



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

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - TELECONFERENCE
MEETING

200 Riverside Drive, Auditorium
Austin, Texas 78704

Thursday
July 23, 2015
8:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Rob Stephens, Chair
- John McBeth, Vice Chair
- J.R. Salazar, Transportation Provider Representative
- Glenn Gadbois, Transportation User Representative

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIA TELECONFERENCE:

- Michelle Bloomer, General Public Representative

TxDOT PARTICIPANTS:

- Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN) (Presenter)
- Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN (Presenter)
- Ryan Granger, Federal Relations Division (Presenter)
- Kari Banta, Program 5210 Manager (Presenter)
- Steve Wright, Program Manager (Presenter)

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY:

VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Call to Order	Page 3
2. Safety Briefing	Page 3
3. Approval of Minutes	Page 4
4. Division Director's report	Page 5
5. Texas Legislative Update	Page 9
6. Update on federal authorization	Page 13
7. Review of FY2015 Section 5310 Formula Grants for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program Activities	Page 25
8. Presentation on coordinated regional planning Activities	Page 53
9. Discussion and development of PTAC Work Plan	Page 62
10. Public Comment	Page 77
11. Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting	Page 87
12. Adjourn	Page 89

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. STEPHENS: All right. We have a quorum. We have Michelle Bloomer on the phone, John McBeth and myself and J.R. Salazar. Let's go ahead and get started. This is a Call to Order. It's -- where's Bobby for the Safety Briefing?

MR. SALAZAR: Josh, can you do that?

MR. RIBAKOVE: I'll do the safety briefing.

MR. STEPHENS: Josh? Josh? Okay.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Sure. Welcome to 200 East Riverside of the TxDOT Campus. If we have inclement weather and we need to meet somewhere indoors, this is the room for it. You don't need to go anywhere else. If for some reason there should be an actual fire or a fire drill or some reason that we need to evacuate the building, you can either use the set of doors that you came in right here or either of the doors at the far side of the room. We'll see signs for the exits. Just exit the building and head back towards the apartments back behind TxDOT's buildings and we will meet up over there.

Please be aware that if you're -- if you're visiting Austin, that Austin has passed a hands-free use only in the cars law and they are enforcing it pretty well. So don't -- don't be texting and driving or -- or holding your GPS at that point. And that's our safety briefing.

1 MR. STEPHENS: Did we have someone else joining
2 us?

3 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, this is Glenn. I'm on my way
4 but I'm calling in until I get there.

5 MR. STEPHENS: All right, Glenn. We just -- we
6 just opened up the meeting and had a safety briefing by
7 Josh.

8 MR. SALAZAR: Are you hands-free, Glenn?

9 MR. GADBOIS: I -- I am both hands free and
10 walking.

11 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

12 MR. STEPHENS: And walking?

13 MR. SALAZAR: Don't walk into anything.

14 (Laughter).

15 MR. SALAZAR: All right.

16 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. We got Item Number 3,
17 approval of minutes from May 26th, 2015. Everybody get a
18 chance to look at those?

19 MR. McBETH: Move approval.

20 MR. SALAZAR: Second.

21 MR. STEPHENS: We got John McBeth, motion to
22 approve, J.R. Salazar second. Any discussion?

23 (No audible response).

24 MR. STEPHENS: Hearing none, everyone who want to
25 approve, say I.

1 (Chorus of "Ayes")

2 MR. STEPHENS: Anyone disapprove, same sign.

3 (No audible response).

4 MR. STEPHENS: The minutes pass as written. Item
5 Number 4, we have Eric. You got your Division Director's
6 report.

7 MR. GLEASON: Good morning, everybody. This is
8 Eric Gleason, Director of Public Transportation for TxDOT.
9 In your packet, you have a -- a one page director's report
10 from me that summarizes June and July and August Commission
11 actions. I do want to note one -- one change to that
12 report. The -- the first paragraph talking about the August
13 meeting. It -- it talks about us looking to re-obligate
14 some relatively small remaining JARC and New Freedom program
15 balances.

16 That's actually going to move to September. One
17 of the reasons it's moving is that -- well, in fact the main
18 reason it's moving is that we -- we've had a number of these
19 contracts ended on May 31st and we're still working through
20 some final billing on those contracts. And so we won't know
21 the total remaining amount until -- until after we're sure
22 that everything ends. So that -- that item there will be in
23 September.

24 TIGER VII application, again, it's in -- not seen
25 a schedule for announcing awards. We'll let everyone know

1 when we do. I do understand it's generally sometime this
2 fall. Had a very lively I think, and hopefully mostly
3 successful semiannual meeting yesterday. A lot of our folks
4 who were there yesterday are here in the audience this
5 morning. It's great to see everybody.

