

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
May 27, 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Michelle Bloomer, Chair
JR. Salazar, Vice Chair
Glenn Gadbois
Rob Stephens

TxDOT PARTICIPANTS:

Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Division Director, PTN (Presenter)
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN
Steve Wright, Public Transportation Division (Presenter)
Michelle Conkle, TPP (Presenter)
Donna Roberts, TxDOT

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY:

VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Call to Order	Page 3
2. Safety Briefing	Page 3
3. Approval of Minutes	Page 5
4. Division Director's report	Page 5
5. Presentation and discussion - Steve Wright	Page 9
6. Presentation and discussion - Michelle Conkle	Page 60
7. Presentations and discussion - Bobby Killebrew	Page 89
8. Review and discussion PTAC Work Plan	Page 103
9. Public Comment	Page 104
10. Confirm date of next meeting	Page 105
11. Meeting adjourned	Page 109

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. SO we'll go ahead and call the meeting to order. And I will turn it over to Bobby to give us our safety briefing before we get started.

MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you, Michelle. For the record, Bobby Killebrew, Texas Department of Transportation, Public Transportation Division.

We do have some inclement weather in the area, so I want to take this opportunity for those in the room, our committee members, to point out some of the safety features of our building if I may. Yes. Thank you, Glenn, giving me the hand signals here. If we do have to shelter in place, we're actually going to head toward the stairwells. And probably the best stairwell for this location is going to be, and I'm pointing this time in the direction, which would be eastward. Just follow me.

It is possible we will lose power also, because I did look at the weather. This building happens to sit on two different power grids in Austin. And, you know, depending on which floor you're on, depending on which area of the floor, you may have lights in the ceiling that work but the power outlets may not or vice versa. So I do have my flashlight. Because if the lights go out in here it's going to get dark. So, just follow me with the flashlight.

If we have an emergency, if y'all need any medical

1 attention, I'm first aid certified at the moment, until next
2 year, so just let me know and we'll get you the medical
3 attention that you need. But thank you for listening and I
4 don't anticipate the fire alarm to go off any more like they
5 have in the past. They seem to have gotten that fixed. So,
6 if that's the case, we'll also head to the closest exit and
7 exit the building.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Well, I saw them downstairs working,
9 so --

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Oh, no. Are you serious? Well,
11 in that case, there are three exits on this floor. One is
12 by the elevators that you came up, the other is over in this
13 direction, and then of course, the third exit is the
14 eastward in here, so we would go to the closest, safest exit
15 and we will rendezvous outside.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any questions for Bobby on
18 the safety? Okay.

19 Moving on to Item 2 on the agenda, approval of the
20 minutes from the February 25th, 2014 meeting. Do I have a
21 motion?

22 MR. GADBOIS: I move to approve.

23 MR. SALAZAR: Second.

24 MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion and a second. All
25 those in favor, say aye.

1 (Chorus of ayes)

2 MS. BLOOMER: Any opposed? Okay. Moving on.
3 Since there's only four of us, we won't do roll call.

4 I'll turn it over to Eric for Item 3, the Division
5 Director's report to the Committee regarding public
6 transportation matters.

7 MR. GLEASON: All right. Well, this is Eric
8 Gleason, Division Director, TxDOT Public Transportation.
9 You all have the Director's report in your notes. I won't
10 go through it exhaustively, but General Webber is on board.
11 He's been here at TxDOT now for almost a month. He has
12 announced some organizational changes. Nothing that effects
13 the Division too dramatically. Mostly how he attends to
14 organize his own administrative leadership.

15 He comes to us from Texas A&M and before that, 36
16 years in the military. He's a retired Marine Lieutenant
17 General, so we're glad to have him on board and he's getting
18 up to speed pretty quickly.

19 March to May this year, basically we're getting
20 the money out the door. Between the March and the May
21 Commission meetings, over \$90-million in the state and
22 federal public transportation dollars will be awarded. And
23 this has, you know, been waiting for the federal
24 apportionments, so it's a combined total of the federal
25 apportionments for this year and then next year's state

1 funds are being awarded this Thursday.

2 We typically do those awards in June for those of
3 you that track this. We're doing them in May, b/c the June
4 meeting is an out of town meeting in Houston and the
5 preference would be to do that here in Austin.

6 MR. GADBOIS: And which programs are these?

7 MR. GLEASON: That's -- well, it's every program
8 that we administer.

9 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay. Okay.

10 MR. GLEASON: There really isn't one that I can
11 think of that's not been part of either a March or a May
12 agenda item, so it's been pretty comprehensive.

13 I would note that the work last year the committee
14 did on the modifying the administrative code to reflect MAP-
15 21; in March, we did allocate the 5339 program funds which
16 is the former state of good repair program under SAFETEA-LU
17 under MAP-21 5339, so we allocated two years' worth of
18 federal funding for those programs in March.

19 And then this Committee also worked quite a bit on
20 the 5310 program and that is on the docket for May.

21 MR. GADBOIS: That's part of this.

22 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. So with that, that concludes
23 my remarks and I'll answer any questions you may have.

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

25 MR. GADBOIS: Well, just one about our new

1 Executive Director.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Is there any -- has he asked for
3 Divisions to brief him directly or kind of what's the
4 opportunities; say it the other way. What's the
5 opportunities for us to gage where he is on public
6 transportation as part of this Agency?

7 MR. GLEASON: Okay. He has not asked for Division
8 level briefings. He has made a number of statements in
9 public about his commitment to multimodal transportation
10 system. So I find that encouraging. I've not yet had a
11 chance to engage him on the topic of public transportation.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thanks.

13 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, on, I'm not sure what page
14 it is of the Division Director's report, it's the first two
15 pages kind of summarize the report and then the next page --
16 oh, there it is, page one of five or one of four, with the
17 detail, the second item there, Agenda Item 6A, the second
18 item there, Agenda Item 6A.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

20 MS. BLOOMER: It says that last sentence of the
21 first paragraph, "This year's call for projects generated 60
22 project proposals totaling 49-million."

23 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

24 MS. BLOOMER: "The total amount available for
25 award was 12-million."

1 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Is any of that information being
3 used to document sort of the need? I guess I'm just sort of
4 a little blown away, given there was 12-million, you got 49-
5 million.

6 MR. GLEASON: Not atypical for the call to have
7 that kind of a gap between the amount of money available and
8 the request.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

10 MR. GLEASON: There's quite a bit wrapped up in
11 new facility development, which as you know, we're not in as
12 much of a position as we have been in the past to fund. So
13 that was one large gap.

14 We did have also a large number of inner-city bus
15 operating proposals from carriers we don't normally see a
16 lot of requests from; Omnibus. You know, they run a lot of
17 service between, you know, the Valley and up to Houston and
18 out to San Antonio, and they submitted for three or four
19 routes for operating subsidy. We've not subsidized them in
20 the past. We didn't choose to do so this time either.

21 Generally, under the sense that it's a fairly well
22 traveled corridor and we felt as though our needs were
23 greater in west Texas than in there. So --

24 MS. BLOOMER: All right.

25 MR. GLEASON: But you know, we just get a lot of

1 varied types of requests.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And has that information in any way
3 sort of informed the 2040 plan as far as the needs?

4 MR. GLEASON: It will. It will.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

6 MR. SALAZAR: And have you talked to -- I know you
7 and I had a side conversation about the proposed routes from
8 San Angelo/Fort Worth. Have you talked to them?

9 MR. GLEASON: Yes, we have.

10 MR. SALAZAR: You have. Okay. And it went well?

11 MR. GLEASON: Yes, it did.

12 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other questions for Eric
14 on the Director's report? Just curious, there's no April
15 meeting? There was no April meeting?

16 MR. GLEASON: There is an April meeting, but we
17 have no items on it.

18 MS. BLOOMER: No items, okay.

19 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. The April meeting was in
20 Lubbock, I believe.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then if there are no further
22 questions, I will move on to Agenda Item 4, presentation
23 discussion of Texas Regional Coordination Public
24 Transportation Planning.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon. My name is Steve

1 Wright. I work with the Public Transportation Division here
2 at TxDOT. I have a brief presentation and follow-up to the
3 February PTAC meeting. There are three handouts that you
4 should all have copies of. If it's okay, I'll just briefly
5 walk through the three of those and be glad to respond to
6 any questions that there might be.

7 The first handout is titled Regionally Coordinated
8 Transportation Planning Assessment and Recommendations by
9 topic;

10 The second one is Funding Cycle for FY 2016
11 through FY2023; and

12 The third is Goal and Model Options for Texas.

13 Looking at the first handout, handout on
14 assessment and recommendations by topic; you'll recognize
15 the recommendations. You've seen these in previous reports.
16 And just as a reminder, these recommendations that are
17 listed are from the statewide working group that was
18 convened by TxDOT in 2013 to provide recommendations on
19 future direction of the regionally coordinated
20 transportation planning effort in Texas. The
21 recommendations stem from the group's discussions on what
22 worked well and areas for improvement.

23 The recommendations are documented in a final
24 report that was completed in fall 2013 which you have seen.
25 The items marked as "Works Well" and "Needs Improvement" are

1 TxDOT's summary from the working group discussion that
2 informed the recommendations.

3 So the works well observations, the observations
4 on what needs improvement and the recommendations are
5 categorized by the following topics:

6 Funding;
7 Performance Metrics;
8 Membership and Engagement of Local Stakeholders;
9 Outreach to Stakeholders and the General Public;
10 Content/Components of the Regional Plans;
11 Selection and Expectation of Lead Agencies; and
12 The TxDOT Role in Providing Guidance and
13 Direction.

14 I won't walk through each one of these, but to
15 give you an example -- yes.

16 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric Gleason.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

18 MR. GLEASON: I think -- could you remind the
19 Committee, the Committee has seen some of this before, but
20 at their request, we've added some information to it. And
21 so could you define what they've seen before and what's been
22 added since the last time?

23 MR. WRIGHT: Right. The recommendations that are
24 listed here are items that you have seen before in previous
25 reports and attachments. The items that are listed as works

1 well and needs improvement is what you have not seen before.

2 MR. GLEASON: And they asked for that at their
3 last meeting and so this is in response to that?

4 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, at the February meeting. And so
5 that is in addition to the recommendations.

6 So as an example looking at the first two; funding
7 and performance metrics, the group --

8 MS. BLOOMER: Sorry, Steve. Can I ask --

9 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

10 MS. BLOOMER: So we've seen the recommendations
11 before --

12 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

13 MS. BLOOMER: -- and that came out of the
14 statewide working group --

15 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

16 MS. BLOOMER: -- that TxDOT convened. The works
17 well and needs improvement we haven't seen before, and that
18 came out of where?

19 MR. GLEASON: Same place. We just hadn't
20 documented it before.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

22 MR. GLEASON: But these are -- this is all
23 conversations that were held with the statewide group. The
24 first piece we provided you didn't document as well as it --

25 MR. WRIGHT: So the recommendations stemmed from

1 the observations about what works well and what needs
2 improvement.

3 So for instance, under funding, the group felt
4 what works well includes TxDOT's provision of funding
5 through an annual call to lead agencies to conduct regional
6 planning activities. And what also works well is that the
7 lead agencies that are able to leverage other resources to
8 support the regional planning effort are less vulnerable to
9 funding shortfalls and interruptions in planning activities.

10 As far as in what needs improvement in the area of
11 funding, the group observed that state level collaboration
12 among TxDOT health and human services agencies, workforce
13 agencies and others to specifically track, compile and
14 report relevant transportation funding data is lacking in
15 the state of Texas and is something that is needed and would
16 be very valuable.

17 Another observation under funding is assurance by
18 TxDOT of consistent, predictable funding to adequately plan
19 for staffing and other needs and to help sustain the
20 regional planning effort and to increase the number of lead
21 agencies that leverage other funds to help sustain the
22 regional transportation planning effort.

23 And then again, the recommendations very closely
24 align to those observations that were noted.

25 Under performance metrics for instance, there was

1 not a works well noted, but it was -- there was significant
2 discussion about the topic of performance measures and the
3 need for performance measures.

4 The two observations, each planning region, and
5 Texas has 24 planning regions, should have local performance
6 metrics, but many either do not or do not regularly collect
7 and analyze performance data. Therefore, there is no way to
8 demonstrate overall impact of this regional planning effort.
9 And two, there are no statewide performance metrics. And
10 then the recommendations that follow.

11 And so, the same pattern you'll find through the
12 rest of the recommendations which I won't take the time to
13 go through all of those now, but if y'all have questions on
14 any of those, of course would be happy to respond to those.

15 The second handout is on the funding cycle and
16 you'll notice this is marked draft. But we are looking
17 ahead to the next big regional planning update which
18 currently we are looking at having the regional plans
19 updated by December of 2016, which would mean that in
20 February of this coming year, February of 2015, we'll be
21 issuing a call for projects for the regions to do that big
22 update.

23 Reading from the top of that handout, TxDOT
24 anticipates increased funding will be available to lead
25 agencies every five years to reimburse for major updates of

1 regionally coordinated transportation plans. During the
2 interim years, some level of funds will be available to lead
3 agencies to help sustain regional coordination activities.
4 Additionally, some funds may be available for projects to be
5 awarded competitively through the annual call for projects.

6 And then the charts below on that handout are for
7 illustration. Of course, this is all to be finalized, but
8 at this point, it seems reasonable that the funding amounts
9 for the next several years might be in the neighborhood as
10 presented there where TxDOT would be able to offer over the
11 course of two fiscal years, 2016 and 2017, \$900,000 per
12 year. Funding would not -- and our estimate based on past
13 history, is that this is the amount that it would take to --
14 for the 24 regions to reasonably update their plans.

15 So we'd be looking at about 1.8-million over the
16 course of two years, again, to be finalized in February --
17 December 2016, which is into fiscal year 2017. And you can
18 see on the top chart, you can see the pattern or the cycle
19 that we are thinking in terms of at this time, where in 2016
20 and 2017, you'll see a significant spike in funding, and
21 then the funding for regional planning activities would
22 significantly drop and that would just be to provide some
23 very baseline funding for what we've been generally
24 referring to as sustainability activities or activities to
25 sustain the process, to have quarterly stakeholder meetings

1 and that sort of thing, as opposed to funding for like big
2 major projects or studies. So that is kind of the funding
3 pattern that we are looking at.

