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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: I move to approve.

MR. SALAZAR: Second.

MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion and a second. All
those in favor, say aye.
(Chorus of ayes)


Since there’s only four of us, we won’t do roll call.

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

MR. GLEASON: All right. Well, this is Eric Gleason, Division Director, TxDOT Public Transportation.

You all have the Director’s report in your notes. I won’t go through it exhaustively, but General Webber is on board. He’s been here at TxDOT now for almost a month. He has announced some organizational changes. Nothing that effects the Division too dramatically. Mostly how he attends to organize his own administrative leadership.

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

March to May this year, basically we’re getting the money out the door. Between the March and the May Commission meetings, over $90-million in the state and federal public transportation dollars will be awarded. And this has, you know, been waiting for the federal apportionments, so it’s a combined total of the federal apportionments for this year and then next year’s state
funds are being awarded this Thursday.

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

MR. GADBOIS: And which programs are these?

MR. GLEASON: That’s -- well, it’s every program that we administer.

MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay. Okay.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: That’s part of this.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions for Eric?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, just one about our new
Executive Director.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thanks.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: It says that last sentence of the first paragraph, “This year’s call for projects generated 60 project proposals totaling 49-million.”

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: “The total amount available for award was 12-million.”
MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: All right.

MR. GLEASON: But you know, we just get a lot of
varied types of requests.

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

MR. GLEASON: It will. It will.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MR. GLEASON: Yes, we have.

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

MR. GLEASON: Yes, it did.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: No items, okay.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon. My name is Steve
Wright. I work with the Public Transportation Division here at TxDOT. I have a brief presentation and follow-up to the February PTAC meeting. There are three handouts that you should all have copies of. If it’s okay, I’ll just briefly walk through the three of those and be glad to respond to any questions that there might be.

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

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

The third is Goal and Model Options for Texas.

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

The recommendations are documented in a final report that was completed in fall 2013 which you have seen. The items marked as “Works Well” and “Needs Improvement” are
TxDOT’s summary from the working group discussion that informed the recommendations.

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

- Funding;
- Performance Metrics;
- Membership and Engagement of Local Stakeholders;
- Outreach to Stakeholders and the General Public;
- Content/Components of the Regional Plans;
- Selection and Expectation of Lead Agencies; and
- The TxDOT Role in Providing Guidance and Direction.

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

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric Gleason.

MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Right. The recommendations that are listed here are items that you have seen before in previous reports and attachments. The items that are listed as works
well and needs improvement is what you have not seen before.

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

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

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

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

    MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

    MS. BLOOMER: So we’ve seen the recommendations
before --

    MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

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

    MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

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

    MR. GLEASON: Same place. We just hadn’t
documented it before.

    MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

    MR. WRIGHT: So the recommendations stemmed from
the observations about what works well and what needs improvement.

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

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

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

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

Under performance metrics for instance, there was
not a works well noted, but it was -- there was significant
discussion about the topic of performance measures and the
need for performance measures.

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

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

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

Reading from the top of that handout, TxDOT
anticipates increased funding will be available to lead
agencies every five years to reimburse for major updates of
regionally coordinated transportation plans. During the interim years, some level of funds will be available to lead agencies to help sustain regional coordination activities. Additionally, some funds may be available for projects to be awarded competitively through the annual call for projects.

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

So we’d be looking at about 1.8-million over the course of two years, again, to be finalized in February -- December 2016, which is into fiscal year 2017. And you can see on the top chart, you can see the pattern or the cycle that we are thinking in terms of at this time, where in 2016 and 2017, you’ll see a significant spike in funding, and then the funding for regional planning activities would significantly drop and that would just be to provide some very baseline funding for what we’ve been generally referring to as sustainability activities or activities to sustain the process, to have quarterly stakeholder meetings.
and that sort of thing, as opposed to funding for like big major projects or studies. So that is kind of the funding pattern that we are looking at.

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

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

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

Model C reduces the number of planning regions and lead agencies from the current 24 to either eight or 11. So that would require collapsing obviously some of the planning regions. And the thinking behind this option is that this would align with Texas health and human service regions and boundaries. Some of the Texas health and human service agencies use eight regions. Some use 11 districts. So, if we wanted to pursue Model C, we would have to explore the pros and cons of those options.
And the thinking is that because the human services transportation plan by definition calls for close collaboration with our sister agencies in the health and human services realm, that it might help to make coordination at both the state and local levels easier if we were all working off of the same maps and boundaries. And that would also include the overlay of statewide performance metrics.

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

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

And then the last model which we’re calling Model E is a centrally developed statewide plan, plus statewide performance metrics. So that option would not necessarily have those sub plans. All of this is very kind of
conceptual, but it would still call for close collaboration with local stakeholders.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Steve.

