWOOD: Maybe some afternoon or something we  
2 could have a room to meet and do our meeting.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

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

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

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

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: Yep.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

20 MS. BLOOMER: Are you --

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

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

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

1 April.

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

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: It's the last week.

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

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

6 MS. BLOOMER: -- and 27th.

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

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

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

12 MR. NELSON: Yes, he is.

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

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

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

1 transport providers is well documented.

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

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

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

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

1 out there and services that are not being provided out there.

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

5           MR. GLEASON: Thank you, Lyle.

6           MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

7           MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Lyle.

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

13           MR. GADBOIS: Certainly not without the bar.

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

1 maybe we throw a wild card up there that says we want to do X  
2 and people respond well, that's crazy. Well, great, then what  
3 do you think we should do, and we can start that conversation.

4

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

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

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: All things are possible with Bobby.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: He's caucusing right now.

25 MS. BLOOMER: Isn't three -- we only have five

1 members. Oh no, we don't.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: There's six.

3 MS. BLOOMER: I can't count today.

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

6 MR. GADBOIS: Can I suggest --

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: -- another way around?

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

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

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

25 MR. GADBOIS: Or a straw woman or a straw family.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Straw person.

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: Straw person.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Straw people.

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

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: Will you reiterate that?

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

16 MR. GADBOIS: March or April?

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

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

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: April.

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: I want to make sure we have enough time  
25 between when we meet to turn it around for TTA. So I would

1 say we keep our end of March meeting with the only item on the  
2 agenda being the regional coordination.

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

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

6 MR. GADBOIS: We go to April.

7 MS. BLOOMER: -- and?

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

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

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

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

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: We're basically in March as it is.

1 MS. BLOOMER: As far as scheduling goes, I think it'd  
2 be easier since we all have and we all know and we all  
3 committed to try to keep those open than to trying to find a  
4 date in April that we can all make. But I'm -- you made the  
5 motion, so --

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

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

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: In April.

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

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

16 MS. BLOOMER: To TTA.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: That will be our meeting, right?  
18 We're going to do a meeting, not just stand up and do an  
19 update, correct?

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: Oh. Brad's suggesting we have a PTAC  
25 meeting --

1 MR. UNDERWOOD: I just want to do the PTAC --

2 MR. GADBOIS: I know.

3 MS. BLOOMER: I didn't get that.

4 MR. GADBOIS: I got that in --

5 MR. UNDERWOOD: Just work through our agenda at the  
6 meeting.

7 MS. BLOOMER: With this being the main item on the  
8 agenda?

9 MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure. Anything else we need to clean  
10 up from May or March.

11 MS. BLOOMER: I think we can do that but we -- we  
12 don't have a meeting in April scheduled. Our next one would  
13 be May. So, I think we need to meet prior to taking something  
14 to TTA to know what we're going to take.

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: I don't want it to be rehearsed. I'd  
16 just as soon let's just have it there. It gives everyone the  
17 opportunity, they're all going to be -- I mean, most transit  
18 providers are going to be at the conference. So it gives them  
19 an opportunity at 2:00 we're doing a meeting, a PTAC meeting.  
20 You've always wanted to come see one, you've always want to  
21 join, but you don't want to drive to Austin to do it, it's  
22 going to be right here with you. I'd just as soon work  
23 through our agenda just like we normally would; our May items  
24 and our March items. Obviously this will be one of them and  
25 we do it all in April. I think it's fine. If nobody shows

1 up, I guess no one ever wants to come, but at the same time --

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

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

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: It's in your backyard.

5 MS. BLOOMER: -- just --

6 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

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

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

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

23 We then meet in April, concomitant with the April TTA  
24 meeting in Fort Worth, and have a -- have our March meeting at  
25 that time. So switch from March to April. At that meeting,

1 we have scheduled enough time to have a serious discussion  
2 about what we found in assessments and what we think the  
3 program ought to be doing going forward, and how to make those  
4 into statements that we can -- well, so make those into  
5 statements.

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

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

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

19           MR. UNDERWOOD: More like a filibuster.

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

22           MR. UNDERWOOD: It's a filibuster.

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

24           MS. BLOOMER: Yes, okay.

25           MR. GADBOIS: She can.

1 MS. BLOOMER: We have a motion.

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

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

6 MR. GADBOIS: Yep.

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

15 MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle --

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: Then so be it.