4 And then the third handout presents a handful of
5 model options. If we step back and really look at the high
6 level picture as far as the model that Texas currently uses,
7 we have come up with five scenarios. There could be more,
8 but we've presented five, which we've labeled as Models A,
9 B, C, D and E.

10 Model A is the status quo. That is exactly as
11 Texas operates now which 24 planning regions, 24 lead
12 agencies, and 24 individual plans.

13 Model B is the status quo with the addition of
14 statewide performance metrics. And this is pretty much the
15 model that the statewide working group was working off of
16 and recommending.

17 Model C reduces the number of planning regions and
18 lead agencies from the current 24 to either eight or 11. So
19 that would require collapsing obviously some of the planning
20 regions. And the thinking behind this option is that this
21 would align with Texas health and human service regions and
22 boundaries. Some of the Texas health and human service
23 agencies use eight regions. Some use 11 districts. So, if
24 we wanted to pursue Model C, we would have to explore the
25 pros and cons of those options.

1 And the thinking is that because the human
2 services transportation plan by definition calls for close
3 collaboration with our sister agencies in the health and
4 human services realm, that it might help to make
5 coordination at both the state and local levels easier if we
6 were all working off of the same maps and boundaries. And
7 that would also include the overlay of statewide performance
8 metrics.

9 Model D calls for a centrally developed statewide
10 plan to include locally developed regional plans and
11 statewide performance measures. So the big difference there
12 is that this would be a model that called for TxDOT actually
13 to centrally manage the development of a statewide plan,
14 again, working closely with local stakeholders, and there
15 would be like a set of -- the statewide plan would be
16 constructed or structured in such a way as to be somehow
17 built around sub regions.

18 So that would add the -- that would add two
19 elements: One, a statewide plan; and two, it would be
20 centrally managed as opposed to having 24 independently
21 managed plans by 24 different entities.

22 And then the last model which we're calling Model
23 E is a centrally developed statewide plan, plus statewide
24 performance metrics. So that option would not necessarily
25 have those sub plans. All of this is very kind of

1 conceptual, but it would still call for close collaboration
2 with local stakeholders.

3 So the distinctions in there you'll see outlined
4 at the bottom of page one as each model progresses, some
5 include simply statewide performance metrics, some look at
6 the idea of collapsing regions so we have a smaller number
7 of regions and lead agencies, looking at the idea of a
8 centrally developed statewide plan, and all of them, all
9 models, Models A through E, call for local collaboration.

10 So again, I won't take the time to walk through
11 page by page each of the documents, but we would be happy to
12 respond to any questions that you might have on any of this.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Steve.

14 You mentioned Model B was the one the statewide
15 working group was working on. Where did the other four --
16 where were they derived from?

17 MR. GLEASON: We -- this is Eric. We came up with
18 the other three or four; Model A is just status quo, so --
19 thinking based on the conversations we heard here at this
20 Committee and thinking of what we've heard from members of
21 the community throughout this whole process, we came up with
22 the other one just as a way of hoping to prompt conversation
23 to see if any pieces of them resonated with you.

24 Clearly, we're not suggesting this or any of these
25 is something you might place a check next to, but we thought

1 they kind of captured the range of interest, and I'm -- I'm
2 sorry that Mr. Underwood's not here with us today, because
3 he has been a -- has a lot of interest in this topic and is
4 very vocal about it, and in part some of this was in
5 response to some of his interests, so.

6 MR. WRIGHT: And I would say that some of these
7 ideas bubbled up and were mentioned as part of the statewide
8 working group discussion such as for instance, there was
9 discussion about -- from some of the health and human
10 service and transit folks, that there's often frustration
11 with folks having to work with --

12 MR. GADBOIS: Multiple jurisdictions.

13 MR. WRIGHT: -- jurisdictional boundaries that
14 don't match. So there -- that was discussed and as well as
15 the idea of a centrally developed statewide plans. There
16 was some anecdotal references to other states that folks
17 believed were set up and operated that way. But again,
18 those weren't pursued in a serious way. They seemed to be
19 comfortable with Model B.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and too -- I just want to be
21 clear on this; the models A through E were not presented to
22 the working group as they are here and they decided on B.
23 There were conversations about some of these items in the
24 process of thinking through it, but B was really their
25 original product where they land -- in terms of where they

1 landed; is that an accurate --

2 MR. WRIGHT: That's true.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

4 MR. WRIGHT: The discussion with them and this --
5 this high level view about the basic model, was at the
6 beginning of their -- of their sessions that they spent
7 together. And those discussions were verbal. We had not
8 developed an actual handout with the visuals. We refined
9 this after the February PTAC meeting and we though, you
10 know, these are some really good questions and points and
11 let's see if we can visually depict and kind of refine those
12 thoughts that had kind of been talked about conceptually in
13 bits and pieces, but verbally, Glenn, the group clearly
14 indicated, although they weren't calling it Model B, they --
15 there was consensus that it is the content of model -- the
16 concept of Model B that they were suggesting we move forward
17 with.

18 They liked the idea of the regions and but they
19 very much were recommending, as you know, the overlay of
20 statewide performance measures.

21 MR. GADBOIS: And it also, just on process again,
22 to make sure I'm clear, so this group has made
23 recommendations. Those recommendations are to division?
24 Who are those recommendations to?

25 MR. GLEASON: We convene the group with the idea

1 of getting some input and feedback on where to go next with
2 the program. So yes, they were informing the Division.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

4 MR. GLEASON: And I think the expectation would be
5 that in subsequent call for projects, subsequence guidance
6 on the program, that their work would be reflected in that.
7 It wasn't suggested to them that it would go any further
8 than us.

9 MR. GADBOIS: And then our consideration of this
10 item is to end up where? What's the outcome of our
11 consideration of this?

12 MR. GLEASON: Well, I would say two possible
13 places. Clearly, the Division. We would take the outcome
14 of this conversation and weigh it equivalently with the
15 outcome of the stakeholder workgroup. You all are also
16 responsible for advising the Commission on policy. This is
17 a key element of our work program, so clearly you have that
18 avenue as well.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And so, the outcome would be
20 reflected in conversations y'all made in terms of your
21 thinking about your work plan, but we could choose to make a
22 formal recommendation to the Commission on your work plan
23 which I would assume then might also have impact on the
24 funding you're looking at handing out for this process for
25 the 2016 revisions; is that --

1 MR. GLEASON: Possibly, yes. I think one of the
2 things if -- if this group, if PTAC were to recommend to the
3 Division or to have a strong interest in us pursuing a
4 different approach to this program than was recommended by
5 the statewide work group, then I think one avenue for us
6 would be to hear that from you today, take some direction
7 from you today to go flush out a particular approach to
8 greater detail and bring it back to your next meeting for
9 further consideration.

10 And if we were to land on a different model, one
11 of the things we would have to talk about is how to
12 transition from this current approach to that new approach.
13 And right now I would recommend that we sustain the current
14 approach through the next update. Because people are very
15 close to starting that and if -- it just makes -- it would -
16 - one way to transition would be to let the current
17 arrangement hold through the next round of updates and then
18 to transition to whatever dramatically different model we
19 wish to pursue.

20 And what I mean by that is if we -- if this group
21 were to recommend and we were to reach agreement with a
22 strong statewide planning approach, that significantly
23 altered, if not no longer relied on a lead agency that would
24 --

25 MR. GADBOIS: And I can see that. I'm more

1 thinking along the lines of that's probably true on some
2 things and less true on others.

3 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

4 MR. GADBOIS: And so the for example is if we
5 decided to have some statewide performance metrics, then
6 those metrics could be put into the grant application or the
7 agreements for the planning money such that it altered the
8 funding arrangements. Not necessarily the amount of money,
9 but at least it gave guidance on what they need to do with
10 that money.

11 MR. GLEASON: Yes. I mean, yes. We would need to
12 be collecting that data consistently across all the regions.
13 Yes.

14 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh. Okay. Those are my process
15 questions, but --

16 MS. BLOOMER: So -- this is Michelle. I
17 understand each planning region should have local
18 performance metrics, but this says many either do not or do
19 not regularly collect. So is that not part of the
20 requirement that's in the plan? And if it is, then why
21 isn't it in the plan and then happening?

22 MR. GLEASON: This is a relatively new arena and
23 the history with this process as we get into it, positive
24 encouragement, constructive guidance approach. And we've
25 not yet gotten to the point where we would withhold funding

1 if you will from an area if they did not produce those
2 performance metrics. That would be a next step.

3 I think clearly if there are some statewide
4 metrics, then that tightens and toughens up the need for the
5 local metrics.

6 MS. BLOOMER: I guess my concern with the
7 statewide metrics is, is then we're getting to sort of a one
8 size fits all which we recognized in the very beginning
9 stages that doesn't work, hence, there's supposed to be
10 locally driven bottom up approach. So it concerns me that
11 if we're giving the locals the opportunity to establish
12 their own service measurements or metrics, that they aren't.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, but I don't think that if we
14 can get it into discussion, I don't think that statewide
15 performance metrics necessarily preclude complete local
16 control and experimentation. You can have some broad but
17 meaningful metrics that everybody can track for. I don't
18 know whether y'all have got clear ideas on what some good
19 metrics might be that cross every boundary.

20 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

21 MR. GADBOIS: But my suspicion is y'all have some
22 experience with those. But mine, for example, would be
23 finding some way of measuring how much work is happening to
24 bring in HHS agencies, bring them into the table and have
25 them be a partner in the planning. Now what exactly that

1 metrics is if you can figure out and it -- I would think,
2 but that kind of metrics ought to apply to every region,
3 right? Because that's what coordination's supposed to be
4 about.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Right. My -- I understand that,
6 Glenn. My concern is we're going to start -- we're going to
7 start encouraging folks to sort of plan to the metrics that
8 they're measured so they can check that box; did you do
9 this, check, check, check, and then we're going to get away
10 from what the real intent of regional coordination is. And
11 so going back to something I think at the last, maybe even
12 the meeting before that, is what are we trying to accomplish
13 with regional coordination?

14 We have a proposal for models but I'm still
15 unclear. I mean, are we just trying to have a plan or are
16 we actually trying to do something with that plan? And if
17 so, what is that something we're trying to accomplish and
18 then let's work ourselves back from there as to what -- how
19 we would measure that, how we would do a plan.

20 MR. WRIGHT: I -- this is --

21 MS. BLOOMER: What?

22 MR. GLEASON: I assume that you want a committee
23 conversation or are you looking at response from us?

24 MS. BLOOMER: Well --

25 MR. GLEASON: I mean --

1 MR. GADBOIS: I think at this point it's a full
2 conversation. If you all have something to say, jump in,
3 please. Is that fair?

4 MS. BLOOMER: That's fair.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

6 MR. WRIGHT: I was just going to share, again
7 going back to the group that met in the fall, they were
8 working -- they were basically using the goal that's
9 presented as kind of -- at least for the work that they did
10 last fall, they were using that as a basic working goal,
11 which was basically to look at developing a plan or plans to
12 more efficiently and effectively meet the public's
13 transportation needs in Texas.

14 MS. BLOOMER: And I -- I mean --

15 MR. WRIGHT: So that would just ensure --

16 MS. BLOOMER: I don't know if I'm splitting the
17 hair, but to me the goal to develop a plan is --

18 MR. GADBOIS: Is not the goal.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Is not the goal. It's something
20 that has to happen to achieve the goal, which is to more
21 efficiently and effectively meet the public transportation
22 needs. But if all we're doing is developing a plan, then
23 we're like check, we did it, we achieved our goal. And I
24 think what I'm hearing from some of the providers is well,
25 you -- it's great you have this group, they get together

1 monthly, they come with all these great ideas and plans, but
2 then as transit providers, we can't implement them because
3 we don't have the funding or the resources, so we've met the
4 goal, but we can't achieve the desired outcome. So is that
5 really beneficial because then it sets up this friction,
6 which we've been trying to decrease with regional
7 coordination, to get health and human services and transit
8 to come together and talk about the needs. But if we're
9 setting up this expectation that we're going to develop this
10 plan and this is what our goal is and we should do this, and
11 then we can't deliver, is that necessarily something we want
12 to do and move in that direction?

13 And back to how much we've spent and how much
14 service we've provided as a result of the money we've spent;
15 I mean, if our goal is to provide more trips and be more
16 efficient, have we achieved that in the last nine years, is
17 it? Or have we -- have we met our goal of developing plans?

18 MS. ROBERTS: This is Donna Roberts. I think
19 that's -- Michelle, that's why we are wanting some statewide
20 metrics, not just at the regional level -- or not only the
21 regional level, but some common themes that would stretch
22 across the state to be able to answer that question; what
23 are we doing statewide. You've got your individual, your
24 local outcomes if you want, but across the state what does
25 that mean for our return on investment. And we are -- our

1 next step is to put together a work group to discuss the
2 metrics. We don't want to do it just as a division, we have
3 a plan to get a group together to do that.

4 MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle, I'm firmly committed to
5 part of the proposition I think you're saying, which is that
6 real coordination is going to best happen as relationships
7 get built one kind of small working project at a time until
8 that kind of builds into programs, that builds into
9 structure and planning and systems. And if that's what
10 you're saying, I completely agree with that.

11 What I think I have hope for and maybe it's, you
12 know, Pollyannaish, but is, is that we can actually develop
13 performance measures that measure that and start to track
14 that. How much of that is happening, where is it happening,
15 who's initiating it, is it a transit agency, is it an HHS
16 agency, you know, kind of a what is -- what and why is it
17 happening ought to be performance measurable.

18 MR. GLEASON: If I can, Glenn, what would be an
19 example of a measure under that?

20 MR. GADBOIS: Well, so let me flip around to make
21 sure that I'm clear on what it's not. Getting people around
22 a table, I don't care what their titles are or their
23 agencies, is not it. What would be it is how many projects
24 are you starting up, are you maintaining, are you -- you
25 know, are you keeping going and what's the character of

1 those projects? Are they -- are those projects serving
2 general public, HHS services, what's then then HHS
3 relationship to that; are they contributing money, are --
4 you know, is there an intent to grow that from one
5 population to multiple populations. Those kinds of things
6 are measurable and those kind of things in my mind are real
7 indicators of real relationships being built.

8 MR. GLEASON: Okay. So let me -- this is Eric.
9 Let me just -- I think this is a -- this is an interesting
10 juncture and I'm going to -- the other whole approach to
11 coordination is to treat it as a federal and state
12 requirement.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

14 MR. GLEASON: And to ask ourselves what is a
15 minimal effort or what is a basic effort to meet that
16 requirement. And so, you know, another objective would be
17 to meet whatever -- satisfy whatever minimum requirement there
18 is that we do coordination. And what I'm wondering about is
19 if there's a feature where there's some effort around that
20 that satisfies that minimum and then allows those regions
21 that want to go further with it, to go further.