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

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

Clearly, we’re not suggesting this or any of these is something you might place a check next to, but we thought
they kind of captured the range of interest, and I’m -- I’m sorry that Mr. Underwood’s not here with us today, because he has been a -- has a lot of interest in this topic and is very vocal about it, and in part some of this was in response to some of his interests, so.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Multiple jurisdictions.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: That’s true.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: We convene the group with the idea
of getting some input and feedback on where to go next with the program. So yes, they were informing the Division.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: And so, the outcome would be reflected in conversations y’all made in terms of your thinking about your work plan, but we could choose to make a formal recommendation to the Commission on your work plan which I would assume then might also have impact on the funding you’re looking at handing out for this process for the 2016 revisions; is that --
MR. GLEASON: Possibly, yes. I think one of the things if -- if this group, if PTAC were to recommend to the Division or to have a strong interest in us pursuing a different approach to this program than was recommended by the statewide work group, then I think one avenue for us would be to hear that from you today, take some direction from you today to go flush out a particular approach to greater detail and bring it back to your next meeting for further consideration.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: And I can see that. I’m more
thinking along the lines of that’s probably true on some things and less true on others.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: This is a relatively new arena and the history with this process as we get into it, positive encouragement, constructive guidance approach. And we’ve not yet gotten to the point where we would withhold funding
if you will from an area if they did not produce those performance metrics. That would be a next step.

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: But my suspicion is y’all have some experience with those. But mine, for example, would be finding some way of measuring how much work is happening to bring in HHS agencies, bring them into the table and have them be a partner in the planning. Now what exactly that
metrics is if you can figure out and it -- I would think, but that kind of metrics ought to apply to every region, right? Because that’s what coordination’s supposed to be about.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: I -- this is --

MS. BLOOMER: What?

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

MS. BLOOMER: Well --

MR. GLEASON: I mean --
MR. GADBOIS: I think at this point it’s a full conversation. If you all have something to say, jump in, please. Is that fair?

MS. BLOOMER: That’s fair.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: So that would just ensure --

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

MR. GADBOIS: Is not the goal.

MS. BLOOMER: Is not the goal. It’s something that has to happen to achieve the goal, which is to more efficiently and effectively meet the public transportation needs. But if all we’re doing is developing a plan, then we’re like check, we did it, we achieved our goal. And I think what I’m hearing from some of the providers is well, you -- it’s great you have this group, they get together
monthly, they come with all these great ideas and plans, but then as transit providers, we can’t implement them because we don’t have the funding or the resources, so we’ve met the goal, but we can’t achieve the desired outcome. So is that really beneficial because then it sets up this friction, which we’ve been trying to decrease with regional coordination, to get health and human services and transit to come together and talk about the needs. But if we’re setting up this expectation that we’re going to develop this plan and this is what our goal is and we should do this, and then we can’t deliver, is that necessarily something we want to do and move in that direction?

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

MS. ROBERTS: This is Donna Roberts. I think that’s -- Michelle, that’s why we are wanting some statewide metrics, not just at the regional level -- or not only the regional level, but some common themes that would stretch across the state to be able to answer that question; what are we doing statewide. You’ve got your individual, your local outcomes if you want, but across the state what does that mean for our return on investment. And we are -- our
next step is to put together a work group to discuss the metrics. We don’t want to do it just as a division, we have a plan to get a group together to do that.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Well, so let me flip around to make sure that I’m clear on what it’s not. Getting people around a table, I don’t care what their titles are or their agencies, is not it. What would be it is how many projects are you starting up, are you maintaining, are you -- you know, are you keeping going and what’s the character of
those projects? Are they -- are those projects serving
general public, HHS services, what’s then then HHS
relationship to that; are they contributing money, are --
you know, is there an intent to grow that from one
population to multiple populations. Those kinds of things
are measurable and those kind of things in my mind are real
indicators of real relationships being built.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Uh-huh.

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

One of the challenges of trying to manage that
level of effort statewide is that we can’t. I mean, it’s
just -- it is so relationship dependent and so people
dependent that without being everywhere or all places at the
-- you know, to move --

    MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

    MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

    MR. GADBOIS: And some of that is, you know, locals don’t get it, have -- want to, you know, tightly control it, you know, don’t want to spend much time on it. I get all that. And some of that will happen. But if we see that it’s happening, we have a better opportunity to
control it through investment rather than trying to control it through management.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Or maximize.