6 And we went over a number of issues and it was a
7 pretty nuts and bolts business meeting from my perspective,
8 a lot of detail type stuff, updates from FTA, summary of
9 moving to the new grant system later on this -- this year at
10 the federal level. The Department did sign a purchase order
11 to begin amending an electronic spread management system
12 here at TxDOT.

13 We had a great panel that talked about an issue
14 this Committee is very interested in, growth and
15 urbanization. We had a number of analysts who had some very
16 unique and specific experiences with the last Census that
17 they provided some insights into lessons learned and how
18 they approached things. And I think this will continue to
19 be an important policy topic for this Committee to stay out
20 in front of even though we're five years away from the next
21 Census, and then as we know another two to three years away
22 after that from actual announcement of urbanized areas. So
23 lots of lead time, but that time will go quickly. And so
24 very encouraging there.

25 And the finally, the -- the last topic of the day

1 yesterday again is -- is a topic of interest to this
2 Committee. And there was a -- an opportunity for folks to
3 provide us some feedback and some ideas on how to improve
4 both our coordinated call and our 5310 process. So that
5 concludes my report, Mr. Chair.

6 MR. STEPHENS: All right, guys.

7 MR. GLEASON: Any questions?

8 MR. STEPHENS: Any -- any questions for --

9 MR. RIBAKOVE: Rob, there's just a -- just a
10 couple of housekeeping things that I neglected when I did
11 the safety briefing. We are recording this today. It's a
12 public meeting. If you would like to make a comment, we
13 have comment cards over on the table where you pick up your
14 agenda. Just fill one out, give it to me. And when it's
15 time for your comment, we'll give you a call and just come
16 make it in the front so that your mics can pick it up so the
17 public can hear it when we post the audio on TxDOT's website
18 in a few weeks.

19 And restrooms our out the doors and go across to
20 the front door and then to the right. Good morning, Glenn.

21 MR. GADBOIS: Good morning.

22 MR. STEPHENS: Good morning. We just --

23 MR. GADBOIS: I -- I heard -- I heard Eric.

24 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. We're going to slow things
25 down. Does anyone have questions for Eric or any comments

1 or anything, guys?

2 (No audible response).

3 MR. STEPHENS: Did someone else just join us?

4 MR. SALAZAR: I think that was Glenn driving. Was
5 that Glenn driving?

6 MR. STEPHENS: Oh, Glenn.

7 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

8 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

9 MR. McBETH: You -- so -- Eric, you started with
10 lively --

11 MR. GLEASON: What's that?

12 MR. GADBOIS: You started with your description of
13 the -- the annual meeting as lively.

14 MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir.

15 MR. GADBOIS: How so?

16 (Laughter).

17 MR. GLEASON: A very engaging conversation
18 throughout the entire topic, all the topics. Everyone was
19 on the edge of their seats.

20 (Laughter).

21 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

22 MR. McBETH: You all had a different meeting after
23 all then evidently.

24 (Laughter).

25 MR. STEPHENS: All right. Anyone got questions

1 for Eric or any comments you want to make guys? Michelle?

2 Michelle, are you --

3 MS. BLOOMER: I'm good.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All right.

5 MR. RIBAKOVE: We missed you yesterday, Michelle.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you. Thank you. I miss you
7 guys too.

8 MR. STEPHENS: All right. That concludes the
9 Director's Report. I guess we'll move onto Item Number 5, a
10 -- the Texas Legislative Update. We have --

11 MR. GLEASON: I guess that's me. As I reported
12 yesterday at the semi-annual meeting, I think on the
13 legislation side in -- in our view, the -- the session ended
14 up being pretty much a non-event other than they didn't take
15 anything. As John pointed out yesterday, they didn't take
16 any action to the detriment of our programs. From an
17 appropriations side, status quo on the level of funding for
18 State Public Transportation grants, exception item that was
19 included in the Department's LAR was -- was not approved.

20 The one thing that -- that did happen as a part of
21 our appropriations is it was approved to the Department to
22 flex over from the highway side from a highway funding seven
23 and a half million dollars a year, 15,000,000 for the
24 biennium to help with a fleet replacement program.

25 So I don't know. John, if you want to add

1 anything from your perspective?