22 One of the challenges of trying to manage that
23 level of effort statewide is that we can't. I mean, it's
24 just -- it is so relationship dependent and so people
25 dependent that without being everywhere or all places at the

1 -- you know, to move --

2 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

3 MR. GLEASON: -- it along, it doesn't move in many
4 areas and it works well in others.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and -- so, I completely get
6 the two propositions and I guess my response is that
7 historically, the places you're getting innovation,
8 entrepreneurialship and real progress are not where you have
9 a centrally managed structure.

10 Historically, to the extent we can find ways to
11 give guidance and get good information back to then start
12 rewarding success, we -- but at the same time releasing, you
13 know, using that clear guidance as a way to release some of
14 the management functionality, I actually think you have a
15 better opportunity or better shot at getting real progress
16 to happen.

17 As a consequence, I think you can tell I'm getting
18 -- I'm kind of moving away from the E option. You know, I
19 see problems now with what's happened, right?

20 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

21 MR. GADBOIS: And some of that is, you know,
22 locals don't get it, have -- want to, you know, tightly
23 control it, you know, don't want to spend much time on it.
24 I get all that. And some of that will happen. But if we
25 see that it's happening, we have a better opportunity to

1 control it through investment rather than trying to control
2 it through management.

3 MR. GLEASON: And when you say control it through
4 investment, that would be to minimize investment --

5 MR. GADBOIS: Or maximize.

6 MR. GLEASON: Or maximize investment, depending
7 which way you want to look at it, and yet, we still have a
8 statewide requirement to coord -- for coordination. It has
9 to be satisfied.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh. Part of the deal then
11 getting the rest of the money. The Feds have had no problem
12 with that forever. I don't know why we do.

13 You know, part of the deal for getting any dollar
14 from the Feds or the states are you have to comply with our
15 minimums. Now, you know, so what I'm suggesting on optional
16 dollars, I mean, especially on optional dollars like how
17 much we're going to invest in planning, you may not give a
18 place zero if they're not performing, that's always a bad
19 kind of way to do it, but you don't want to reward by
20 equalizing the investment if somebody's not really working
21 hard on it and somebody's really performing like a -- you
22 know, incredibly well.

23 MS. ROBERTS: Glenn, that is sort of what we had
24 discussed in the workgroup when they talked about the
25 predictable level of funding and some of the recommendations

1 on how to improve the quality of those plans; those
2 discussions went hand in hand. So you look at that cycle,
3 the funding cycle. If you developed a good quality plan and
4 it has all of these things in it, yes, then you get the
5 sustainability funds. You might not have to complete for
6 it, because we have a certain amount available. You still
7 have to apply for it. And if you met all these specs over
8 here, then you can get the sustainability funds over here.
9 If you didn't, then that's problematic.

10 MS. BLOOMER: I guess my question is, is so you've
11 developed a good plan and it meets the state requirements --
12 or the federal requirements, and it meets the state
13 requirements, but nothing actually happens in the next five
14 years as a result of that plan, is that still a good plan?

15 MR. GADBOIS: That's why I'm focused on the
16 performance measures, not the plan. It -- I --

17 MS. BLOOMER: Then wouldn't we want to get to
18 something like maybe just going off of Eric's idea and -- of
19 a hybrid approach where you have a statewide plan that
20 satisfies the requirement and then for those entities or
21 those areas that aren't, why do we keep giving them money to
22 do a plan that they don't want to do that doesn't meet the
23 minimum standards that, you know, doesn't result in any
24 measureable difference five years later? Instead, say thank
25 you very much, but we're going to take that 60,000 we gave

1 you and we're going to put it back in the pot and these
2 entities that are taking their plan and are coordinating,
3 creating real coordination and real relationships, make that
4 money available to help facilitate that coordination or that
5 project or that innovation, instead of just funding plans?

6 MR. SALAZAR: Is the five year plan mandated that
7 it has to be updated every five years?

8 MR. WRIGHT: FTA recommends that the plans be
9 updated every four or five years depending on air quality
10 compliance. And discussions that -- and that's a
11 recommendation. So the discussions through the working
12 group and internally following that, you know, figuring out
13 the best and most efficient way to move forward, we have
14 landed on the idea as represented in the funding cycle, of
15 keeping every -- all regions' concern on the same cycle,
16 just because if some were on a four year cycle, some are on
17 a five year cycle, it could get very confusing. So to keep
18 everybody on the same five year cycle is the idea that we
19 landed on. But that is -- to answer your question, that is
20 the FTA recommendation, every four or five years.

21 MR. GADBOIS: So the -- I mean, so the real driver
22 is that y'all get money for it more than that there's a
23 federal requirement or even a state requirement for a cycle,
24 a particular cycle?

25 MR. WRIGHT: I think --

1 MR. GADBOIS: There's just a requirement that you
2 have a plan?

3 MS. ROBERTS: Every four or five years.

4 MR. GADBOIS: That's the guidelines, it's not a
5 requirement, right?

6 MR. WRIGHT: That's the guidelines. That's right.
7 The every four or five year update.

8 And I would say that some regions are more -- you
9 asked about funding being the driver. Some regions seem to
10 be more dependent on TxDOT funding than others. There are
11 some planning regions in the state that have regional
12 planning going on on an ongoing, continuing basis, and they
13 don't use TxDOT funds. They have other sources of funding
14 to do that and it's working very well.

15 Other regions are more dependent on TxDOT dollars.

16 MR. GLEASON: So we really have the federal
17 guidance is limited to the 5310 program, which was, you
18 know, and they consolidated 5317 and 5310 into one larger
19 program, and that is the federal program that does require
20 that funded projects become locally -- derive from local --
21 locally developed coordination plans. And then we have the
22 state requirement which is broader and it says that, you
23 know, local -- or regional coordination plans will be done
24 to, you know, gain efficiencies and da da da da da da da.

25 But it's actually the state requirement which is

1 much broader in scope and not limited to a particular
2 program, that also is a big impetus for what we're trying to
3 do here.

4 MS. ROBERTS: Michelle, back to one of your
5 original concerns that the models, each of these models in
6 here had this really one which is assess the progress on the
7 plan. Are you working the plan; you've got a plan, now what
8 are you doing with it and what are your outcomes and how are
9 you assessing those outcomes.

10 MS. BLOOMER: All right. But if the plan isn't
11 linked to any funding, I think that's what I've been hearing
12 from some of the transit providers that that's great, we
13 have -- you know, we all get together every month, we come
14 up with projects, we get really excited, we're
15 collaborating, we're coordinating on it, but then there's no
16 funding.

17 MR. GLEASON: Well, the other version you have is
18 why get together every month --

19 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

20 MR. GLEASON: -- and spend all this time doing it
21 when there is no funding.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

24 MR. GLEASON: You've got some that may be excited
25 about it, you've got a bunch of others that aren't excited

1 about it at all because there's no new money.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Which was --

3 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

4 MR. GADBOIS: -- the Dave Marsh and what's his
5 name from Brazos Valley argument.

6 MR. GLEASON: John.

7 MR. GADBOIS: John.

8 MS. BLOOMER: So back to Glenn's point about
9 project focus, you know, when you've got people together
10 that are doing real coordination and coming up with
11 projects, instead of doing a plan, why not do it on a
12 project basis?

13 MR. WRIGHT: And that's what we do during the
14 interim years. You know, we -- we pay for the plan every
15 five years for the update, and in the interim years, what we
16 do with the money that we've earmarked as regional planning
17 funding, we have an annual competitive call and folks
18 basically submit by and large, project proposals to carry
19 out a needed study or a project that their plan calls for.
20 And so then they request funding to do this study or that
21 study or what have you that meets a priority that's
22 identified in their big plan.

23 So most of the regions do that and then that
24 includes some level of this funding to just sustain,
25 because, you know, the lead agencies make a compelling case

1 that well, most of this might be project specific for the
2 funding, but some of this, you know, it costs us staff time
3 and dollars, you know, just to convene a meeting and we
4 should get a reasonable reimbursement for that.

5 So there's a mix of that. But mostly during the
6 interim years it is to pay for projects called for in
7 respective plans.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and Steve, here's a complaint,
9 and I can -- I mean, that I see Michelle raising, I don't
10 know that it's exactly what she's raising, without a doubt
11 the regions are used to -- certainly the transportation
12 folks are used to developing plans, revising those or
13 updating those plans on regular cycles. And so that's a
14 tried and true process that they're very used to.

15 But the problem is whereas that makes a lot of
16 sense on the highway program side where there's a lot of
17 money flowing in regularly and you have to -- not enough,
18 but a lot of money flowing in regularly and you have to
19 figure out exactly how to program it all, it's obviously
20 making less sense for some of the transit folks and the way
21 that it's happening regionally I think is a fair statement,
22 but it is also not necessarily generating the kind of
23 coordination we had hoped to generate in the first place,
24 where, you know, you may have developed a plan, but that
25 doesn't necessarily mean you're getting the HHS agencies

1 really engaged, they're stepping up with any of their money,
2 and you're starting to solve real problems in new ways.

3 Right?

4 So, there's some reason to question the whole plan
5 notion as a way to solve this, right? As a consequence, I'm
6 suggesting and this is stepping way out of Michelle's, I'm
7 suggesting we focus more on performance measures, let plans
8 lay, let them keep updating them, but focus on how can we
9 get performance measures to really make it a valuable
10 investment, give people a reason to actually engage and
11 start, you know, encouraging the kind of program work that
12 will payoff for everybody and make it worth being at the
13 table.

14 MR. GLEASON: Okay. So let me try and -- this is
15 Eric. Let me try something here and see if it captures what
16 I'm hearing.

17 So the statewide working group, their notion of
18 continuing on with 24 regions, continuing to do this work,
19 and then add some statewide performance metrics, I'm not
20 hearing anyone necessarily step away from that model. What
21 I'm hearing is an interest on the part of the Committee
22 toward getting results, not emphasizing getting a plan done
23 as much as getting results. And Glenn, I like the solve
24 real problems in new ways thing, because so -- and the
25 question I'm hearing is how do we get there.

1 How do we -- what combination of measures and
2 guidance and accountability can we build into this program,
3 leaving the structure the same, how can we make -- how can
4 we focus it so that it's -- it's on real work, it's on
5 productive work, and it gets results. Hearing is how do we
6 get there.

7 How do we -- what combination of measures and
8 guidance and accountability can we build into this program,
9 leaving the structure the same, how can we make -- how can
10 we focus it so that it's -- it's on real work, it's on
11 productive work, and it gets results.

12 MR. GADBOIS: With one exception. I personally
13 don't think that B, C or D, are off the table. I mean, I
14 think any one of those could work, we need to first figure
15 out how we can do the performance measures to get a kind of
16 real innovation and then look back at which one of these is
17 going to most help us to convey that, achieve that level of
18 performance and encouragement.

19 MR. GLEASON: So leave the current model go, let
20 it go ahead, but let's -- and let's spend our time, let's
21 spend the Committee's time, focusing on your question. That
22 may lead at the end of that to a revisiting of any one of
23 these, but not now.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Yes. I'm fine with that. Are you
25 all comfortable with that?

1 MS. BLOOMER: I think so. Rob?

2 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, I'm listening.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Any comments or thoughts?

4 MR. STEPHENS: I don't know how comfortable I am,
5 but I am listening.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Do you have any thoughts for us?

7 MR. STEPHENS: No, you guys covered it. I mean,
8 you know, you do a great job there. Michelle, I think
9 you're doing an awesome job there and to put together what
10 everyone's concerns are and Eric, of course, I'm kind of
11 listening to what you're hearing and kind of putting that
12 back out to the Committee. You know, I've been on board on
13 this thing for a very long time. I don't know, you know, I
14 don't -- it's an extremely complicated problem and I think
15 we get down to some just basic questions; what -- how do we
16 define success, what is progress, what are we trying to
17 achieve here? Are we talking bare minimum statewide
18 requirement for coordination? What are we trying to do
19 here?

20 You know, I agree with all of you, I just don't
21 know where we go from here. Where do we plan on getting the
22 money to pay for this planning effort this coming two years,
23 these next two years?

24 MR. GLEASON: Well, the money comes from where
25 it's always come from, Rob, and that is we have federal,

1 state planning and research funds, the 5304 program, which
2 largely foots the bill for this. And those --

3 MR. STEPHENS: The last time I heard from, I think
4 it was Steve when we last met, he described several
5 different funds --

6 MR. GLEASON: Yeah, well, for a while there we had
7 JARC and New Freedom funds.

8 MR. STEPHENS: Maybe you heard that; I don't know.

9 MR. GLEASON: And but those programs don't exist
10 as standalone programs anymore. And so --

11 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

12 MR. GLEASON: -- first and foremost and it's -- it
13 comes out of that 5304 program, which -- and some of those
14 larger years, those years where you see \$900,000, that is 75
15 percent of the program. And that's also the program that
16 can be used to fund special studies, route analysis studies,
17 it can help move --

18 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

19 MR. GLEASON: -- facility projects through project
20 development stages of, you know, project feasibility,
21 environmental work, right of way, property acquisition
22 things, getting it ready to be constructed.

23 So there are -- there's a lot of demand on that
24 program and part of our interest was seeing if we couldn't
25 strike a different balance with this effort that would allow

1 us to move forward --

2 MR. STEPHENS: Uh-huh.

3 MR. GLEASON: -- into the future with more funds
4 available for other uses.

5 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, it's interesting now that you
6 mentioned it. I would be concerned about how you -- how you
7 see all those different types -- or ways of using the plan
8 funds, how do you see that future for those different needs
9 competing with the regional planning process? I mean that -
10 -

11 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think if we don't find a way
12 to I think increase the level of buy-in through, you know,
13 getting results, then I think we're going to continually
14 hear that from some segment of the community, we're going to
15 continue to hear that these monies can be used better
16 elsewhere. So I think the -- the onus is on us to build in
17 some accountability into the coordination planning effort so
18 it's not just about producing plans.

19 MR. STEPHENS: Uh-huh, I think that's what I agree
20 with Michelle and others. I mean, that's pretty much what
21 it ended up being is check off the box, we've done that, and
22 move on down the road.