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

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

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

MS. ROBERTS: Glenn, that is sort of what we had discussed in the workgroup when they talked about the predictable level of funding and some of the recommendations
on how to improve the quality of those plans; those discussions went hand in hand. So you look at that cycle, the funding cycle. If you developed a good quality plan and it has all of these things in it, yes, then you get the sustainability funds. You might not have to complete for it, because we have a certain amount available. You still have to apply for it. And if you met all these specs over here, then you can get the sustainability funds over here. If you didn’t, then that’s problematic.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Then wouldn’t we want to get to something like maybe just going off of Eric’s idea and -- of a hybrid approach where you have a statewide plan that satisfies the requirement and then for those entities or those areas that aren’t, why do we keep giving them money to do a plan that they don’t want to do that doesn’t meet the minimum standards that, you know, doesn’t result in any measurable difference five years later? Instead, say thank you very much, but we’re going to take that 60,000 we gave
you and we’re going to put it back in the pot and these
entities that are taking their plan and are coordinating,
creating real coordination and real relationships, make that
money available to help facilitate that coordination or that
project or that innovation, instead of just funding plans?

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

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: I think --
MR. GADBOIS: There’s just a requirement that you have a plan?

MS. ROBERTS: Every four or five years.

MR. GADBOIS: That’s the guidelines, it’s not a requirement, right?

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

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

Other regions are more dependent on TxDOT dollars.

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

But it’s actually the state requirement which is
much broader in scope and not limited to a particular program, that also is a big impetus for what we’re trying to do here.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: You’ve got some that may be excited about it, you’ve got a bunch of others that aren’t excited
about it at all because there’s no new money.

MR. GADBOIS: Which was --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

MR. GLEASON: John.

MR. GADBOIS: John.

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

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

So most of the regions do that and then that
includes some level of this funding to just sustain,
because, you know, the lead agencies make a compelling case
that well, most of this might be project specific for the
funding, but some of this, you know, it costs us staff time
and dollars, you know, just to convene a meeting and we
should get a reasonable reimbursement for that.

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

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

But the problem is whereas that makes a lot of
sense on the highway program side where there’s a lot of
money flowing in regularly and you have to -- not enough,
but a lot of money flowing in regularly and you have to
figure out exactly how to program it all, it’s obviously
making less sense for some of the transit folks and the way
that it’s happening regionally I think is a fair statement,
but it is also not necessarily generating the kind of
coordination we had hoped to generate in the first place,
where, you know, you may have developed a plan, but that
doesn’t necessarily mean you’re getting the HHS agencies
really engaged, they’re stepping up with any of their money, and you’re starting to solve real problems in new ways. Right?

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

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

So the statewide working group, their notion of continuing on with 24 regions, continuing to do this work, and then add some statewide performance metrics, I’m not hearing anyone necessarily step away from that model. What I’m hearing is an interest on the part of the Committee toward getting results, not emphasizing getting a plan done as much as getting results. And Glenn, I like the solve real problems in new ways thing, because so -- and the question I’m hearing is how do we get there.
How do we -- what combination of measures and guidance and accountability can we build into this program, leaving the structure the same, how can we make -- how can we focus it so that it’s -- it’s on real work, it’s on productive work, and it gets results. Hearing is how do we get there.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. I’m fine with that. Are you all comfortable with that?
MS. BLOOMER: I think so. Rob?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes, I’m listening.

MS. BLOOMER: Any comments or thoughts?

MR. STEPHENS: I don’t know how comfortable I am, but I am listening.

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Well, the money comes from where it’s always come from, Rob, and that is we have federal,
state planning and research funds, the 5304 program, which largely foots the bill for this. And those --

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

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

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

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

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

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

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

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

So there are -- there’s a lot of demand on that program and part of our interest was seeing if we couldn’t strike a different balance with this effort that would allow
us to move forward --

MR. STEPHENS:  Uh-huh.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Well, I don’t think that’s true universally. I think we’ve got some regions that really have taken the ball and run with it. And then we have
others that are really struggling that perhaps may fall more into that mode. And the challenge with this program is as a requirement has always been how far to push it in those areas that --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- that don’t necessarily find value in it.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, well, pushing it’s uncomfortable. I mean, I’ve had my fair share of being on both ends of pushing and pulling and you know, that’s kind of where the rub is; it’s easier just to do the bare minimum and just kind of do that, so more risky for a person to go out there and push and pull a little bit. But that’s what my personal experience has been, so I don’t know. You’ve described planning process to come out of agencies that describe a whole list of them that has value and that get them prioritized within an agency that need but may not be a reasonable concern, so you’ll have those two kinds of things happening, you know, multiplied by however many you have. And I think we can ultimately end up with occasionally what you’ll have is people don’t agree on what coordination really means, what we’re actually doing, so what is our goal here. And then it becomes -- it just becomes a time when you have -- it just becomes this process that you just do -- you know, operators just competing for the limited amount of
funding on the table now to achieve whatever it is they want
to achieve that we’re not sure that we’ve collectively
agreed upon. That’s my experience with it. Everyone just
has their own ways. You asked me what I thought, so I gave
it to you.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and --

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Rob.