2 MR. McBETH: No, this is John. Like I said
3 yesterday, they -- they did no harm. And I think we all got
4 out very well unscarred. I would like to make the same
5 comment I made yesterday. The -- in -- in a session that
6 was -- that dwelt on finding -- picking up anytime you saw
7 Representative Pickett or Senator Nichols in the hall, they
8 were picking pennies and nickels and dimes up off the floor
9 to put in their massive highway fund that they -- they were
10 trying to get increased. And they increased it by
11 \$5,000,000,000. And I think it's a credit to Eric and --
12 and PTM staff that they were able to convince the Department
13 to flex \$15,000,000 of highway money at the time that they
14 weren't giving any money away to anything but highways over
15 the public transit.

16 And that's -- and I know factually that Eric
17 carried this ball. It was his idea. And we owe you a great
18 --

19 MR. GLEASON: Appreciate it.

20 MR. McBETH: -- debt of gratitude for doing that.
21 I mean, 15,000,000 is 15,000,000. That's --

22 MR. GADBOIS: Maybe pennies to some, but it's very
23 significant over here.

24 MR. McBETH: It's very significant on our side,
25 yeah. 5,000,000,000 would have been nicer, but --

1 (Laughter).

2 MR. McBETH: But 15,000,000 we will not turn down.

3 So thank you very much for your --

4 MR. GLEASON: Appreciate that.

5 MR. McBETH: -- for your insight on that.

6 MR. GLEASON: And Mr. Chair, if I could recognize

7 Mark Williams in the audience. Mark is my boss. And Mark

8 --

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, I -- have -- have we done your
10 mid-cycle review yet?

11 MR. GLEASON: It's coming up.

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Go ahead. Your time is up.

13 (Laughter).

14 MR. GLEASON: Mark is in charge of the
15 Department's -- well, I don't know if in charge is the right
16 word, but the Unified Transportation Program is his
17 responsibility. And a lot of these decisions are -- are
18 made as a part of that overall effort within the Department.
19 So Mark --

20 MR. McBETH: Thank you for your assistance also.

21 MR. GLEASON: -- had a big role on that.

22 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you all. We appreciate --

23 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you --

24 MR. WILLIAMS: We appreciate what you do.

25 MR. STEPHENS: -- Mark. And -- and I kind of like

1 to recognize one of my bosses. Mr. Willie Barber is our
2 board member from the Odessa Urban Transit District who has
3 kindly loaned me out here to be chair for this Committee, so
4 thank you.

5 MR. GLEASON: Don't let him too far off the road,
6 sir.

7 MR. BARBER: Well, he's been doing an excellent
8 job so far. We're real pleased with him -- him and the
9 whole staff there.

10 MR. GLEASON: Thank you for coming. I appreciate
11 your time.

12 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Any questions for Eric on
13 the legislative update or -- or McBeth? Any comments, J.R.?

14 MR. SALAZAR: No.

15 MR. GADBOIS: J, can I just ask you a quick
16 question? Do we have any assessment of the federal, the
17 Senate consensus bill?

18 MR. GLEASON: I have a six man. Look at your
19 agenda.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, sorry.

21 (Laughter).

22 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, jump ahead. Let's go guys.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Jump ahead.

24 MR. GLEASON: All right.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

1 MR. GLEASON: Item 6.

2 MR. STEPHENS: We're ready --

3 MR. GLEASON: Ryan Granger.

4 MR. STEPHENS: We're ready for Item 6.

5 MR. GLEASON: Ryan is with our Federal Relations
6 Division at -- at TxDOT. And he has been emailing me every
7 day I think for the last week about what's going on, so --

8 MR. GRANGER: Probably to your detriment.

9 MR. GLEASON: Ryan asked me about 10 days ago if
10 he needed to get a presentation ready and get it to Josh on
11 time for Josh's deadline. I said why bother? It's going to
12 change between now and then. So --

13 MR. GRANGER: That's right.

14 MR. GLEASON: -- Ryan, you're on.

15 MR. GRANGER: That's right. It's indicative of
16 the situation that I probably rewritten my comments about 10
17 or 20 times. So it's changing pretty rapidly. The -- the
18 Senate voted last night to open debate on a six year
19 transportation bill. And they just introduced finally a
20 very mysterious transit section just two days ago on
21 Wednesday -- or on -- on Tuesday afternoon.

22 To -- the bill includes six years of contract
23 authority, but only general fund pays for three years which
24 is kind of -- have personally done that, which I'll discuss
25 a little bit more. The Senate is reconvening this morning

1 and the chamber will resume consideration of the motion to
2 proceed with -- with that bill. And let's see.

3 They'll begin debating amendments. And the first
4 of which is likely to be one to reauthorize the recently
5 expired Export-Import Bank that you might have heard about
6 on the news. White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said
7 yesterday that a renewal of the EXIM Bank must be attached
8 to the highway bill. And indicated the president might
9 otherwise not support the legislation.