23 MR. GLEASON: Well, I don't think that's true
24 universally. I think we've got some regions that really
25 have taken the ball and run with it. And then we have

1 others that are really struggling that perhaps may fall more
2 into that mode. And the challenge with this program is as a
3 requirement has always been how far to push it in those
4 areas that --

5 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

6 MR. GLEASON: -- that don't necessarily find value
7 in it.

8 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, well, pushing it's
9 uncomfortable. I mean, I've had my fair share of being on
10 both ends of pushing and pulling and you know, that's kind
11 of where the rub is; it's easier just to do the bare minimum
12 and just kind of do that, so more risky for a person to go
13 out there and push and pull a little bit. But that's what
14 my personal experience has been, so I don't know. You've
15 described planning process to come out of agencies that
16 describe a whole list of them that has value and that get
17 them prioritized within an agency that need but may not be a
18 reasonable concern, so you'll have those two kinds of things
19 happening, you know, multiplied by however many you have.
20 And I think we can ultimately end up with occasionally what
21 you'll have is people don't agree on what coordination
22 really means, what we're actually doing, so what is our goal
23 here. And then it becomes -- it just becomes a time when
24 you have -- it just becomes this process that you just do --
25 you know, operators just competing for the limited amount of

1 funding on the table now to achieve whatever it is they want
2 to achieve that we're not sure that we've collectively
3 agreed upon. That's my experience with it. Everyone just
4 has their own ways. You asked me what I thought, so I gave
5 it to you.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and --

7 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Rob.

8 MR. GADBOIS: And Rob, I actually appreciate you
9 asking where the money comes from. To note, I think if we
10 can get to a place where we're looking at performance more,
11 where we're encouraging the use of that money to go to
12 projects that people can work on and start collaborating on,
13 that kind of realigns that money back to its other uses
14 anyway, right?

15 MR. GLEASON: Possibly.

16 MR. GADBOIS: To more --

17 MR. GLEASON: That's one way to look at it.

18 MR. GADBOIS: -- more towards those kind of
19 projects people would use it for if not for regional
20 planning. That doesn't make any sense to you, Michelle?

21 MS. BLOOMER: So are you -- your point being that
22 if we aren't using it to do the plans, we can use it to do
23 projects, which --

24 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

25 MS. BLOOMER: -- would have been in the plans and

1 would be actual examples of regional coordination, that
2 would get us something, a product.

3 MR. GLEASON: So our region could decide, you
4 know, we need to get more out of our current fixed route
5 system. Stakeholders around the table don't feel like
6 they're being served as well. Go look at them.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Instead of updating their plan, we
8 want to do --

9 MR. GLEASON: And that would be a -- you know,
10 that would be an evaluation of current service which we
11 fund. Those are the kind of things I like to fund. And it
12 could result in, you know, using the same level of resources
13 differently in a community and more effectively. And I
14 think that's what Glenn is -- you know, that would be a
15 great deal.

16 Now, what you can't have in that is a lead agency
17 who is not the transit agency --

18 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

19 MR. GLEASON: -- because that doesn't work.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

21 MR. GLEASON: And so it -- that requires -- and
22 Rob, what I didn't say was you can't have a lead agency
23 telling a transit agency that they need to do an evaluation
24 because they think their service isn't good.

25 MR. STEPHENS: That's my experience. I've seen a

1 little bit of that, Eric.

2 MR. GLEASON: Right. And so that's where this
3 begins to break down when we run into relationships that
4 aren't functioning the way they should function.

5 MR. STEPHENS: Putting this down on paper and
6 demanding that recipients of formula funding comply and this
7 is what we're doing and this is what you start doing, and
8 that's a little bit of an awkward approach I think, which
9 puts everybody at odds with each other. What I thought what
10 the preliminary objective was when this whole coordination
11 got started or at least back in 2006, was to try to bring in
12 the health and human service agencies which was a parallel
13 system to the public network that was kind of a consumer
14 oriented individual emphasis on participants in that
15 program, how do you capture the value of all that out there
16 and bring it to the table to make more of public transit.
17 And that hasn't happened. I mean, I haven't seen it happen.
18 Maybe it's happened in a few places, but that's not what's
19 happening from what I understand, so I -- we've got
20 something a little different going on now where we've got to
21 focus on a plan and then we have this other thing where we
22 have, you know the coordination, whatever it is, kind of
23 collectively been an assortment of what folks think should
24 happen, but then we don't really have a prioritization
25 there, because you have different agencies in charge of

1 different funding streams that do different -- have
2 different priorities. So you're kind of going in circles a
3 lot of times, but -- so I'm interested in where we're going
4 to go from here, because I've heard a lot of really good
5 stuff, but I don't know where we go next.

6 MR. GADBOIS: And Eric, you made a comment that --
7 at the same time; would you repeat it?

8 MR. GLEASON: Which one was that?

9 MR. GADBOIS: You don't remember what it was?

10 Well, it started with this isn't the lead agency telling a
11 transit agency to do an evaluation --

12 MR. GLEASON: Right.

13 MR. GADBOIS: -- because they think they're doing
14 a bad job.

15 MR. GLEASON: Right.

16 MR. GADBOIS: And that actually coalesces one of
17 the reasons that I want to focus on performance rather than
18 planning is, you know, one of the complaints I hear is a
19 lead agency thinks its lead agency role is to develop a plan
20 and then enforce towards its vision of that. And I really
21 do want to get away from that, because that isn't very
22 effective coordination.

23 What in my mind is going to work a lot better is
24 if we can figure out a way to encourage the right kinds of
25 relationship building, the right kinds of project

1 development, so that we are really getting the results.

2 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

3 MS. BLOOMER: That's it. Should be simple and
4 easy, right?

5 MR. STEPHENS: I just didn't know what are the
6 results we're interested in.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Right. I think --

8 MR. GADBOIS: We're going to figure that out, but
9 not today.

10 MS. BLOOMER: I think that --

11 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All right. All right.

12 MS. BLOOMER: I think we're all on the same page
13 that we don't know what the end results are, we haven't
14 agreed on that, but we agree we need to focus on what the
15 results should be or that we want, and then come up with
16 performance measures that help us measure whether or not
17 we're getting there. And then we can determine if any one
18 of these models helps us or if we just go to --

19 MR. GADBOIS: Default.

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- the statewide plan or a plan or -
21 - but what are we trying to accomplish first and get
22 everybody to agree to that. But I would agree, it's the
23 relationships, and it's not the lead agency developing the
24 plan and then dictating to everybody and maybe they're one
25 of the key players that makes it happen or maybe they aren't

1 one of the key players, but it's -- in my mind it's
2 facilitating those discussions so you can pull in -- and
3 maybe you only pull in -- that's my concern with performance
4 measures is I don't want people to feel like they just have
5 to do all of it so they check off the box.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

7 MS. BLOOMER: If you can get one key HHS person to
8 the table, focus on that. But then you need some funding in
9 order to actually make that happen. Well, then this would
10 be in my mind a source to help facilitate that and bring
11 them in, do a project, make it successful, and then now you
12 have a partner. But just sitting around a table and coming
13 up with a plan, those relationships don't develop that way.

14 MR. GADBOIS: And the only last thing I want to
15 make clear is when I say invest in performance, I actually
16 don't mean invest only in high performance.

17 MR. GLEASON: Oh, I know.

18 MR. GADBOIS: You know, in good. Because
19 experimentation is part of what we want and need, right?
20 Which assumes failure. And so we've also got to be very
21 attentive to allowing experimentation. The only thing I
22 don't want to invest in is somebody that's just checking
23 boxes and not, you know, not participating, not really
24 coming -- not coming to the table with any genuine effort.

25 MR. GLEASON: So before we leave this discussion,

1 if we're about to leave it, I think we would benefit hearing
2 some description of what work you as a Committee would like
3 to see us do on this between now and your next meeting.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Madam Chair, I'm sorry.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead.

6 MR. GADBOIS: All yours. I'll jump in -- or if
7 you want, I --

8 MS. BLOOMER: Well, I -- I think one thing we had
9 -- and I appreciate that we went back and we added the works
10 well and needs improvement, but I think one piece we're
11 still missing is this is all generated from the working
12 group. And I know we took it to the semiannual and we
13 didn't get a lot of comments, but we had talked about at the
14 last meeting going to TTA and connecting with that
15 conference as -- and that didn't work out.

16 But the whole point of that was to get a larger
17 input from the transit providers, from the stakeholders that
18 are participating in the plan.

19 One of my big concerns is we're getting ready to
20 spend another 1.8-million in two years to develop plans.
21 And I think what we've heard is we've spent a lot of money
22 on developing plans, we're getting ready to spend another
23 chunk of money to develop plans. What has it gotten us. So
24 I think before we go into that we need to let folks know
25 that if this is what we're going to do, we're going to use

1 this process now over the next 16 to 18 months to evaluate
2 this, come up with a proposal to move forward, that it's not
3 -- we're just not going to continue doing what we've been
4 doing forever.

5 MR. GLEASON: So let me window that down a bit,
6 because I think what Steve had said earlier is that in order
7 to gear up for the fiscal year '16 and '17 funding --

8 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

9 MR. GLEASON: -- that spike you see --

10 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

11 MR. GLEASON: -- we're actually going to start
12 that in the winter of 2015.

13 MR. WRIGHT: The call would go out in February and
14 we would go out -- our plan is to go out and provide
15 regional workshops --

16 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

17 MR. WRIGHT: -- and guidance to folks in January.

18 MR. GLEASON: So the call for fiscal year '16
19 funding is going to go out this next February.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

21 MR. GLEASON: So if you're looking for a window to
22 do work on this to influence the expenditure of that amount
23 of money --

24 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

25 MR. GLEASON: -- we're talking about this summer

1 and the fall.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And I guess my question is I'm not -
3 - I'm asking the Committee, I'm hearing, you know, I -- I
4 don't know that we have enough time to come up with a
5 complete new plan and transition it. But what I also don't
6 think is that we need another three years to sit and do
7 nothing before we come up with a plan. So, if we're not
8 going to do anything and we're going to issue the money in
9 '16 and '17 meaning starting next February so we can plan
10 ahead, that we let folks know upfront that we're going to be
11 monitoring this process this time, we're going to be, you
12 know, seeking their input during the process to get good
13 feedback on what is and isn't working in each region, and
14 then we're going to use that information and we're going to
15 come up with a plan for the next cycle going forward.

16 Or we say no, we don't want to and we want to come
17 up with maybe a hybrid approach where we set half of that
18 900,000 aside, say 450 is available to help with planning,
19 to develop your plan or update your plan, we want to put the
20 other 450 aside to help fund innovative projects or route
21 analysis of existing services or et cetera to help you
22 actually move something in your existing plan forward.

23 MR. GADBOIS: Can I suggest a hybrid of that?

24 MS. BLOOMER: Sure.

25 MR. GADBOIS: And just seeing -- so I think that

1 we have to assume this next round is going forward with
2 planning and the investment in that.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

4 MR. GADBOIS: I mean, I think that part -- and
5 there's just not enough time to transition. I don't care
6 how fast we get work done. It -- but as importantly,
7 there's no way to have the community engagement and buy-in
8 and so it would be basically a top down approach even if we
9 could do it that way, which is all wrong.

10 So we have to kind of assume that piece of it, but
11 what we could do over the next three meetings we have --

12 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Over the next three meetings is
14 decide how we could communicate. As this is rolling out, as
15 there's the meetings with the launch, as the money's going
16 out the door, communicate that this is the last time it's
17 getting invested this way and this is where we're
18 transitioning towards. Figure out exactly what that
19 communication might look like. That also I would think
20 means we need to do some real work to define and clarify
21 what we think are the results we want, how do we describe
22 that, how might the metrics be done, and at the same time,
23 then we can do some kind of data collection or feedback
24 opportunities to make sure that we've either got it right or
25 hear other good ideas along the way, such that we are ready

1 fairly early to -- to have specific performance measures we
2 can pursue.

3 And if we can get -- and I think we can get those
4 done in a timely enough fashion to where they could be ready
5 on the front end, including going out to the public some,
6 talking to TTA, et cetera, to have them ready for when the
7 money is put out. I would think we could have some
8 performance measures that are fairly well vetted done by
9 then.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Before the money goes out in
11 February.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Well, the money goes out in
13 February.

14 MR. GLEASON: Maybe it won't go out, but before
15 the proposal goes out.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Well, before the --

17 MS. BLOOMER: To vote proposals.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, so -- so before the -- the
19 announcement or whatever it is, yeah. Would that make sense
20 for a work plan for us to focus on and get this done? And
21 it's going to -- and that's also going to mean a good bit of
22 work from y'all because my first question is going to be I
23 can guarantee y'all have ideas on both results that kind of
24 would apply across the board and/or some thoughts on
25 performance measures. I'd like to start there.

1 MS. ROBERTS: All right, but our original plan was
2 to take these recommendations from the work group, the
3 recommendations that we had received consensus on from all
4 the lead agencies and which we've discussed at -- with the
5 transit community at the semiannual, but we were -- our plan
6 was to develop a set of guidelines based on these
7 recommendations, hold some workshops this fall, canvass the
8 state to say here's at least what a new level of
9 accountability is going to be in your next plan. We expect
10 you to have these things in it.

11 Here's the new guidelines. Here's the
12 recommendations. Here's what we're going to be looking for.
13 So that was in the works between now and February, which
14 would be that next call for projects.

15 So how is what you're suggesting -- yeah.

16 MR. GADBOIS: So fall is when you'd be going out
17 and doing the stakeholder meetings.

18 MS. ROBERTS: Yes, in advance of that February
19 project proposal.

20 MR. GADBOIS: What I'm suggesting is if we can do
21 work fairly quickly to define what results might look like,
22 what performance measures might look like, so we have
23 something concrete enough to talk to people about, then the
24 crafting of the message is really only we're going to invest
25 one more time in this planning process, we're going to get

1 to a place to where we can have performance measures as part
2 of that, and then we may refine those performance measures
3 some, but thereafter, those plans evolve at the speed with
4 which they evolve because what we're now going to invest in
5 from thereon is performance and results.

6 MS. ROBERTS: And we are getting a group together
7 to discuss performance measures, because even in this next
8 plan update, we would like to have performance measures in
9 them. Right.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, and so that gives us a way to
11 integrate that part and test and make sure they're actually
12 right and start getting some data.