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

MR. GLEASON: Possibly.

MR. GADBOIS: To more --

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MS. BLOOMER: -- would have been in the plans and
would be actual examples of regional coordination, that would get us something, a product.

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- because that doesn’t work.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

MR. STEPHENS: That’s my experience. I’ve seen a
MR. GLEASON: Right. And so that’s where this begins to break down when we run into relationships that aren’t functioning the way they should function.

MR. STEPHENS: Putting this down on paper and demanding that recipients of formula funding comply and this is what we’re doing and this is what you start doing, and that’s a little bit of an awkward approach I think, which puts everybody at odds with each other. What I thought what the preliminary objective was when this whole coordination got started or at least back in 2006, was to try to bring in the health and human service agencies which was a parallel system to the public network that was kind of a consumer oriented individual emphasis on participants in that program, how do you capture the value of all that out there and bring it to the table to make more of public transit. And that hasn’t happened. I mean, I haven’t seen it happen. Maybe it’s happened in a few places, but that’s not what’s happening from what I understand, so I -- we’ve got something a little different going on now where we’ve got to focus on a plan and then we have this other thing where we have, you know the coordination, whatever it is, kind of collectively been an assortment of what folks think should happen, but then we don’t really have a prioritization there, because you have different agencies in charge of
different funding streams that do different -- have
different priorities. So you’re kind of going in circles a
lot of times, but -- so I’m interested in where we’re going
to go from here, because I’ve heard a lot of really good
stuff, but I don’t know where we go next.

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

MR. GLEASON: Which one was that?

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: -- because they think they’re doing
a bad job.

MR. GLEASON: Right.

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

What in my mind is going to work a lot better is
if we can figure out a way to encourage the right kinds of
relationship building, the right kinds of project
development, so that we are really getting the results.

       MR. GLEASON: Okay.

       MS. BLOOMER: That’s it. Should be simple and
easy, right?

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

       MS. BLOOMER: Right. I think --

       MR. GADBOIS: We’re going to figure that out, but
not today.

       MS. BLOOMER: I think that --

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

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

       MR. GADBOIS: Default.

       MS. BLOOMER: -- the statewide plan or a plan or -

but what are we trying to accomplish first and get
everybody to agree to that. But I would agree, it’s the
relationships, and it’s not the lead agency developing the
plan and then dictating to everybody and maybe they’re one
of the key players that makes it happen or maybe they aren’t
one of the key players, but it’s -- in my mind it’s
facilitating those discussions so you can pull in -- and
maybe you only pull in -- that’s my concern with performance
measures is I don’t want people to feel like they just have
to do all of it so they check off the box.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Oh, I know.

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

MR. GLEASON: So before we leave this discussion,
if we’re about to leave it, I think we would benefit hearing
some description of what work you as a Committee would like
to see us do on this between now and your next meeting.

MR. GADBOIS: Madam Chair, I’m sorry.

MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead.

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

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

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

One of my big concerns is we’re getting ready to
spend another 1.8-million in two years to develop plans.
And I think what we’ve heard is we’ve spent a lot of money
on developing plans, we’re getting ready to spend another
chunk of money to develop plans. What has it gotten us. So
I think before we go into that we need to let folks know
that if this is what we’re going to do, we’re going to use
this process now over the next 16 to 18 months to evaluate this, come up with a proposal to move forward, that it’s not -- we’re just not going to continue doing what we’ve been doing forever.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- we’re talking about this summer
and the fall.

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: And just seeing -- so I think that
we have to assume this next round is going forward with planning and the investment in that.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Well, before the --
MS. BLOOMER: To vote proposals.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, so -- so before the -- the
announcement or whatever it is, yeah. Would that make sense
for a work plan for us to focus on and get this done? And
it’s going to -- and that’s also going to mean a good bit of
work from y’all because my first question is going to be I
can guarantee y’all have ideas on both results that kind of
would apply across the board and/or some thoughts on
performance measures. I’d like to start there.
MS. ROBERTS: All right, but our original plan was
to take these recommendations from the work group, the
recommendations that we had received consensus on from all
the lead agencies and which we’ve discussed at -- with the
transit community at the semiannual, but we were -- our plan
was to develop a set of guidelines based on these
recommendations, hold some workshops this fall, canvass the
state to say here’s at least what a new level of
accountability is going to be in your next plan. We expect
you to have these things in it.

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

So how is what you’re suggesting -- yeah.
MR. GADBOIS: So fall is when you’d be going out
and doing the stakeholder meetings.