10 So some of the other amendments that are coming
11 down the pipe are likely to be contentious as the -- the
12 bill is becoming a must pass bill with only six more days
13 left to -- to work on it before the deadline.

14 And -- let's see. And Senators Rand Paul and Ted
15 Cruz have threatened to attach amendments related to
16 abortion and Obamacare. And they're likely to be a whole
17 slate or parliamentary drama and intrigue today. So C-SPAN
18 is going to be hopping. It's going to be really great. And
19 since it sounds like there's some interest on what actually
20 is in the bill and none of that drama, I can go into details
21 with highlights and changes if -- if that's okay. Okay.

22 See, based on our very initial analysis from APTA
23 and Eno Transportation Weekly and Eno Transportation Weekly
24 and myself, see, the bill completely rewrites the 30 -- 5339
25 bus and bus facility section. Increases the formula

1 amounted for national distribution from 65 and a half
2 million under MAP-21 to a hundred and two point five million
3 and it increases the state minimum from 1.25 million to
4 2,000,000.

5 The discretionary program is funding at a hundred
6 and ninety million per year with 55 of that set aside to no
7 or low emission grants. And at least 10 percent of the
8 hundred and ninety million will go to rural issues. There
9 are issues with that that I can go into.

10 Some of the other highlights of changes coming, I
11 -- if this bill goes anywhere. You see, it proposed a pilot
12 project for innovative leasing. It would include no less
13 than six grantees which two are from urban areas. Two are
14 from urban areas of 200,000 or less. And two are from rural
15 areas. It establishes a new title for innovative
16 procurement of rolling stock which allows the state to
17 oversee a cooperative procurement with vendors to purchase
18 rolling stock and it has multi-state flexibility.

19 It eliminates a -- a requirement of a MAP-21 for a
20 weekend service for quarter based projects. And it
21 increases the current 60 percent domestic content to 65
22 percent in 2018 and '19 and then 70 percent to 2020 and
23 thereafter.

24 Let's see. There -- there's just a few more --
25 few more highlights of the changes I have. Let's see. U.S.

1 Project Oversight will begin during a project development
2 phase. It will be limited to quarterly reviews unless that
3 project falls behind for at least in two consecutive
4 quarters.

5 The small starts which we were actually talking
6 about just before the meeting increased the threshold for
7 federal funding from 75,000,000 to a 100,000,000. And the
8 total project cost from 250,000,000 to 300,000,000. And
9 once again, I'm sorry that I don't have materials to -- to
10 share this with you. I know it's a lot of information to
11 throw at you now, but it's just come out.

12 But I noticed small starts -- let's see, change
13 was -- it allows FTA funding for intercity rail projects in
14 the New Starts and core capacity programs. But it excludes
15 eligibility for those project elements eligible for funding
16 from the State of Good Repair programs.

17 Let's see. Some of the potential issues that came
18 out earlier, the -- the most major possibly could be that
19 the minority staff on senate banking, which has a transit
20 title as well as some other credits has said that the bill's
21 funding ratio of general funds paid into mass transit
22 account and the Highway Trust Fund doesn't maintain the
23 traditional 80-20 split. A minority analysis done, it says
24 that public transportation receives only six percent of that
25 rather than 20 percent. So we're going to be taking a

1 closer look at that to see if that is indeed the case.

2 For the transit program, we've given a faster
3 spend rate for transit programs that, funding that I
4 mentioned earlier for only three years, that may not be
5 adequate to ensure funding, especially as time goes on.

6 And let's see. Another issue would be for the bus
7 and bus facilities that I've hinted at earlier. It
8 authorizes a -- a total amount for -- for bus and bus
9 facilities. But meaning -- and -- and that includes a
10 hundred and ninety million for the discretionary funding.
11 But let's see. So it includes the hundred and ninety
12 million annually in discretionary funding, but the balance
13 actually goes to the -- the formula program.

14 So if -- if appropriate -- if appropriators were
15 funding down the line, if they fund on that sort of level,
16 what will happen is that the discretionary money, that there
17 could be little of it to be dished out even if it was
18 authorized in this bill.

19 And I guess the last potential issue that I caught
20 late last night when I was spending some quality time with
21 the bill was -- and it was urbanized formula grant money to
22 finance the operating cost and equipment in facilities for
23 up to two fiscal years in any area. But there's certain
24 limitations that it places on it.