13 MS. ROBERTS: That's right.

14 MR. GADBOIS: But the other piece of this is
15 announced upfront, this is the last time we're investing in
16 plan updates. From now on y'all are responsible for just
17 keeping them flowing and updated. Because what we're
18 investing from hereon is performance towards real results.

19 Sound like a politician? Yes, sir. You don't
20 have to raise your hand, Steve.

21 MR. GLEASON: Is it too late to cast my vote
22 today?

23 MR. WRIGHT: I just wanted to clarify for the
24 record and anybody listening, we only provide funding for
25 plan updates every five years. The interim years we don't

1 fund for plan updates. I just wanted to make sure there
2 wasn't a misunderstanding of that.

3 MS. ROBERTS: I think we're just suggesting
4 there's a change in that cycle.

5 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

7 MR. GLEASON: And even in the interim years, what
8 we're funding is we're sustaining the process --

9 MS. ROBERTS: Yes.

10 MR. GLEASON: And I think what is being said is
11 even that is not the future. The future is --

12 MS. ROBERTS: That's right.

13 MR. GLEASON: -- more project specific.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Having some outputs and outcomes.

15 MR. GLEASON: With measureable outcomes associated
16 with a project that flow in to some -- a set of performance
17 metrics --

18 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

19 MR. GLEASON: -- that assuming projects are
20 successful, should, you know, float the boat down --

21 MR. WRIGHT: But even more than this --

22 MR. GADBOIS: Even when they're not successful,
23 they're still building the relationship that's important for
24 coordination, right?

25 MR. GLEASON: Right.

1 MR. GADBOIS: So --

2 MR. WRIGHT: And even more -- we even provi --
3 during the interim years, we provide more funding for
4 specific projects than we do for the sustainability. So
5 when the funding application comes in, the applicant is to
6 identify the activity that they're applying for and
7 demonstrate how that addresses a priority that has
8 previously been set in their plan. So it's funding like a
9 transportation -- a couple of examples.

10 Like in the Panhandle, they had identified
11 veterans' transportation in their plan; they identified that
12 as a need, but it needed further study. So the interim
13 years provides funding for that further study.

14 Or in far west Texas, their plan identified as a
15 priority a need for a dialysis related transportation that
16 needed study. So in the interim years, TxDOT provides
17 funding to do that further study on dialysis transportation,
18 et cetera. And Campo, you know, consolidated eligibility
19 determination amongst the sister agencies.

20 Those are like needs identified in the plan and
21 they are planning projects to meet the need.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Right, but what I care is that
23 project's now going to get funded, not because it's needed
24 planning, but because they're committing to bring in the dia
25 -- you know, 15 dialysis centers and, you know, and this

1 agency and that local agency, to actually bring people to
2 the table to help develop that analysis and planning and
3 maybe contribute a little bit of money to it.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

5 MR. GADBOIS: That's what makes that project
6 fundable.

7 MR. GLEASON: Okay. I think we got it.

8 MS. ROBERTS: Yeah.

9 MR. GLEASON: And I don't know how much time we
10 should spend more on this.

11 MS. ROBERTS: Right. I just had one -- we do have
12 a question in to FTA on the requirements for the plan
13 update.

14 MR. GLEASON: I recall that.

15 MS. ROBERTS: I don't know if that is an actual --

16 MR. GLEASON: We can hold on that. I think we've
17 got enough direction from the Committee today.

18 MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then we know what -- so
20 we'll come back next time with defining and clarifying the
21 results with proposed matrix (sic) and then how we're going
22 to communicate that when we go out in the fall.

23 MR. GLEASON: Matrix?

24 MS. BLOOMER: The metrics.

25 MR. GLEASON: Metrics, okay.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Sorry. Metrics, matrix.

2 MR. GLEASON: All right

3 MR. GADBOIS: She was going all Keanu Reeves on
4 us.

5 MS. BLOOMER: That concludes Item 4. We'll go on
6 to Item 5, which is the presentation and discussion of
7 TxDOT's Texas Transportation Plan 2014. And Michelle is not
8 able to be -- sorry. Michelle Conkle is not able to be here
9 in person, but my understanding is she is on the phone.
10 Michelle?

11 MS. CONKLE: Good afternoon, everyone.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Michelle, hang on. We need to turn
13 the volume up.

14 MS. CONKLE: Okay.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Alrighty, go ahead.

16 MS. CONKLE: Can you hear me now?

17 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

18 MS. CONKLE: Okay. Thank you all again for having
19 me back again to make a presentation to your group. I may
20 be flying a little bit blind in that I'm going to just have
21 someone change reply based on the numbers, but I'm going to
22 stay on the line to answer any questions you have about any
23 of your most specific needs at the end of this or take any
24 comments that you have on our public involvement tool which
25 we'll go over a little bit. So we'll just go ahead and jump

1 right in.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

3 MS. CONKLE: First slide --

4 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

5 MS. CONKLE: Go ahead.

6 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, this is Bobby Killebrew.

7 MS. CONKLE: Yes.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: I'm glad you joined us. Can you
9 hang on just one second while we take a small break if you
10 don't mind? I know you've been on the phone forever, but --

11 MS. CONKLE: No, that's --

12 MR. KILLEBREW: -- but all of --

13 MS. CONKLE: That's wonderful. That'd be good for
14 you all, I'm sure.

15 MR. GLEASON: Well, mostly for us, yes, Michelle.

16 MS. CONKLE: That's fine.

17 MR. KILLEBREW: Mostly us. I apologize. We'll
18 get back to you in just a minute.

19 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

20 (Off record)

21 MR. KILLEBREW: Okay, Michelle, I think we're --
22 the Committee's back in the room and so I think we're a go
23 now.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Michelle?

25 MS. BLOOMER: Maybe she took a break.

1 MR. GADBOIS: She didn't believe we'd be just a
2 minute.

3 MS. CONKLE: No, I'm sorry. I'm actually here. I
4 was on mute.

5 (Laughter)

6 MR. GADBOIS: Are you done with your presentation
7 yet?

8 MS. CONKLE: I was talking to someone else here in
9 the office and I'm like oh, no. I'm back.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. We are, too.

11 MS. CONKLE: Okay. I'll make this as painless on
12 you guys as possible because I know you have a pretty robust
13 agenda today.

14 This presentation that I'm giving today is the
15 exact same presentation that we gave to our own Texas
16 Transportation Plan 2040, Technical Advisory Committee so
17 that everybody gets the same message. If we go to slide 2,
18 okay, basically and again, because for consistency reasons,
19 this was the agenda that we went up there with our TAC.
20 Basically just talk about the schedule, recap of our last
21 meeting and the draft goals which I also shared with you
22 guys the last time I updated you on the plan. Talk a little
23 bit about stakeholder and public outreach for round two, an
24 overview of that. The outreach schedule, our outreach tool
25 and investment approaches. Talked about the unconstrained

1 needs assessment by mode. For this particular presentation,
2 we're going to focus on transit, bicycles, pedestrian and
3 rail specific modes, and then talk about the TTP 2040 next
4 steps. Next slide.

5 The TTP development schedule, you've all seen this
6 before. At the time that I had forwarded this to Josh, it
7 was the middle of May, so of course the slide now has moved
8 to the end of May and we're getting ready to go into the
9 second round of our public involvement. We're having public
10 open house style public meetings around the state, to all 25
11 districts, which I'll put the schedule up here in a minute.

12 Much like we did the first round, we'll be having
13 stakeholder meetings in the early afternoon and public
14 meetings in the late afternoon for a total of 50 scheduled
15 meetings that are posted by public notice. And again, I'm
16 happy always to come and speak to any of your groups
17 individually if that's what you would like us to do, give
18 you more information. Next slide.

19 The TAC 2 recap, we basically summarized round one
20 outreach and early survey findings. We discussed the draft
21 TTP goals and objectives. We reached general consensus on
22 goals and objectives with some language modifications and we
23 added financial sustainability as a goal and objective,
24 which I think is very relevant to some of the conversation I
25 heard before the presentation. We're -- I think all modes

1 are suffering right now, but no more so than public
2 transportation. Next slide.

3 So to the TTP draft goal areas summary, if you can
4 see on the screen, we've added financial sustainability.
5 The TAC, the public and other advisory committees felt so
6 strongly about this that we didn't even really try to work
7 it in with all the other draft goals. We feel like
8 financial sustainability is a goal that makes everything
9 under it possible. And that's why it actually encompasses
10 everything there, because again, much like has already been
11 discussed, we can plan and we can spend money to do things
12 when we get money, but we're never going to be able to do
13 those things and we're never going to be able to measure our
14 goals without having financial sustainability as one of our
15 goals. Next slide.

16 So stakeholder public outreach round two overview.
17 Again, we're -- we have news releases going out from our
18 communications office. We have -- we already have the
19 meeting notices on TxDOT's website. Again, all you have to
20 do is go on to the TxDOT website and search for TTP 2040,
21 it'll give you a full list. We're making personal calls and
22 personally extending invitations to all of you to attend
23 meetings in your area or in an area where you might be
24 traveling.

25 Again, we have Twitter, Facebook. We've had

1 several hundred people join our Twitter account and our
2 tweeting information about this. And all of that can be
3 found on the TxDOT website at TTP 2040.

4 The format again is facilitated workshops for
5 stakeholders which will be early afternoon and individual
6 open house style discussions with the public, featuring an
7 outreach tool that was created by CH2M Hill and the study
8 team and then made usable by the public by a company called
9 MetroQuest.

10 Other ongoing efforts to provide information, we
11 also have version two of our survey, that's the survey we
12 handed out two meetings ago on SurveyMonkey. With that
13 survey we asked additional questions to try to bridge the
14 gap between respondents stated preference for using single
15 vehicles versus riding transit and just the statement that
16 they would ride transit. So it's very interesting and we've
17 got over a thousand responses to that. Again, we have the
18 TxDOT website and the MetroQuest tool.

19 The map that you see, this was survey responses as
20 of 5/9/2014. There are now over a thousand responses to the
21 second survey and we had approximately 500 responses to the
22 first survey. So we feel like we also have gotten better
23 coverage, because between the first and second survey, we
24 used a few college students to help us tweet this and get
25 the word out. So, in a little more than a month we have

1 almost doubled the response to the second survey and we
2 invite you to go out there and take it, even if you took the
3 first survey. Next slide.

4 This is our outreach round two schedule. Week
5 one, week of June the 9th, we'll be in the Bryan District.
6 We'll be next in the Beaumont District, then the Houston
7 District, and then Lufkin. So that's 9, 10, 11 and 12.

8 The second week, 6/16 through the 18th, we'll be
9 out 6/16 in San Angelo, 6/17 in Odessa, and 6/18 in El Paso.

10 Week three, which is June 24th through the 26th,
11 the June 24th we'll be in the Atlanta District, June 25th
12 we'll be in the Paris District at Paris Junior College, and
13 on the 26th we'll be at the Tyler TxDOT District Office.

14 Week four, which is 7/7 through 7/10; July 7th
15 through the 10th. We'll be in Dallas, Wichita Falls, Fort
16 Worth and Brownwood.

17 I'm going to stop just a second and ask Bobby, are
18 these slides -- are they -- do you see one big huge state
19 with all the colors in it?

20 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

21 MR. KILLEBREW: We're progressing just fine.
22 Thank you.

23 MS. CONKLE: All right. Okay. Thanks. I'm
24 thinking they're probably going what's she talking about.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: We figured it out.

1 MS. CONKLE: Thank you.

2 Week five, July 14th through the 17th, we'll be in
3 Laredo, Pharr, Corpus Christi and Victoria.

4 Week six, we'll be in Waco.

5 Week seven, which is July 28th thorough the 30th,
6 we'll be in Abilene, Childress, Amarillo and Lubbock.

7 And then finally in week eight, which is August
8 4th and 5th, we'll be in San Antonio and Austin,
9 respectively.

10 And again, if you want time and physical location
11 of the meetings, those are in the public notice on TxDOT's
12 website. Next slide.

13 MetroQuest tool features. I know we explained to
14 you that we were building a tool that would allow
15 stakeholders and the public to be able to move money around
16 and create their own budget based on what their specific
17 priorities are. This budgeting allows users to create their
18 own budget to better understand investment tradeoffs that we
19 have to make here in TxDOT and the tradeoffs on the overall
20 system performance. Next slide.

21 We basically have three investment approaches.
22 And we want to say upfront, we realize there are much like
23 the shakes at Sonic, there are a million combinations, but
24 what we tried to do is we tried to take projects that helped
25 us to meet the goals and objectives of the plan and put

1 those together where they naturally fit, so that it would be
2 something digestible to the public. So we've come up with
3 three scenarios.

4 And investment approach number one is system
5 preservation. This scenario focused on investing in the
6 state transportation system to achieve a state of good
7 repair for highway, bridge, and transit assets as is
8 required by MAP-21. Deficient assets with respect to
9 condition and performance, for example, functional
10 obsolescence, will be prioritized and addressed. That
11 sometimes is a safety issue which is why those would be
12 priorities. Next slide.

13 Investment approach two is metropolitan mobility.
14 This scenario is focused on addressing congestion in urban
15 and suburban areas through strategic capacity enhancements,
16 operational improvements, and investment in multimodal
17 facilities and infrastructure. Focus will be placed on
18 increasing travel time reliability and on enhancing transit
19 in the fastest-growing areas. Next slide.

20 Investment approach three, connectivity and
21 freight mobility. This scenario is focused on rural
22 investment to facilitate the movement of goods and services
23 and support Texas industry. Focus will be placed on
24 improving interregional connectivity, specifically along
25 primary freight corridors identified in the Texas Freight

1 Mobility Plan and between economic activity centers, and on
2 providing rural residents with access to goods and services.

3 I'm going to stop right here and say that you
4 might have wondered why in the last two meetings I've told
5 you that safety is TxDOT's primary goal, it's the primary
6 goal of MAP-21, but you don't see that have its own
7 individual slide. That's because safety, again, like I said
8 in the last scenario, it's the first and foremost, paramount
9 in all of these investment approaches, been already if you
10 will baked in to each scenario. So it is a baseline
11 requirement. Next slide.

12 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. Can I ask a
13 question?

14 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

15 MR. GLEASON: So we've got three investment
16 approaches; is rural mobility -- I don't see that anywhere.
17 I see the connectivity -- I see investment three being
18 freight oriented. I don't see rural mobility, rural
19 connectivity from a people movement standpoint.

20 MS. CONKLE: Well, you're correct and I need to
21 get my consultant to add that, but at the bottom it does say
22 providing rural residents with access to goods and services.