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

MR. GADBOIS: What I’m suggesting is if we can do
work fairly quickly to define what results might look like,
what performance measures might look like, so we have
something concrete enough to talk to people about, then the
crafting of the message is really only we’re going to invest
one more time in this planning process, we’re going to get
to a place to where we can have performance measures as part of that, and then we may refine those performance measures some, but thereafter, those plans evolve at the speed with which they evolve because what we’re now going to invest in from thereon is performance and results.

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

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

MS. ROBERTS: That’s right.

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

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: I just wanted to clarify for the record and anybody listening, we only provide funding for plan updates every five years. The interim years we don’t
fund for plan updates. I just wanted to make sure there wasn’t a misunderstanding of that.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

MS. ROBERTS: Yes.

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

MS. ROBERTS: That’s right.

MR. GLEASON: -- more project specific.

MR. WRIGHT: Having some outputs and outcomes.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Right.

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

MR. WRIGHT: But even more than this --

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

MR. GLEASON: Right.
MR. GADBOIS: So --

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Right, but what I care is that project’s now going to get funded, not because it’s needed planning, but because they’re committing to bring in the dia -- you know, 15 dialysis centers and, you know, and this
agency and that local agency, to actually bring people to
the table to help develop that analysis and planning and
maybe contribute a little bit of money to it.

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

MR. GADBOIS: That’s what makes that project
fundable.

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

MS. ROBERTS: Yeah.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: I recall that.

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

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

MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

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

MR. GLEASON: Matrix?

MS. BLOOMER: The metrics.

MR. GLEASON: Metrics, okay.

MR. GLEASON: All right

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

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

MS. CONKLE: Good afternoon, everyone.

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

MS. CONKLE: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Alrighty, go ahead.

MS. CONKLE: Can you hear me now?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

MS. CONKLE: First slide --

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

MS. CONKLE: Go ahead.

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, this is Bobby Killebrew.

MS. CONKLE: Yes.

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

MS. CONKLE: No, that’s --

MR. KILLEBREW: -- but all of --

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

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

MS. CONKLE: That’s fine.

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

MS. CONKLE: Sure.

(Off record)

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

MR. GADBOIS: Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: Maybe she took a break.
MR. GADBOIS: She didn’t believe we’d be just a
minute.

MS. CONKLE: No, I’m sorry. I’m actually here. I
was on mute.

(Laughter)

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. We are, too.

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

This presentation that I’m giving today is the
exact same presentation that we gave to our own Texas
Transportation Plan 2040, Technical Advisory Committee so
that everybody gets the same message. If we go to slide 2,
ok, basically and again, because for consistency reasons,
this was the agenda that we went up there with our TAC.
Basically just talk about the schedule, recap of our last
meeting and the draft goals which I also shared with you
guys the last time I updated you on the plan. Talk a little
bit about stakeholder and public outreach for round two, an
overview of that. The outreach schedule, our outreach tool
and investment approaches. Talked about the unconstrained
needs assessment by mode. For this particular presentation, we’re going to focus on transit, bicycles, pedestrian and rail specific modes, and then talk about the TTP 2040 next steps. Next slide.

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

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

The TAC 2 recap, we basically summarized round one outreach and early survey findings. We discussed the draft TTP goals and objectives. We reached general consensus on goals and objectives with some language modifications and we added financial sustainability as a goal and objective, which I think is very relevant to some of the conversation I heard before the presentation. We’re -- I think all modes
are suffering right now, but no more so than public transportation. Next slide.

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

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

Again, we have Twitter, Facebook. We’ve had
several hundred people join our Twitter account and our tweeting information about this. And all of that can be found on the TxDOT website at TTP 2040.

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

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

The map that you see, this was survey responses as of 5/9/2014. There are now over a thousand responses to the second survey and we had approximately 500 responses to the first survey. So we feel like we also have gotten better coverage, because between the first and second survey, we used a few college students to help us tweet this and get the word out. So, in a little more than a month we have
almost doubled the response to the second survey and we invite you to go out there and take it, even if you took the first survey. Next slide.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MR. KILLEBREW: We’re progressing just fine.

Thank you.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: We figured it out.
MS. CONKLE: Thank you.

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

Week six, we’ll be in Waco.

Week seven, which is July 28th through the 30th, we’ll be in Abilene, Childress, Amarillo and Lubbock.

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

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

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

We basically have three investment approaches. And we want to say upfront, we realize there are much like the shakes at Sonic, there are a million combinations, but what we tried to do is we tried to take projects that helped us to meet the goals and objectives of the plan and put
those together where they naturally fit, so that it would be
something digestible to the public. So we’ve come up with
three scenarios.