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

22 I don't know at this point whether that's large  
23 group, throw it out to everybody and let's just have a brawl,  
24 let's do it at a bar, you know, might as well for a bar room  
25 brawl. But or whether we arrange specific people to be in

1 there that we'll be good for that discussion. I'm not the one  
2 in charge of that, TTA and PTN staff are the one -- there's --  
3 that are going to help us arrange that.

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: April.

9 MR. GLEASON: -- at the TTA conference?

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

12 MR. UNDERWOOD: April at the conference.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Would be April.

14 MR. GLEASON: April at the TTA conference.

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

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

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

22 MR. GLEASON: Oh, you're talking about the same day -  
23 -

24 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, yeah.

25 MR. GLEASON: -- in Fort Worth?

1 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, yeah. I want to -- you know --

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: Maybe just get on their agenda.

3 MR. GADBOIS: -- let's just have -- let's just work  
4 for them to change for a little while.

5 MR. GLEASON: Okay. But so I'm putting this agenda  
6 together for this April meeting, okay? I'm seeing this right  
7 next to you here.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

9 MR. GLEASON: Trying to figure out what we're doing.  
10 We have a -- we have an agenda that is inclusive of a open  
11 invite meeting to listen and participate in a PTAC  
12 conversation on --

13 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

14 MR. GLEASON: -- future directions of the regional  
15 coordination program. And then the agenda does what? It goes  
16 into -- it has a --

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

19 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

20 MR. GADBOIS: With stakeholders from TTA --

21 MR. GLEASON: You bet. It's the second meeting I'm  
22 struggling with, Glenn.

23 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, it -- well, so but it doesn't  
24 have to be a second meeting. So at --

25 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

4 MR. GLEASON: Yep.

5 MR. GADBOIS: On this program. And then you have as  
6 a second item discussion with TTA stakeholders on item number  
7 1's outcomes.

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

10 MR. GLEASON: That sounds like public comment.

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

13 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

17 MR. GLEASON: Sure.

18 MR. GADBOIS: So that there's no question about  
19 whether it's interactive or not. We can always decide if  
20 we're not going to get the conversation in that -- you know,  
21 we set up the agenda that way. Y'all then have a conversation  
22 with TTA, y'all, y'all, whoever y'all. If we decide we're not  
23 going to have the kind of interactive discussion and open  
24 discussion we want in that forum, then we can always decide  
25 afterwards we're going to adjourn that meeting at some point

1 and three of us are going to walk into this other arranged  
2 meeting for a two hour discussion, or two of us, right? We  
3 can always do that.

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

6 MS. BLOOMER: Well, I'm --

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

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

12 MS. BLOOMER: I think, yeah.

13 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

18 MR. GADBOIS: Yep.

19 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

1 they think about what we talked about.

2 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.

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

10 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: First and a second.

12 MS. BLOOMER: A first and a second.

13 MR. UNDERWOOD: Uh-huh.

14 MS. BLOOMER: All those in favor?

15 (Chorus of ayes)

16 MS. BLOOMER: Motion passed.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you, all.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

19 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Now I really need to go.

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

22 The next item on the agenda is --

23 MR. KILLEBREW: Madam Chair?

24 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: We lost a quorum, so you actually

1 just need to --

2 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: -- end the meeting.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Move to adjourn.

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

7 MR. GLEASON: Oh, what do you --

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

12 MR. GADBOIS: I didn't.

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

15 MR. GADBOIS: Oh.

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

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

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- whole documentation.

21 MR. GADBOIS: Okay, good.

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

24 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay. Okay.

25 MS. BLOOMER: That we go ahead and get that back on

1 the agenda as an item.

2 MR. GADBOIS: So I don't need to look for it. I  
3 don't need -- do we need to confirm a meeting date? Did we  
4 just do that with our?

5 MR. KILLEBREW: You just did.

6 MR. GADBOIS: With our vote?

7 MS. BLOOMER: April -- we did. For now say April  
8 25th, 26th, and 27th on your calendar.

9 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

12 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, all.

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

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

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I, KIMBERLY C. McCRIGHT, CET, certified electronic transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 100 constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

DATED this 11th day of March, 2014.



---

Kimberly C. McCright, CET

Certified Electronic Transcriber