23 MR. GLEASON: I know, but it looks like a --

24 MS. CONKLE: So there's an assumption that --

25 MR. GLEASON: It looks like a freight movement

1 approach.

2 MS. CONKLE: Well, I -- no, that's a good comment.

3 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

4 MS. CONKLE: And I will have them make that more
5 passenger-centric. Would that acceptable?

6 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

7 MS. CONKLE: And then to address an issue of --
8 just to make sure we're all clear and using the same
9 terminology, when we say connectivity because we've had
10 other questions on well, how come you're not addressing
11 rural congestion, well, there frankly is no rural congestion
12 for the most part and that's why we constrain congestion
13 needs to the metropolitan area, because if not, we put the
14 entire system in there and it makes it look like that the
15 statewide --

16 MR. GLEASON: Right.

17 MS. CONKLE: -- congestion is not as bad there and
18 it really is and we all know it's very bad in the
19 metropolitan areas, so we focused on connectivity in the
20 rural areas. But I will re-word that and I appreciate the
21 comment.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and Michelle, let me jump in
23 with one quick; on number two, metropolitan mobility,
24 there's no reference to land use, but that's the other big
25 side of the equation, particularly in metropolitan areas.

1 And --

2 MS. CONKLE: Okay.

3 MR. GADBOIS: And I don't know that traditionally
4 y'all do much of that, but frankly, the metro areas will.

5 And so --

6 MS. CONKLE: That is correct.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And so if you'll figure out a way
8 to, you know, at least consider integrating that into the
9 message it'd be I think important for the metro folks.

10 MS. CONKLE: Okay. And I will tell you definitely
11 there is -- it's not as explicit, because again, all of us
12 our transportation professionals and we're trying to make it
13 again, digestible for the public, but I will tell you that
14 the cost of requiring right of way and moving utilities,
15 utility adjustments, are factored in. So, in a way, you
16 know, from a mathematical, scientific, engineering
17 standpoint they are in there, but I will find a way to work
18 that into a message that can be understood by the public.

19 So thank you again for -- your group for providing
20 us some good input. That's why we want to hear from you.

21 MR. GADBOIS: Well, it --

22 MS. CONKLE: Is there any other suggestions on the
23 approaches?

24 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I just want to make
25 sure and paint this clearly, so you're having a fight in

1 Austin over I-35 and whether it's primarily a transportation
2 facility or whether it's an asset for the community and
3 development that happens around it. You're having the same
4 argument over whether you keep a freeway in Dallas area.
5 You're having a number of those discussions in metropolitan
6 areas that I think you at least ought to acknowledge when
7 you're talking about metropolitan mobility. Does that make
8 sense?

9 MS. CONKLE: Okay. So I want to make sure I
10 capture this. You want to acknowledge --

11 MR. GADBOIS: Well, not acknowledge those
12 particular instances, just acknowledge that there -- that
13 metropolitan mobility requires you to make a more complex
14 arrangement between development and the transportation
15 system than simply coming in and building a facility.

16 MS. CONKLE: Okay. More of a nexus between land
17 use and facility. Would that be?

18 MR. GADBOIS: Sure. However you want to say that
19 and you write it ought to be framed for the general public.
20 We're -- they're not --

21 MS. CONKLE: Okay.

22 MR. GADBOIS: They're not transportation geeks
23 like me.

24 MS. CONKLE: Okay. Yeah, which is why I won't use
25 nexus either because that's my own planning term. But I

1 will definitely work that into the scenario.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

3 MS. CONKLE: Is there other -- are there any other
4 suggestions for the definitions of these scenarios for the
5 public? Okay. Well, with that we'll move to slide 12.

6 This is actually a screenshot of the first screen
7 on the MetroQuest tool. And basically what happens here is
8 you get a little bit of introduction and information.
9 Again, this is a static slide and I'm sorry about -- I'd
10 love to be able to do a live presentation, but suffice to
11 say that you have two dots there in the bottom of the box.
12 So the first box gives you a little bit of information about
13 how many people are moving into Texas and the next one gives
14 you a little bit of information about the plan and its
15 purpose. Next slide.

16 Again, these are screenshots, so the top
17 screenshot, this allows users to take and drag the gray
18 boxes above that yellow line and put those into their own
19 priorities one, two and three. And as you drag them, you
20 get a visual pictorial representation of what it is that
21 you're actually prioritizing. In other words, pavement
22 condition's number one, so there's a picture there of some
23 very definite cracking and falling, so we have -- and also,
24 I want to point out that when you scroll over these, there's
25 more information. It's sort of like a lot of web tools, if

1 you're not sure what pavement condition is based on the
2 photograph there, you can scroll over and we give you a
3 definition of what each of these means.

4 We also allow you to make open-ended comments.
5 You'll see a blue bar right below the picture. You can open
6 a comment session on any one of these screens and make a
7 comment. That comment may be I don't see my priority here.
8 It could be anything. We also at the bottom we allow you to
9 suggest other priorities for our consideration.

10 All of this is captured by MetroQuest and
11 concatenated and returned back to us as raw data that we can
12 use to try to gage again, try to gage then the public's
13 response to their priorities versus our priorities and their
14 budget considerations versus how TxDOT currently spends its
15 budget.

16 So if you click the next button, you would see the
17 explore approaches and these approaches if you see at the
18 top, A, B and C were the approaches just at -- just as I
19 described them. And again, every time you click on one of
20 those tabs you get another system, you get a definition of
21 system preservation even more lengthy than the one that was
22 on the slide. Same for metropolitan mobility and same for
23 connectivity and freight mobility.

24 And again, what I'll do is make sure that those
25 definitions include your comments as well. So basically

1 what you do is you ranked your top three in the top screen,
2 so you get a dashboard, a color dashboard that tells you how
3 your priorities rank under system preservation.

4 The cost of this approach is not populated here
5 because we were still working the numbers, but it's
6 somewhere in the range of \$250-million on just preservation.
7 And what it does is it tells you that if you look here at
8 these different colored graphs, it tells you where your
9 priorities, along with other priorities, rank at that amount
10 of money being spent on them and it's important to note that
11 this is where they're going to rank -- this is -- this
12 basically has -- is a cost that's been assigned to this
13 approach over the next 25 years.

14 So what you see is this is performance from now to
15 2040.

16 And then at the bottom, now that you can see how -
17 - now that you can see how your priorities rank in this
18 system, you tell us what you think about this particular set
19 of priorities and how they rank. And you can click on the
20 stars one through five. Again, always you're able to give
21 us an optional comment.

22 There -- you will see a full description button.
23 Again, that's where we get a more detailed definition of
24 each of these scenarios. Next slide.

25 So basically -- what I should have said is I only

1 have a slide for one of the scenarios, but basically you can
2 see all three of the scenarios and the way that they relate
3 to each other based on your priorities. Those are static.

4 In this part of the outreach tool you get to
5 create a budget. We call this the chip game. And what you
6 do, you're -- some of the preservation or pavement
7 preservation, roadway expansion, transit service expansion,
8 some of these are prepopulated in the tool because it's the
9 money that we currently have that's allocated to those
10 things. Those are the silver bars. And then the gold bars
11 are the ones that you can stack on each of these different
12 sets of priorities. And then at the top, you click view
13 dashboard or you click the top tab, and then you see the
14 second slide.

15 And this will show you, you know, based on where
16 you put your money, how the performance changes in each of
17 those areas. It's really pretty neat and I just really
18 can't do it justice with a static slide. But it allows you
19 to go back and forth and back and forth and move your budget
20 wherever you want it until you get your performance where
21 you would like it.

22 And when you have your performance where you'd
23 like it, and I can guarantee you there isn't any amount of
24 money on that screen that will make everything green, but it
25 assumes the budget that TxDOT has, plus an additional \$5-

1 billion, which is what has been conveyed to our Legislature.
2 So you get the money that we have, plus the extra 5-billion,
3 you can put it anywhere you'd like to to get the system
4 performance that you would like on that create a budget.
5 And when you've made it as good as you can possibly make it,
6 you click finish, and it captures your preferences. Next
7 slide.

8 So basically, the multimodal needs assessment
9 serve as the basis for those investment approaches like I
10 said, which is why safety is taken into consideration and
11 there are some costs of right of way acquisition, utility
12 adjustments, just placements, things like that, we'll make
13 that land use a little more -- we'll make that pop a little
14 more for the public.

15 So what we did is we look at unconstrained needs
16 by mode. We shared the draft needs in the meeting that day.
17 Investment scenarios and outcomes, which again, were in
18 development and almost finished. And presented in 2014
19 constant dollars the cost of each of those scenarios for the
20 25-year horizon. Next slide.

21 Basically, for pavement, unconstrained needs to
22 2040 were about 107, almost \$108-million. Five billion
23 dollars average annual calculated over 27 years. And the
24 reason it's 27 years instead of 26 is because our numbers
25 are 2014 through 2040, so we take all the available

1 information and we make it work into our horizon. And that
2 includes preservation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

3 Again, to maintain pavement on the state system in
4 good or better condition. Again, something we equate to
5 state of good repair under MAP-21. Does not include --
6 pavement needs do not include expansion. Next slide.

7 Then we have highway expansion, unconstrained
8 needs to 2040, \$297-billion or about \$10-billion on average
9 calculated over 30 years from 2010 through 2040. And if
10 you're wondering why we're using 30 years, that's because
11 administration wanted us to go back and start with the
12 methodologies in the 2030 committee document. So that's why
13 we costed this out over 30 years. And again, this includes
14 the cost to achieve goal of Level of Service C, or about
15 average traffic flow on our highways. It does not include
16 pavement and bridge expansion because again, pavement has
17 its own number which we just talked about. And then bridge
18 has its own number, which we're about to talk about.

19 The unconstrained needs to 2040 are about \$41 and
20 a half-billion or average 1.5-billion calculated over 27
21 years, because again, we have data from 2014 through 2040.
22 The cost to maintain all bridges on the system to bridge
23 index rating of 6 or better for all bridge components and to
24 eliminate functional obsolescence.

25 Again, this does not include expansion needs

1 unless a bridge is functionally obsolete. It wouldn't make
2 any sense for us to go take down a bridge that's
3 functionally obsolete and build another one in capacity
4 terms that's also obsolete. So, expansion is taken into
5 consideration if it's functionally obsolete and we need to
6 rebuild it. Otherwise, it's not. Next slide.

7 The unconstrained needs for transit to 2040.
8 According to our modeling and working with Public
9 Transportation Division, the MTAs and other transit
10 providers, is \$105-billion; 97-billion to the MTAs, 8-
11 billion to the non-MTAs. That comes out to 3.9 or roughly
12 4-billion average annual calculated over 27 years; 2014
13 through 2040. This includes capital and operating costs for
14 existing transit assets and services to maintain good or
15 better level of service, as well as expansion needs by
16 region, those being major, urban, collar, small urban, and
17 rural. This does not include passenger rail. Next slide.

18 Passenger rail needs are 22.4-billion or .8-
19 billion average annual calculated over 27 years, including
20 capital costs for two new High Speed Rail corridors, 22-
21 billion, as well as the cost to expand existing Amtrak
22 services at 400-million. It does not include other proposed
23 routes, High Speed Rail and Amtrak that lack funding. These
24 are actually projects that are being studied and funded is
25 within reason could be committed. And again, that doesn't

1 include the operating costs for Amtrak. Next slide.

2 Bicycle and pedestrian unconstrained needs are
3 2.3-billion or average of .1-billion, annual calculated
4 cover 27 years. These are MPO-identified projects with
5 additional unconstrained needs of .4-billion for the rural
6 areas. This does not include expansion needs given
7 population projections. These are actually projects that
8 are planned, programmed or on the books to be programmed.
9 Next slide.

10 Unconstrained needs for aviation, 21.2-billion or
11 .8-billion annual calculated over 27 years. This includes
12 extrapolated needs from TxDOT's RAMP and TADS systems.
13 These are just systems that maintain pavement on commercial
14 service and general aviation airports that TxDOT commits
15 funding to like runways, runway pavement conditions, and the
16 like. It does not include expansion projects for large
17 commercial airports or preservation needs for facilities and
18 runways.

19 And then unconstrained needs for Intelligent
20 Transportation Systems are 13.7-billion, .5-billion over 26
21 years, because that data we had from 2015 to 2040, includes
22 the cost to operate, maintain, replace existing ITS assets;
23 costs to implement, operate, maintain future planned assets
24 as identified by TxDOT, meaning these assets are already
25 programmed to be operational, so we'll have to cost -- do

1 life cycle costs. That does not include operations
2 strategies identified in the State Freight Plan or
3 technologies required for future changes to revenue
4 collection, i.e., toll collection. Next slide.

5 Then we have unconstrained needs on freight. This
6 is modeled out of our statewide analysis model a few months
7 ago. The unconstrained needs are still in development.
8 We're trying to work with the team that is preparing the
9 Texas Freight Mobility Plan to make sure that our numbers
10 dovetail nicely into theirs, but I will say that investment
11 approach 3 includes bottleneck reduction on the Primary
12 Freight Network as well as the completion of the Trunk
13 System in rural areas, again, going back to connectivity
14 between population centers. Freight-significant projects
15 are not captured in the bottleneck/Texas Trunk. Other needs
16 will be added if available, so there's probably going to be
17 more specificity or granularity if you will, in the Texas
18 Freight Mobility Plan than there will be at the statewide
19 level. Next slide.

20 The TTP 2040 next steps. We're going to -- we
21 have vetted the unconstrained needs estimates with our TAC
22 and other TxDOT staff and executives meaning the people in
23 the various divisions; bridge division, design division,
24 PTN, so that they can have a look at these and make sure
25 that our methodologies have come up with numbers that are

1 consistent with what they are modeling or consistent with
2 what they are assuming. We're going to finalize the cost of
3 all investment approaches, launch the MetroQuest tool on or
4 about June 1, and complete outreach round 2.

5 And so for the most part that concludes the update
6 to you today on what's happening with the Texas
7 Transportation Plan 2040. We're also looking forward to
8 having you attend stakeholder meetings if you'd like.
9 Again, a full schedule with the actual logistics are on our
10 website and we're certainly looking forward to any formal
11 comment that the PTAC would like to provide on the plan.

12 So thank you for your time today.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Michelle. Are there are
14 any questions from the Committee?