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

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

Investment approach three, connectivity and
freight mobility. This scenario is focused on rural
investment to facilitate the movement of goods and services
and support Texas industry. Focus will be placed on
improving interregional connectivity, specifically along
primary freight corridors identified in the Texas Freight
Mobility Plan and between economic activity centers, and on providing rural residents with access to goods and services.

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

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

MS. CONKLE: Sure.

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

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

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

MS. CONKLE: So there’s an assumption that --

MR. GLEASON: It looks like a freight movement
approach.

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

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

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

MR. GLEASON: Right.

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

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

MS. CONKLE: Okay.

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

And so --

MS. CONKLE: That is correct.

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Well, it --

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

MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I just want to make sure and paint this clearly, so you’re having a fight in
Austin over I-35 and whether it’s primarily a transportation facility or whether it’s an asset for the community and development that happens around it. You’re having the same argument over whether you keep a freeway in Dallas area. You’re having a number of those discussions in metropolitan areas that I think you at least ought to acknowledge when you’re talking about metropolitan mobility. Does that make sense?

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

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

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

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

MS. CONKLE: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: They’re not transportation geeks like me.

MS. CONKLE: Okay. Yeah, which is why I won’t use nexus either because that’s my own planning term. But I
will definitely work that into the scenario.

MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

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

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

Again, these are screenshots, so the top screenshot, this allows users to take and drag the gray boxes above that yellow line and put those into their own priorities one, two and three. And as you drag them, you get a visual pictorial representation of what it is that you’re actually prioritizing. In other words, pavement condition’s number one, so there’s a picture there of some very definite cracking and falling, so we have -- and also, I want to point out that when you scroll over these, there’s more information. It’s sort of like a lot of web tools, if
you’re not sure what pavement condition is based on the photograph there, you can scroll over and we give you a definition of what each of these means.

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

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

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

And again, what I’ll do is make sure that those definitions include your comments as well. So basically
what you do is you ranked your top three in the top screen, so you get a dashboard, a color dashboard that tells you how your priorities rank under system preservation.

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

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

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

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

So basically -- what I should have said is I only
have a slide for one of the scenarios, but basically you can see all three of the scenarios and the way that they relate to each other based on your priorities. Those are static.

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

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

And when you have your performance where you’d like it, and I can guarantee you there isn’t any amount of money on that screen that will make everything green, but it assumes the budget that TxDOT has, plus an additional $5-
billion, which is what has been conveyed to our Legislature. So you get the money that we have, plus the extra 5-billion, you can put it anywhere you’d like to to get the system performance that you would like on that create a budget. And when you’ve made it as good as you can possibly make it, you click finish, and it captures your preferences. Next slide.

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

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

Basically, for pavement, unconstrained needs to 2040 were about 107, almost $108-million. Five billion dollars average annual calculated over 27 years. And the reason it’s 27 years instead of 26 is because our numbers are 2014 through 2040, so we take all the available
information and we make it work into our horizon. And that includes preservation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

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

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

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

Again, this does not include expansion needs.
unless a bridge is functionally obsolete. It wouldn’t make any sense for us to go take down a bridge that’s functionally obsolete and build another one in capacity terms that’s also obsolete. So, expansion is taken into consideration if it’s functionally obsolete and we need to rebuild it. Otherwise, it’s not. Next slide.

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

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

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

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

And then unconstrained needs for Intelligent Transportation Systems are 13.7-billion, .5-billion over 26 years, because that data we had from 2015 to 2040, includes the cost to operate, maintain, replace existing ITS assets; costs to implement, operate, maintain future planned assets as identified by TxDOT, meaning these assets are already programmed to be operational, so we’ll have to cost -- do
life cycle costs. That does not include operations strategies identified in the State Freight Plan or technologies required for future changes to revenue collection, i.e., toll collection. Next slide.

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

The TTP 2040 next steps. We’re going to -- we have vetted the unconstrained needs estimates with our TAC and other TxDOT staff and executives meaning the people in the various divisions; bridge division, design division, PTN, so that they can have a look at these and make sure that our methodologies have come up with numbers that are
consistent with what they are modeling or consistent with
what they are assuming. We’re going to finalize the cost of
all investment approaches, launch the MetroQuest tool on or
about June 1, and complete outreach round 2.

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

So thank you for your time today.

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

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

So -- I guess nobody has --

MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead.

MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle, I’m going to just say
this and I know that it’s pretty much impossible at this
point for you to integrate it, but I feel the need to say
it. TTI just did research on I-35, modeling different
scenarios for building to address congestion. And what they
discovered is congestion is going to get much worse over the
next, you know 20 years or so and the only build solution
reduces that much worse by maybe five percent. So without
getting in to how you get to your projections of the
unconstrained costs and whether they actually deal with
congestion or not, the one scenario that they actually did
that made a difference is actually aligned with your
financial sustainability priority, which is to reduce
demand. Shift demand --

    MS. CONKLE: Right.