25 The first one is that the population has to be

1 below 200,000. And with a three month unemployment rate,
2 over seven percent. And at least two percentage points
3 greater than the lowest three month average for the area
4 during the preceding five years. So if -- if that is making
5 your head hurt, it made mine hurt last night as well.

6 MR. McBETH: So what city in the northeast does
7 that refer to?

8 MR. SALAZAR: No kidding.

9 MR. GRANGER: So yeah. I mean, I'll -- I'll be
10 taking a look at that year's later statistics data to see
11 just what areas that is actually referring to currently.

12 MR. RIBAKOVE: I do think that's pretty narrow.

13 MR. McBETH: Yeah, Detroit.

14 MR. GRANGER: So as far as next steps go, I'm
15 sorry I'm being so long-winded on this, Senate Majority
16 Leader Mitch McConnell said that he will keep the chamber in
17 session through Saturday if necessary to push the bill over
18 the finish line. Let's see. That fight that I mentioned
19 over the controversial EXIM Bank may also await that -- but
20 despite that, McConnell probably has the -- the kind of
21 support that he needs to push it through because -- an
22 initial vote that -- that failed -- procedural vote on
23 Tuesday that failed actually went through tonight. So it
24 seems like he probably does have the support to get this
25 bill passed the Senate.

1 And but even if the Senate is able to do that, the
2 House GOP has all but pretty much dismissed this bill. They
3 have their own short term extension that would extend it to
4 December 18th. And that \$8,000,000 extension relies on
5 \$3,000,000 worth of TSA savings of fees and \$5,000,000 in
6 tax compliance measures.

7 So the wheels are in motion. The axle is a little
8 cracked. But that's the latest from the federal
9 reauthorization saga. Does anyone have any questions that I
10 can try to answer?

11 MR. McBETH: This is John. My main question is
12 even if the Senate gets it out by Saturday, do you -- you
13 and your people think that there's even a possibility that
14 the House would agree with it they would even have time to
15 consider?

16 MR. GRANGER: It's pretty unlikely.

17 MR. McBETH: Yeah. Yeah.

18 MR. GRANGER: So yeah. I think a lot of people
19 are wondering why it is that they are trying to do this.
20 But -- but I don't know. The -- you know, they do have some
21 bipartisan support and I guess that they felt like, you
22 know, they -- I think that they were really committed to
23 doing a -- a six year bill and they just got it out very,
24 very late just before the deadline. But yeah, that will be
25 interesting to see what happens.

1 MR. McBETH: Thank you.

2 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I have one question.

3 On the 5339 program that you mentioned of the potential
4 increase in funding, that's -- that's really good news, but
5 I guess my question is there is no change in the way the
6 allocation will be per state. Every state will still get
7 the same -- the same amount, meaning that the state of Texas
8 will get the -- the same amount that Rhode Island will get.
9 Nothing has changed there.

10 MR. GRANGER: I don't -- you know, I need to take
11 a look at that particular language. My -- my impression so
12 far is that it -- it's not any kind of a per capital formula
13 that it's still probably a flat amount, but --

14 MR. SALAZAR: That's what it looks like.

15 MR. GRANGER: -- but I -- but I need to -- to
16 double check that and that's a good question.

17 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

18 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. I think J.R.'s -- I
19 would agree with his assessment based on what you said. It
20 goes up to a hundred and two million, but if the minimum --
21 state minimum is 2,000,000; you can do the math.

22 MR. McBETH: Okay. Yeah.

23 MR. GRANGER: Yeah.

24 MR. GLEASON: And so, you know, we're every bit as
25 much as what we were before. It's just that there's a

1 little bit more. Yeah. Okay.

2 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so Ryan, I've got a couple of
3 questions and -- and I appreciate John's point. This bill,
4 you know, very likely won't make it out. So, you know,
5 spending a whole lot of time on it. I appreciate you doing
6 it, but we probably shouldn't.

7 But there are a couple of questions just because I
8 figured this is indicative. This is the first time they've
9 got a substantive six year old in a while. So -- so a
10 couple of questions. One is MAP-21 stuck us with 20 -- 2000
11 Census data in terms of their allocations by state and
12 substate. Do you know if that's fixed in this version?

13 MR. GRANGER: You know, I haven't taken a look at
14 that yet, but I can look into that and -- and get back to
15 you on that. I -- I think that -- there was a large outcry.
16 I would be shocked if they hadn't updated the 2010 Census
17 data, but I'll definitely look into that and -- and get back
18 to you if I can.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And then -- then no major
20 program shifts. I mean, money shifts in the way -- you
21 know, they've -- they're getting their revenues in and some
22 amount shifts, but in terms of the overall programs, no
23 major shifts in programs?