15 MR. GADBOIS: I'll wait if somebody else has one,
16 but I have one observation to make.

17 So -- I guess nobody has --

18 MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead.

19 MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle, I'm going to just say
20 this and I know that it's pretty much impossible at this
21 point for you to integrate it, but I feel the need to say
22 it. TTI just did research on I-35, modeling different
23 scenarios for building to address congestion. And what they
24 discovered is congestion is going to get much worse over the
25 next, you know 20 years or so and the only build solution

1 reduces that much worse by maybe five percent. So without
2 getting in to how you get to your projections of the
3 unconstrained costs and whether they actually deal with
4 congestion or not, the one scenario that they actually did
5 that made a difference is actually aligned with your
6 financial sustainability priority, which is to reduce
7 demand. Shift demand --

8 MS. CONKLE: Right.

9 MR. GADBOIS: -- away from driving alone to other
10 options; transit, et cetera, and shift them in rather large
11 number. But to do that at all, you actually have to have
12 that as an upfront planning objective and give it some
13 serious investment in and of itself, right? And I see --

14 MS. CONKLE: That's correct.

15 MR. GADBOIS: And I see absolutely no sign of that
16 in this planning. Am I correct there?

17 MS. CONKLE: Well, I would not want to call you
18 incorrect, but the assumption is not correct. When you see
19 the MetroQuest planning tool you're actually given \$5-
20 billion to put on any of those priorities you want. And
21 when you move that to transit, it does move the needle on
22 congestion.

23 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

24 MS. CONKLE: It absolutely does.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, it -- yeah, and no, and I

1 appreciate that part of it and I actually appreciate that
2 this is much more multimodal than any other TxDOT plan.

3 What I'm suggesting is demand management in and of itself
4 requires investment. To be able to shift the demand --

5 MS. CONKLE: No, and we will address that. We are
6 addressing that in the plan as a strategy to reduce
7 congestion.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

9 MS. CONKLE: It's hard to give -- it's hard to get
10 any group an overview over everything we're going to cover
11 in the statewide plan while we're still out collecting
12 comments.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Oaky.

14 MS. CONKLE: But it's not going to be ignored by
15 any stretch.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, good. Fantastic. Thank you.

17 MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, this is Michelle
18 Bloomer. I just have one clarifying question. On all the
19 draft unconstrained needs, specifically the transit one,
20 slide 19, so the unconstrained needs to 2040 are 105-
21 billion. Is that just the revenue needed or is that the
22 revenue above and beyond let's say, the 97-billion for the
23 NTAs? You know, does it take into account how much funding
24 is already available and that they have or is it just saying
25 regardless of any funding that's available, here's how much

1 is needed?

2 MS. CONKLE: That is correct. It does not -- it
3 does not -- these are the needs. These are the needs
4 irrespective of how much funding we have. That's when --

5 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

6 MS. CONKLE: -- you get to go into the tool and
7 play with -- that's when you understand when you start
8 looking at the chip game how under-funded some of these
9 strategies are.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

11 MS. CONKLE: These are just the needs again, to
12 maintain all of the things that I talked about in a state of
13 good repair under MAP-21. As you noticed on just about
14 every scenario, in just about every area included under a
15 scenario, whether it be preservation or expansion, when I
16 got to the what is not covered, what is not covered is
17 basically, you know, enhancements or improvements to just
18 about any of these areas, with the exception of the actual
19 the two -- the highways that actually say expansion. And
20 even then, they're constrained, you know, to what we
21 currently spend on those, plus 5-billion for vehicles
22 wherever you would like.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

24 MS. CONKLE: And what we have versus what we plan
25 to get, what should be very apparent is we don't have nearly

1 what we need. And even if we got an additional 5-billion,
2 we wouldn't have nearly what we need. But it does give you
3 an opportunity as a stakeholder or a private citizen to make
4 those hard decisions and know that the very things that you
5 say in these meetings, you could put all of that money, you
6 could put all of that money, on congestion and it would
7 barely move that needle, which sort of I guess is
8 representative of the comment I just received about travel
9 demand management.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

11 MS. CONKLE: And you could do that. You can take
12 the whole 5-billion and put it over there and see that the
13 level of service, it barely moves the needle. Yet, when you
14 put all of that money on other, you know, other areas that
15 reduce congestion through demand management, again, you're
16 not moving the needle greatly. I'm not going to say that
17 it's the panathea of putting all the money somewhere else,
18 but it will move more significantly and, you know, it also
19 improve mobility.

20 So I encourage you to go out and play with the
21 tool and you know, help us and help the public to
22 understand, you know, the tradeoff. Again, this tool is
23 about tradeoff and it's one of the first times we've ever
24 allowed the public to see a representative amount of money
25 being moved around, you know, money that TxDOT actually has,

1 plus the 5-billion, the ones you go to the Legislature for,
2 and see how that would impact the system. And there is --
3 there's a lot of engineering and calculus to back this up.
4 So if any of you would like to see the math that went into
5 this, it is months of work, months of modeling, and months
6 of honing down our unit cost so that we can give you the
7 most representative experience possible.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

9 MR. GADBOIS: The tool looks fun, thank you.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions?

11 MS. CONKLE: No, thank you.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions or comments from
13 the committee? Okay.

14 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

15 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. I'm not a
17 committee member, but I will comment. Kelly Kirkland sits
18 on the group that helps with this as well and he came to my
19 office today and he actually gave me the link to this tool
20 that Michelle's trying to demonstrate in her slides and it's
21 pretty slick. It really is. I enjoyed playing with it,
22 moving the money around, making different decisions to see
23 what the impact would be to see where the little needle was
24 moving, and I was quite surprised in some areas when some of
25 my decisions put things way in the red, you know, which

1 isn't a bad thing.

2 MS. CONKLE: Yeah.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: It's just now you've got to
4 realize, that's the decision you live with. If you want to
5 increase this one, guess what, something else went down.
6 And so it was a really -- it's a pretty slick tool.

7 MS. CONKLE: And that is -- that's a message that
8 we are just not very good at -- you know, when we go out and
9 tell people what do you need and they say well, these are
10 our needs, there's that other side of that, a flipside of
11 that coin, that makes you understand with the constrained
12 finances we have, even if we improved it, put all the money
13 there to improve it, something else is going to go, you
14 know, into the red, into the yellow, into the red, so I'm
15 very, very happy to have that feedback and that you
16 understand the, you know, the type of exercise and the type
17 of experience we're trying to give the users.

18 MR. KILLEBREW: I wish we had this for transit
19 operators at times so when they're making their decisions on
20 where to put their routes, what type of transportation, what
21 days of the week are they going to be in this county and so
22 forth, Michelle's kind of smiling here, you know, what
23 decisions you make because you don't have all the funding in
24 the world. So if you're going to do this service, then this
25 other service may have to give a little, so -- but kudos to

1 the group. I thought it was really worth it.

2 MS. BLOOMER: I think that sounds like an
3 interesting TxDOT research practice --

4 MS. CONKLE: Well, thank you.

5 MS. BLOOMER: -- to create that for transit
6 providers. Hmm.

7 MR. GLEASON: A new regional coordination tool.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Oh, there you go. We can spend some
9 of that 900,000 on that instead. All right. Thank you,
10 Michelle.

11 MS. CONKLE: Thank you very much. I appreciate
12 your time.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you. Moving on to Item 6 on
14 the agenda is presentation discussion of transportation
15 development and credit award for transit projects. Who's
16 the lucky presenter? Bobby.

17 MR. KILLEBREW: For the record, again Bobby
18 Killebrew from TxDOT.

19 This is request of the committee to ring this back
20 from your last meeting. It is on your agenda item as an
21 action item. That doesn't mean you need to take action
22 today, we just left it there in case you wanted to say
23 something.

24 In your packets today there is a handout that
25 gives you a quick look at the 2014 and 2013 award of

1 transportation development credits.

2 You know, no surprise, historically we're still
3 using this for capital expenses. We've had one operating
4 award of TDCs, but historically for the transit component of
5 this it's still be using for capital expenses. Mostly in
6 the vehicle world.

7 We have some facilities and some other capital
8 items as well, preventative maintenance which people say is
9 really an operating expense, but it's still capitalized
10 expense. But most of it's still going for vehicles. And
11 that's where it originally started and I think that's where
12 a lot of it's still going to continue to be used.

13 There is a -- a couple things on here I'd like to
14 highlight. The awards that you see on this handout really
15 are for the people that we deal with most often. So this is
16 going to be your small urban communities and your rural
17 communities. There is some 5310 mom and pops in here is why
18 we call them that. The metros for the most part, if they're
19 in a large urbanized areas where the TDCs are earned, they
20 can get those TDCs locally.

21 We do have an exception on here. We do have a
22 couple of large urbanized areas that don't earn TDCs, Laredo
23 for example. And so they're getting some 5310 awards and
24 they're being matched with some TDCs in some of these that
25 you see before you.

1 We also had in 2014, Houston wasn't ready to award
2 their TDCs even though the Commission had allocated a bunch
3 of TDCs to that area, and you'll see in 2014 that they
4 transferred a little bit over 3.8-million back to the
5 Commission and the Commission actually took what Houston
6 would have done had they had a plan of action in place and
7 they awarded those TDCs to those projects in the Houston,
8 the larger Houston urbanized areas.

9 So we did just as the Houston folks again would
10 have done if they'd had their plan in place.

11 We also did a couple of things this year,
12 something that this committee was very interested about when
13 you were reviewing the TDC rules, that the Department was
14 altering not too terribly long ago. There was a small
15 caption there that said that the Commission could award, you
16 know, kind of like a blanket amount, a bucket of TDCs for a
17 category of projects or for an emphasis type areas. And a
18 couple of our minute orders we've done recently, we've done
19 that.

20 We were ready to go to the Commission with some
21 awards of funds, but we weren't sure how to apply the TDCs
22 exactly, so what we've done is we've asked the Commission in
23 that minute order just to award a set amount of TDCs for
24 those projects that when we get into the project development
25 stage, we'll know exactly how much TDCs to apply to the

1 individual project. So that did come to our benefit. We
2 kind of struggled with that one, saying how would we use
3 this, you know, maybe use more on the highway side.

4 We actually took advantage of that and we used it
5 on the transit side. And --

6 MR. GADBOIS: So is that where you got the round
7 2-million?

8 MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah. That's where we get the
9 rounded \$2-million figure there.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And Bobby, just to make sure
13 I understand, because I don't have these M.O. numbers
14 memorized.

15 MR. KILLEBREW: Uh-huh.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Mostly these are aggregates of
17 multiple projects per commission item or are they individual
18 applications for TDCs?

19 MR. KILLEBREW: Most of these minute orders that
20 you see here are probably going to be like a large 5310
21 award that has several projects on it or a 5311 award or a
22 capital replacement award. Some of these are individual
23 ones, they're specialized. We may have gotten an out of
24 cycle request from somebody or a need to fund a special
25 situation and those would be there as well. But most of

1 them are probably going to be the aggregate.

2 MR. GADBOIS: But it -- so most of these are
3 aggregate --

4 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

5 MR. GADBOIS: -- and the large -- I mean certainly
6 the larger numbers you don't have one agency asking for
7 almost 4-million and 3,800,000 --

8 MR. KILLEBREW: Correct.

9 MR. GADBOIS: -- in TDCs by itself?

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Correct.

11 MR. GLEASON: That is correct. That was the
12 concern when the rules were developed and how big to make
13 this annual transit, because it wouldn't take much from
14 Villa and San Antonio or Corpus to come in with a request to
15 quickly deplete --

16 MR. GADBOIS: Wipe the --

17 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. But and that's why I just
19 wanted to make sure those are aggregates --

20 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

21 MR. GADBOIS: -- and not one project. Okay. This
22 is hugely helpful. Thank y'all for doing this.

23 MR. KILLEBREW: Okay.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Bobby, on the fiscal year 2013 TDCs,
25 so the award and then the utilized versus the balance, can

1 you just explain that a little bit more?

2 MR. KILLEBREW: I threw that in there, I figured
3 the committee would be asking that question next; well,
4 you've awarded, you know, in 2013 you've awarded 4.4-million
5 in TDCs, how much have been used to date. And basically a
6 million of that's been used to date, which means there's
7 still a balance.

8 Now, what that really should translate is, these
9 are ongoing projects. The projects haven't completed. So,
10 it's not that we don't anticipate they'll leave that balance
11 on the table; many of our projects we write contracts for
12 longer than 12-months, and if you're ordering a vehicle,
13 sometimes it takes longer than 12 months. Certainly if
14 you're in a facility development, we know that takes longer
15 than 12 months. So we do anticipate these projects to kick
16 off.

17 Some of these items were awarded late in the
18 fiscal year, so we're not even at the 12 month mark yet.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And y'all do some projected
20 utilization, right? I mean, so this much has been awarded,
21 we're tracking, we think that that entire amount to be spent
22 or 90 percent of it will be spent or 80 percent. Y'all do
23 that kind of projection?

24 MR. KILLEBREW: Well, when it comes to TDCs, those
25 are kind of an interesting character when you deal with the

1 feds. When you enter into an agreement, you use federal
2 funds and you match it with TDCs. That locks in a federal/
3 non-federal ratio. And it's hard -- you can't change that
4 federal/non-federal ratio, well basically is kind of is what
5 they tell us. The feds can participate at a lower ratio
6 than what you said they would, but they can't participate at
7 a higher ratio.

8 So we anticipate that everything we lock in is
9 going to be spent at 100 percent.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Is going to be spent.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So the only thing we pay
13 attention to underutilization is if it -- in the rare
14 instance that doesn't happen.

15 MR. KILLEBREW: Project falls apart, doesn't
16 happen at all --

17 MR. GADBOIS: Because otherwise, it's going to get
18 to a hundred a hundred; 100 percent, 100 percent.

19 MR. KILLEBREW: Right.

20 MR. GLEASON: Now, we should probably recognize,
21 Bobby, that sometimes what we do is we award just TDCs. And
22 then the agency uses that for a match on say a 5307 grant.
23 So we don't track the status of that 5307 grant, we have an
24 agreement that -- just with TDC, so it's a little more
25 difficult to follow what Bobby is describing because

1 sometimes it's not one package from our standpoint.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: But the same thing happens on
3 their side, too.

4 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

5 MR. KILLEBREW: They lock in a non-federal/federal
6 ratio and they can't change that in the team system unless
7 they de-obligate money.