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

    MS. CONKLE: That’s correct.

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

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

    MR. GADBOIS: Well --

    MS. CONKLE: It absolutely does.

    MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, it -- yeah, and no, and I
appreciate that part of it and I actually appreciate that
this is much more multimodal than any other TxDOT plan.
What I’m suggesting is demand management in and of itself
requires investment. To be able to shift the demand --

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

    MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

    MR. GADBOIS: Oaky.

    MS. CONKLE: But it’s not going to be ignored by
any stretch.

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MS. CONKLE: And what we have versus what we plan to get, what should be very apparent is we don’t have nearly
what we need. And even if we got an additional 5-billion, we wouldn’t have nearly what we need. But it does give you an opportunity as a stakeholder or a private citizen to make those hard decisions and know that the very things that you say in these meetings, you could put all of that money, you could put all of that money, on congestion and it would barely move that needle, which sort of I guess is representative of the comment I just received about travel demand management.

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

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

So I encourage you to go out and play with the tool and you know, help us and help the public to understand, you know, the tradeoff. Again, this tool is about tradeoff and it’s one of the first times we’ve ever allowed the public to see a representative amount of money being moved around, you know, money that TxDOT actually has,
plus the 5-billion, the ones you go to the Legislature for, and see how that would impact the system. And there is -- there’s a lot of engineering and calculus to back this up. So if any of you would like to see the math that went into this, it is months of work, months of modeling, and months of honing down our unit cost so that we can give you the most representative experience possible.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions?

MS. CONKLE: No, thank you.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

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

MS. CONKLE: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

MS. CONKLE: Well, thank you.

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

MR. GLEASON: A new regional coordination tool.

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

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

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

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

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

In your packets today there is a handout that gives you a quick look at the 2014 and 2013 award of
transportation development credits.

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

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

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

We do have an exception on here. We do have a couple of large urbanized areas that don’t earn TDCs, Laredo for example. And so they’re getting some 5310 awards and they’re being matched with some TDCs in some of these that you see before you.
We also had in 2014, Houston wasn’t ready to award their TDCs even though the Commission had allocated a bunch of TDCs to that area, and you’ll see in 2014 that they transferred a little bit over 3.8-million back to the Commission and the Commission actually took what Houston would have done had they had a plan of action in place and they awarded those TDCs to those projects in the Houston, the larger Houston urbanized areas.

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

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

We were ready to go to the Commission with some awards of funds, but we weren’t sure how to apply the TDCs exactly, so what we’ve done is we’ve asked the Commission in that minute order just to award a set amount of TDCs for those projects that when we get into the project development stage, we’ll know exactly how much TDCs to apply to the
individual project. So that did come to our benefit. We kind of struggled with that one, saying how would we use this, you know, maybe use more on the highway side.

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

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah. That’s where we get the rounded $2-million figure there.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Correct.

MR. GADBOIS: -- in TDCs by itself?

MR. KILLEBREW: Correct.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Wipe the --

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Bobby, on the fiscal year 2013 TDCs, so the award and then the utilized versus the balance, can
you just explain that a little bit more?

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

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

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

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Well, when it comes to TDCs, those are kind of an interesting character when you deal with the
feds. When you enter into an agreement, you use federal funds and you match it with TDCs. That locks in a federal/non-federal ratio. And it’s hard -- you can’t change that federal/non-federal ratio, well basically is kind of is what they tell us. The feds can participate at a lower ratio than what you said they would, but they can’t participate at a higher ratio.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Is going to be spent.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Project falls apart, doesn’t happen at all --

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Now, we should probably recognize, Bobby, that sometimes what we do is we award just TDCs. And then the agency uses that for a match on say a 5307 grant. So we don’t track the status of that 5307 grant, we have an agreement that -- just with TDC, so it’s a little more difficult to follow what Bobby is describing because
sometimes it’s not one package from our standpoint.

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

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

MR. GLEASON: But we don’t always have the full --

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- the full project.

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

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

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Right.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Absolutely.

MR. GADBOIS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: There you go.