24 MR. GRANGER: That's right. Yeah, there weren't
25 any, you know -- you know, subtractions of programs or like

1 --

2 MR. GADBOIS: Consolidations or any --

3 MR. GRANGER: -- some of the MAP-21 rearranging.

4 Yeah, I -- we really didn't see any of that. You know, if

5 -- you know, I'm -- I'm going to take a closer look, but it

6 doesn't seem like at this point that there's anything like

7 that.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. STEPHENS: Anyone else? Michelle, you're
10 still with us?

11 MS. BLOOMER: I'm still here.

12 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. If we don't have any
13 comments from -- from the Board -- or from the Committee, we
14 do have someone wishing -- wishing to speak. Paulette
15 Shelton with Fort Bend. Would you like to speak on the item
16 update on federal authorization?

17 MS. SHELTON: Yes, I just wanted to point out in
18 terms of what is in the Senate bill, the TxDOT legislative
19 agenda as well as the TPAA and Compo and others included and
20 issued that was related to the cap on operating expenses
21 goes back to this hundred bus language in the large urban
22 areas.

23 The special provision in there actually put an
24 operating cap on smaller systems. And those systems that
25 are in the urbanized areas and are dealing with the formula

1 in there which essentially places the cap based on the
2 number of revenue hours. It -- it caused problems.

3 We have worked with our legislature, legislative
4 leaders in this to have a special provision enact with the
5 third one above the one that you were talking about that it
6 deals with the low income areas.

7 Essentially, this language will allow operators to
8 come to an agreement within the region on how they will
9 affect the use of those funds. I just want to point out
10 that that is something that is certainly very important to
11 Fort Bend County but it also is there and will be able to be
12 used by other operators across the -- all of the state that
13 find themselves in a situation where that affects them.

14 On the second side of the bill, there was another
15 issue with that language. It actually totally took away the
16 ability for a small operator less than a hundred busses that
17 was not operating fixed route service to have any operating
18 support. And there's a technical correction in that on the
19 Senate side that allows an operator that's only doing demand
20 response to access the -- the operating funds. They will be
21 subject of course to the threshold with the formula in
22 there, but there are two fixes in there that have been
23 important to Texas and will be important to other operators.

24 I have been able to confirm on the House side that
25 what will come out on the House side does include the fix

1 for the -- the special provision that we talked about. It
2 has been placed on that side. However, I have not been able
3 to confirm whether or not the demand response fix is on that
4 side.

5 I will also point out that there was another issue
6 related to the 5310 program. I've just been made aware of
7 that and I don't see it on the Senate side. It had to do
8 with the ability to use preventative maintenance, funding on
9 5310 on any vehicle in the fleet. I don't find anything on
10 that and I can't -- I was just made aware of that this week.
11 But I -- I went through the corrections, a hundred and
12 twelve page document. I don't find anything related to that
13 on it. I did receive 1,030 page document yesterday, but I
14 did go ahead and get some rest last time and didn't --
15 didn't read through that.

16 So I just wanted to be sure that we are aware that
17 there are some important fixes in that for transit systems.
18 And we need to be sure that they are maintained both on the
19 Senate side and the House side.

20 MR. STEPHENS: All right. Thank you, Paulette.
21 Any -- any other questions for folks up here on the federal
22 legislation update?

23 (No audible response).

24 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

25 MR. RIBAKOVE: Before we leave this topic, Mr.

1 Chair, by the next time we meet I -- I assume you - you all
2 might want this on your next agenda as well just to --

3 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, absolutely. Okay. We'll
4 hear this in September again. Another update on the federal
5 legislation?

6 MR. RIBAKOVE: Sounds good.

7 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Good deal. If there are no
8 other questions for -- for Eric or the staff here, then
9 we'll move on to -- if we're ready to move on to Item Number
10 7 the Review of 2015 Section 5310 Formula Grants for the
11 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with
12 Disabilities program activities.

13 MR. GLEASON: All right. This is Eric Gleason
14 again. I'm going to ask Kari to come on up.

15 MR. STEPHENS: Good morning, Kari.

16 MR. GLEASON: Yeah. Okay. Come on up and join us
17 at the table. In fact, why don't you -- I'll give you my
18 seat for the --

19 REPORTER: Well, it's -- we have a seat right here
20 that's --

21 MR. GLEASON: Oh, all right.

22 REPORTS: -- all ready. It's all mic'd up and
23 ready.

24 MR. GLEASON: Oh, okay. Thank you. Kari Banta is
25 our Program Manager for the 5210 program. As you -- as you

1 know, next week the Commission will be asked to approve a
2 program of projects for the next year. And we will be --
3 right now we're in a period of -- of reflection and it's an
4 opportunity to reconsider and to talk about potential
5 improvements to the process associated with how we manage
6 the program here.