8 MR. GLEASON: But we don't always have the full --
9 =

10 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

11 MR. GLEASON: -- the full project.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Okay. I mean, the only time
13 I'd be concerned about that middle column, utilized, given
14 what y'all just said is, you know, if there's, you know, a
15 problem where all of a sudden you're not getting a high
16 utilization rate. But otherwise, it should come out to --

17 MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah, the only thing I've seen,
18 Glenn, over the historic usage of these TDCs, and we do have
19 a few projects that leave just little, bitty I would say
20 pennies, TDCs left on the projects, if they're ordering --
21 if a system's ordering a bus and by the time they get to
22 that purchase order stage that bus ends up costing them more
23 money than the federal money we're putting in the project,
24 they have to put some local money into it, that may lower
25 the TDC by a little bit because now you've got some local

1 money into it. But they're just leaving I mean really
2 pennies to TDCs on each project that we're closing out.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Wait and so let me say this
4 differently; the only thing I'd care about, you know, that
5 column for, is if in fact people were capturing TDCs and not
6 using them.

7 MR. KILLEBREW: Right.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Right? And if that's not happening,
9 then, you know, let's make this a simpler chart.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Absolutely.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

12 MS. BLOOMER: So I guess what we can take away is
13 we have 15-million as the set aside. Last year we awarded
14 10.5 and we had antic -- I'm sorry, that was the balance;
15 4.4.

16 MR. GLEASON: And it got filled up just as plan to
17 '15 for this year.

18 MS. BLOOMER: And then this year we're at -- back
19 up to 15, we anticipate through May spending -- am I reading
20 that -- 11.9-million. But I guess if you add the 3.8 back
21 from HTAC there's 6 left. So we --

22 MR. GLEASON: There you go.

23 MS. BLOOMER: We have plenty.

24 MR. GLEASON: We do. We have over 6-million left.

25 MS. BLOOMER: Left.

1 MR. GLEASON: And again, it wouldn't take much --

2 MS. BLOOMER: And 15 was a good --

3 MR. GLEASON: -- for a large metro to come in and
4 suck up the rest of that.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

6 MR. GLEASON: With one fleet order.

7 MR. GADBOIS: Now that -- if he doesn't count the
8 HTAC's 3.8, right?

9 MR. GLEASON: That was added to the 15.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Right, okay.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: And Eric makes a good point with
12 the new 5339 program that's out of MAP-21, I probably do
13 anticipate that some of the areas that do not earn TDCs,
14 I'll pick one, Corpus for example, that they may be coming
15 in and saying we've got some 5339 money now, we would like
16 to have some TDCs as match. That would have to come out of
17 the statewide pot, probably out of the 15-million.

18 MR. GADBOIS: So the -- the only last question is,
19 there are other ways to spend TDCs. Do you all do any
20 education to try to encourage and help people understand
21 that TDCs can be used for other things besides capital?

22 MR. GLEASON: Such as operating?

23 MR. GADBOIS: I mean, you know, there are a number
24 of ways that -- that you could use them for a number of
25 different kinds of projects and so I'm just wondering

1 whether -- you know, whether you do anything and you know,
2 annual transit meeting or anything else to help people
3 understand how TDCs can be used.

4 MR. GLEASON: No. Not really.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

6 MR. GLEASON: Not really. And I will say on the
7 operating side, we have limited our use to sort of one time
8 emergency --

9 MR. GADBOIS: Sure.

10 MR. GLEASON: -- stopgap type awards as opposed to
11 an ongoing relationship.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Yeah. Understand. Okay.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Oh. Bobby, back to your -- there's
14 three ways if I can remem -- if I recall, it's been a while,
15 to -- for TDCs to be available. One is if you're in one of
16 the metropolitan or MPA areas that earns toll credits, you
17 go there. Like if you're a large -- like you mentioned
18 Corpus, they aren't, so they can't go, so they can come to
19 TxDOT. There's a third, right?

20 There's the 15-million that's set aside for
21 transit, but then there's also another pot that's available.

22 MR. KILLEBREW: There's -- yes. The Commission
23 makes an allocation or an award to those areas that earn
24 TDCs and then they have their own plan locally on how that
25 they will award that and they report back to the Commission

1 annually. The rest of it's basically Commission
2 discretionary. And out of the Commission's discretionary
3 pot for transit, they're setting aside 15-million TDCs. So
4 we come out of the Commission discretion, which can be used
5 anywhere statewide.

6 There's also a place in the Code that talks about
7 that if the large metro areas don't have a need, don't
8 utilize their local TDCs, then the Commission can also
9 return that to a more discretionary type basis as well.

10 So yes, there's like three pots. There's the ones
11 that the MPOs hand out locally if they're earned in that
12 area.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

14 MR. KILLEBREW: There's the statewide
15 discretionary pot that the commission has, and then like I
16 said, if you want to say there's a third pot, that's our 15-
17 million that we have for transit.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

19 MR. KILLEBREW: But we can certainly award also
20 transit projects out of that statewide discretionary pot as
21 well.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

23 MR. KILLEBREW: It's just that the 15-million
24 protects the transit investment with a set aside amount.

25 MS. BLOOMER: And that's -- that's -- I just was

1 recalling because let's say Dart or Corpus. Dart has the
2 option or the T or any other Villa, to go directly to their
3 MPO area to ask. That's --

4 MR. GLEASON: They have to go there first.

5 MS. BLOOMER: They have to go there first.

6 MR. KILLEBREW: Have to go there first.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Then they can come to TxDOT PTN and
8 ask for a part of the 15. But then they also can just go to
9 the Commission directly. Hence, if one project could take
10 all 15 or you have a large transit provider that isn't part
11 of the MPO pots, and they were to come directly to TxDOT and
12 say one award is 8-million --

13 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

14 MS. BLOOMER: -- that may not be something we can
15 fund out of the 15 transit set aside, but that -- they could
16 go directly to the Commission for the Commission
17 discretionary and ask for it out of that pot as well.

18 MR. GLEASON: Or some combination of both. We
19 would probably look at the remaining amount, make a judgment
20 on whether or not that was sufficient given what we knew
21 about other needs, and the 15 is not a hard and fast
22 ceiling.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

24 MR. GLEASON: It is just a target pot if you will.
25 And the conversation at the time around the rules would be

1 yes, we can go for that. If we had an unusually large
2 request come in, we could go for a portion of the remaining
3 statewide.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Well, now, the other side, see,
5 you've got the 15-million for Commission discretionary pot
6 of money. You could have a transit project that was related
7 to a roadway project. And so for example, managed lane on
8 Mopac transit access through there, you could then claim
9 some transit expense for that program, wrap it in, and go
10 for TDCs for the entire project and that wouldn't debit the
11 15-million, right?

12 MR. GLEASON: Well, in your Mopac example they'd
13 go to the Austin area TDC pot. So --

14 MR. GADBOIS: First.

15 MR. GLEASON: -- in -- right.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

17 MR. GLEASON: And but so, if this was -- if that
18 was the situation in San Antonio, then they would come
19 straight into this --

20 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other questions on the
22 TDC presentation from Bobby?

23 Okay. We'll move on to Item 7, review and
24 discussion of the PTAC work plan. Any -- does anybody have
25 -- thank you for including it this time.

1 MR. SALAZAR: Have we heard anything else on
2 anybody being appointed? Still nothing?

3 MS. BLOOMER: How many did you say we had, Bobby?
4 Six? One, two, three, four, five --

5 MR. GLEASON: We have six.

6 MS. BLOOMER: -- six; yeah. Out of nine.

7 MR. SALAZAR: Out of nine.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: Well, it's the quorum of the
9 membership.

10 MR. SALAZAR: Yeah. Quorum is four. I -- given
11 the membership of six, the quorum is four, right.

12 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

13 MR. GADBOIS: And what are we doing with this
14 item?

15 MS. BLOOMER: I don't know if -- was there a
16 particular discussion that was envisioned regarding the work
17 plan? I think right -- based off of our discussion earlier,
18 our focus for the next two to three meetings is going to be
19 regional coordination.

20 MR. GADBOIS: I agree.

21 MR. KILLEBREW: I think we include this in your
22 agendas in case there's a desire to talk about it.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and I think originally we had
25 asked to kind of bring this back up to make sure we get on a

1 track for a work plan.

2 MS. BLOOMER: I think we did as part of the
3 initial discussion on regional coordination and recalling it
4 was in our work plan but how, so I think, you know, I was
5 looking at that when we were having the discussion about
6 regional coordination and -- and one of the -- it's funny
7 because the objective is develop metrics that will allow
8 evaluation of the funding formula's consistency with
9 strategic values of regional coordination task. Define
10 strategic values for coordination task. Develop metrics for
11 coordination and test evaluation of the funding formulas
12 based on coordination metrics.

13 So I guess if we're looking at our work plan, our
14 next couple of --

15 MR. GADBOIS: We're right on track.

16 MR. GLEASON: That's right on track, you're
17 awesome.

18 MS. BLOOMER: We're right on -- define strategic
19 values for coordination and develop metrics.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, you find that surprising,
21 Madam Chair? I thought that was your plan all along.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Ha ha. All right. Are there any
23 public comment? No public comment. Josh, can you remind us
24 the next meeting date that's regularly scheduled?

25 MR. RIBAKOVE: Let me just open my calendar --

1 MS. BLOOMER: It would be July --

2 MR. RIBAKOVE: -- here. I can tell you just what
3 it is. We're looking at --

4 MR. SALAZAR: Do we know when the semi-annual is?

5 MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah, the semi-annual meeting --

6 MR. RIBAKOVE: July 29.

7 MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah. PTAC's July 29 and the
8 semi-annual meeting is July 23rd. Hint, if PTAC would like
9 to be on that agenda, we'd sure appreciate it.

10 MR. GLEASON: PTAC is always on the agenda for
11 that meeting.

12 MS. BLOOMER: July -- when's this coming on again?
13 Sorry.

14 MR. RIBAKOVE: The 23rd.

15 MS. BLOOMER: The 23rd? Any way to move PTAC
16 before or after the semi-annual so this will all be here on
17 the 23rd?

18 MR. GADBOIS: How about the 22nd?

19 MR. GLEASON: The 22nd, if the Committee wishes to
20 meet then, it's somewhat complicated for us because we have
21 an all-day division meeting that day. We always take that.
22 Not out of the question that we couldn't staff a committee
23 meeting as well.

24 MS. BLOOMER: What about the day after?

25 MR. GLEASON: Thursday, the day after?

1 MS. BLOOMER: The 24th?

2 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, is it only one day?

3 MR. GLEASON: The semi-annual meeting business
4 meeting is Wednesday only, yes.

5 MS. BLOOMER: And the day before you have the
6 division meeting with all the PTCs and so could we --

7 MR. GLEASON: We do. It's not insurmountable from
8 our standpoint. It might appear a little scattered from
9 your standpoint.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

11 MR. GLEASON: But we could staff it if that were
12 the day that made sense for the committee to meet.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Or if we could do it the -- would
14 Thursday work better?

15 MR. GLEASON: We usually have some kind of
16 training scheduled for the day after, but --

17 MR. KILLEBREW: We're doing ERP training both
18 those days, probably the day before and the day after the
19 semi-annual this year because of --

20 MR. GLEASON: And is that -- is the ERP, is that
21 sub recipient training?

22 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes, part of it will be, yes.

23 MR. GLEASON: But may not -- okay. So committee
24 members, these are also --

25 MR. GADBOIS: What's ERP and --

1 MR. GLEASON: You don't want to know.
2 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, I don't want to know.
3 MR. GLEASON: No, you really don't want to know.
4 MR. KILLEBREW: You don't want to know.
5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So what does that mean in
6 terms of --
7 MR. GLEASON: Changing.
8 MR. GADBOIS: -- having a meeting or not?
9 MR. GLEASON: It means that JR. and Rob and Brad
10 will --
11 MR. GADBOIS: Will be in the training.
12 MR. GLEASON: -- might need to have some other
13 staff with them who could attend the ERP training and
14 probably would anyway.
15 MR. KILLEBREW: Probably would anyway, yes.
16 MR. GLEASON: And so it's probably not an issue.
17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Would that be okay with the
18 committee members if we looked at possibly doing it --
19 MR. SALAZAR: That's fine with me.
20 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, as long as we start at 1:30 on
21 Thursday. I mean, I can be over here -- I can't be here by
22 1:00, but I could be here by 1:30.
23 MR. GLEASON: I suspect the thought process was
24 I'm in town, let's have a morning meeting, but --
25 MR. GADBOIS: Oh. Oh.

1 MR. GLEASON: Just a guess on my part.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

3 MR. GLEASON: Looking at the Chair.

4 MR. GADBOIS: If we -- if we can start at 8:30,
5 and end by 10:30, I can do that.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Have we ever had a meeting that's
7 less than two hours?

8 MR. GLEASON: We just did.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah, we just did.

10 MS. BLOOMER: No, we're at two and a -- well, two
11 and a half.

12 MR. GLEASON: Two and a half; is more than two.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: We would probably host it so we're
14 at the Riverside location as well, because we'll all be over
15 there is my guess.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

17 MR. KILLEBREW: So if that's problematic or if
18 that helps Glenn, I don't know.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, actually that helps me out.
20 It'll be closer so I could --

21 MR. KILLEBREW: How about we'll check on both days
22 because we have to find a location as well that's available
23 to the public, so.

24 MS. BLOOMER: If we could check with Thursday
25 being preferred. If not, the Tuesday. And then if that

1 doesn't work, just going back to the regularly scheduled day
2 on the 29th.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: Okay.

4 MS. BLOOMER: But since most of us are going to be
5 here anyway for the semi-annual that would save a trip. Not
6 that we don't love coming to Austin.

7 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So just for logistics stuff,
8 I could do it as late as -- well, as long as I can be out or
9 you all can let me go and not need quorum, I'll need to
10 leave at like 10:45 in the morning to make from downtown to
11 the meeting at 11:00. Otherwise --

12 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

13 MR. GADBOIS: -- I'm happy to do it.

14 MS. BLOOMER: We'll see what Bobby and Josh can
15 make happen. That Josh can make happen.

16 All right. Any other items for discussion? All
17 right. Hearing none, the meeting is adjourned at 3:30.

18 (Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m. the meeting was adjourned)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, CET, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 109, constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the PTAC meeting, held at 3712 Jackson Avenue, Bld. 6-3rd floor, Austin, Texas, on Thursday, May 27, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.

DATED this 16th day of June, 2014.



Kimberly C. McCright, CET