MS. BLOOMER: We have plenty.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Left.
MR. GLEASON: And again, it wouldn’t take much --
MS. BLOOMER: And 15 was a good --
MR. GLEASON: -- for a large metro to come in and
suck up the rest of that.
MS. BLOOMER: Right.
MR. GLEASON: With one fleet order.
MR. GADBOIS: Now that -- if he doesn’t count the
HTAC’s 3.8, right?
MR. GLEASON: That was added to the 15.
MR. GADBOIS: Right, okay.
MR. KILLEBREW: And Eric makes a good point with
the new 5339 program that’s out of MAP-21, I probably do
anticipate that some of the areas that do not earn TDCs,
I’ll pick one, Corpus for example, that they may be coming
in and saying we’ve got some 5339 money now, we would like
to have some TDCs as match. That would have to come out of
the statewide pot, probably out of the 15-million.
MR. GADBOIS: So the -- the only last question is,
there are other ways to spend TDCs. Do you all do any
education to try to encourage and help people understand
that TDCs can be used for other things besides capital?
MR. GLEASON: Such as operating?
MR. GADBOIS: I mean, you know, there are a number
of ways that -- that you could use them for a number of
different kinds of projects and so I’m just wondering
whether -- you know, whether you do anything and you know, annual transit meeting or anything else to help people understand how TDCs can be used.

MR. GLEASON: No. Not really.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

MR. GADBOIS: Sure.

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


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

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

MR. KILLEBREW: There's -- yes. The Commission makes an allocation or an award to those areas that earn TDCs and then they have their own plan locally on how that they will award that and they report back to the Commission
annually. The rest of it’s basically Commission discretionary. And out of the Commission’s discretionary pot for transit, they’re setting aside 15-million TDCs. So we come out of the Commission discretion, which can be used anywhere statewide.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

MS. BLOOMER: And that’s — that’s — I just was
recalling because let’s say Dart or Corpus. Dart has the
option or the T or any other Villa, to go directly to their
MPO area to ask. That’s --

MR. GLEASON: They have to go there first.

MS. BLOOMER: They have to go there first.

MR. KILLEBREW: Have to go there first.

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

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: It is just a target pot if you will.

And the conversation at the time around the rules would be
yes, we can go for that. If we had an unusually large request come in, we could go for a portion of the remaining statewide.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: First.

MR. GLEASON: -- in -- right.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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


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

Okay. We’ll move on to Item 7, review and discussion of the PTAC work plan. Any -- does anybody have -- thank you for including it this time.
MR. SALAZAR: Have we heard anything else on anybody being appointed? Still nothing?

MS. BLOOMER: How many did you say we had, Bobby?

Six? One, two, three, four, five --

MR. GLEASON: We have six.

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

MR. SALAZAR: Out of nine.

MR. KILLEBREW: Well, it’s the quorum of the membership.

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

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: I agree.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

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

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

    MR. GADBOIS: We’re right on track.

    MR. GLEASON: That’s right on track, you’re
awesome.

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

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

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

    MR. RIBAKOVE: Let me just open my calendar --
MS. BLOOMER: It would be July --

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

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

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

MR. RIBAKOVE: July 29.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: July -- when’s this coming on again? Sorry.

MR. RIBAKOVE: The 23rd.

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

MR. GADBOIS: How about the 22nd?

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

MS. BLOOMER: What about the day after?

MR. GLEASON: Thursday, the day after?
MS. BLOOMER: The 24th?

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: We do. It’s not insurmountable from our standpoint. It might appear a little scattered from your standpoint.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: What’s ERP and --
MR. GLEASON: You don’t want to know.

MR. GADBOIS: Oh, I don’t want to know.

MR. GLEASON: No, you really don’t want to know.

MR. KILLEBREW: You don’t want to know.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So what does that mean in terms of --

MR. GLEASON: Changing.

MR. GADBOIS: -- having a meeting or not?

MR. GLEASON: It means that JR. and Rob and Brad will --

MR. GADBOIS: Will be in the training.

MR. GLEASON: -- might need to have some other staff with them who could attend the ERP training and probably would anyway.

MR. KILLEBREW: Probably would anyway, yes.

MR. GLEASON: And so it’s probably not an issue.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Would that be okay with the committee members if we looked at possibly doing it --

MR. SALAZAR: That’s fine with me.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, as long as we start at 1:30 on Thursday. I mean, I can be over here -- I can’t be here by 1:00, but I could be here by 1:30.

MR. GLEASON: I suspect the thought process was I’m in town, let’s have a morning meeting, but --

MR. GADBOIS: Oh. Oh.
MR. GLEASON:  Just a guess on my part.

MR. GADBOIS:  Okay.

MR. GLEASON:  Looking at the Chair.

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

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

MR. GLEASON:  We just did.

MS. BLOOMER:  Yeah, we just did.

MS. BLOOMER:  No, we’re at two and a -- well, two and a half.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER:  Okay.

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER:  If we could check with Thursday being preferred. If not, the Tuesday. And then if that
doesn’t work, just going back to the regularly scheduled day on the 29th.

    MR. KILLEBREW: Okay.

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

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

        MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

        MR. GADBOIS: -- I’m happy to do it.

        MS. BLOOMER: We’ll see what Bobby and Josh can make happen. That Josh can make happen.

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

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