7 And so I think it's -- this was something that we
8 talked about yesterday at the semi-annual meeting. Many
9 Committee members were -- were there for that conversation.
10 And so this is timely, Mr. Chair.

11 And the one thing that the staff would encourage
12 the -- the Committee is this is something that has been on
13 the agenda numerous times. And I think it's -- I think it
14 would be helpful for the Committee to try and -- and reach a
15 point where they -- as they can specifically itemize out
16 areas that you would like staff to look at for improvement.

17 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Very good. I think we all
18 understand what we want to do with this one. Kari, if
19 you're ready, go ahead and give your report.

20 MS. BANTA: Yeah, sure. If I could direct you to
21 the -- the PowerPoint presentation at the end of the packet.
22 Most of you have that. Because of the dramatic changes, I
23 just wanted to look at how the money was distributed. There
24 were some significant changes this year.

25 I guess the -- the biggest would be the change in

1 preventative maintenance. And that came up before. I know
2 that that's a -- a major factor. The restriction on 5310
3 purchase vehicles only really changed how things worked.
4 The amount going to fleet was about the same. The purchase
5 of service increased. And then actually if you go to the
6 next page, there was a significant increase in the other
7 category which went to mobility management. Because of the
8 -- just an enhanced focus on coordination, mobility
9 management, there's a -- a natural category to increase in
10 this situation.

11 On the -- the next slide, there is an award
12 distribution before MAP-21 to get an idea of how things have
13 changed over the past several years. And we can see that
14 there is significantly more preventative maintenance and
15 fleet for those.

16 Just kind of see that changes occurred with MAP-
17 21. They were further tweaked by the -- the circular. And
18 the -- the major factors were that the local transit
19 districts were no longer traditional 5310 providers. So
20 they no longer qualify on their own for a capital 80-20
21 match.

22 The increased public involvement for projects is
23 significant and very specific. And again, the preventative
24 maintenance is only for 5310 purchased vehicles. So that's
25 sort of a brief overview of what happened this past year.

1 I also included in the packet a -- a summary of
2 the circular looking at the particular -- look at the other
3 sections that are the most applicable. Some of the changes
4 that we made in our process this year responding to these
5 changes in a circular -- we're trying to meet the
6 requirements that are present. And I guess the -- we have
7 to meet the requirements. How we do that is something that
8 we would appreciate some input on from the Committee.

9 Our emphasis is to be a -- a best in class state
10 agency. We want to keep -- minimize gaps in service either
11 inadvertent or unintended. And we would like to increase
12 the predictability of outcome from one year to the next. I
13 know that that's -- especially this year we're kind of all
14 up in topics with the funding issues. But I know that to
15 run an organization, you -- you want to know more than one
16 year in advance. So things might be going.

17 We have seen some of -- some issues that have come
18 up in the process this year. We know that it was
19 significantly more work for the applicants. And I really do
20 appreciate everyone who -- who put in the work and -- and
21 got the things in.

22 The -- other issues that came up were with the
23 scoring teams. Our challenge was finding knowledgeable
24 scorers who weren't involved in any of that partnerships or
25 kind of a direct role. General recruitment in this case is

1 difficult since it's a significant time commitment. A lot
2 of times the PTCs will -- the public transportation
3 coordinators will -- will return to the same scoring team
4 members each year. And the change in the program
5 requirements make it complicated to review. So I guess
6 that's just a -- kind of a quick overview. I can answer
7 some specific questions.

8 MR. STEPHENS: All right. Thank you, Kari. I'll
9 open up. Michele, I know you're online. Do you have -- do
10 you have any questions or comments for the staff or Kari?

11 MS. BLOOMER: No.

12 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Not really. No. I'm sorry.

14 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. How about J.R.?

15 MR. SALAZAR: Yes, I -- I have one question. I
16 know yesterday at the operator meeting you posed the
17 question to the operators about how they felt on the -- the
18 application deadline being the same with the coordinated
19 call. I wanted -- I wanted to flip that and see how that
20 went towards you and PTN when you're judging those
21 applications. How -- how did you feel about that process?

22 MS. BANTA: It doesn't have as much of an impact
23 on our side of the things because the scoring process for
24 the coordinator call and 5310 are different. The 5310
25 happening at a local level. I believe it caused a little

1 bit of conflict for the public transportation coordinators
2 to -- were involved in according to call scoring and then
3 also how to run their district local efforts as well.

4 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

5 MR. STEPHENS: John?

6 MR. McBETH: No questions.

7 MR. STEPHENS: No questions. Glenn?

8 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so there are I guess two sets
9 of questions. One is new process in -- in some new
10 requirements on 5310 program and how you're doing it. Do
11 you all -- have you all established any kind of an
12 evaluation methodology such that you can come back with a
13 harder assessment than, you know, seems okay, they were
14 complaining, there were concerns about -- do you all have
15 evaluation methodology?

16 MS. BANTA: We -- just this week we asked for
17 specific comments from our staff as well as the operators
18 yesterday. Part of the sort of wrapping up the application
19 process as each of the public transportation coordinators
20 submits an annual report which gives feedback from the
21 scoring teams, observations. I mean, we --

22 MR. GADBOIS: On -- on the process.

23 MS. BANTA: On the process, yes.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Okay. And so then those will
25 be -- that will be data in --

1 MS. BANTA: Uh-huh. (Affirmative).

2 MR. GADBOIS: -- and then you will produce some
3 sort of an evaluation on either things to adjust or, you
4 know, directions to keep going.

5 MS. BANTA: Yes.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Yes?

7 MS. BANTA: Yes.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And when will we see it that
9 way?

10 MS. BANTA: That will be ready for -- when is the
11 next PTAC meeting?

12 MR. GLEASON: I think that -- this is -- this is
13 Eric Gleason. I think that we will be able to describe to
14 the Committee at the next meeting any changes in the program
15 that we anticipate for the next year and the source of the
16 impetus for those -- those changes.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Good. Thanks. And -- and then
18 substantively for the presentation, so -- so there's a
19 noticeable and rather radical shift in -- in the way some of
20 the funds are spent between 14 and 15. And -- and I just
21 want a general sense. Are -- I -- I assume things like the
22 prevent -- the shift in preventative maintenance, you know,
23 by 50 percent is due to changing requirements.

24 MS. BANTA: Exactly.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Is that -- okay. And -- and then

1 the shift in mobility management doesn't seem to be so. Is
2 that an indication of business model changes, or is
3 something else going on?

4 MS. BANTA: That actually is part of the changes
5 from the circular because transit districts no longer
6 qualify for the capital funding on their own. There is the
7 need to -- to coordinate more with nonprofits and local
8 state agencies that are approved to -- let's see. To
9 coordinate services for seniors and individuals with
10 disabilities. Part of how you maintain that coordination
11 and coordinate service would be through mobility management.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So -- so just to make sure I
13 retain this, tell me if I'm incorrect at all, the mobility
14 management -- the -- the significant increase in mobility
15 management is due to local operators having to now do more
16 work coordinating among agencies that might apply 5310 and
17 bringing them in so that they can apply for 5310 and it is
18 not mobility management directed at helping consumers
19 connect to transit, yes?

20 MS. BANTA: Yes, I wouldn't say that it is focused
21 on connecting consumers to transit, but because you're not
22 dealing with multiple providers or multiple sources of
23 customers that having that mobility management link helps
24 more efficiently distribute the -- the customers throughout
25 the system.

1 MR. GADBOIS: But is there any evidence of that?

2 MS. BANTA: Yes. Actually, we have some of the
3 systems in the state. Their mobility management and
4 purchase of service amounts have increased because of
5 successful ridership. I would say most notably we had an --
6 an increase in the number of Centers for Independent Living
7 who applied and have receiving funding. They're a natural
8 fit for mobility management in a way because they tend to
9 perform the travel training that's -- that's sort of key to
10 that system

11 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Yeah, have you --

12 MS. BLOOMER: Rob.

13 MR. STEPHENS: Yes. Yeah, Ms. --

14 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I have -- I have
15 a question sort of to piggyback onto Glenn. So we follow
16 significant increase in the mobility management. Is that
17 for transit providers or is that for non-traditional folks
18 that are receiving the mobility management fund? I guess my
19 question is transit providers, local transit districts can
20 no longer qualify on their own for a capital fund which has
21 been the traditional use for the 5310 by transit providers.

22 Now that that's not an option, another way to get
23 funding is to go mobility management. So I'm -- I'm
24 wondering if that's just a shift because of the change in
25 the program.

1 MS. BANTA: It's partially a shift. When it is
2 connected to the increase in purchase of service, the -- the
3 definition of traditional right now are the nonprofits and
4 the coordinated -- coordinating state agencies. The -- the
5 mobility management is used to determine and to make use of
6 that purchase of service.

7 So a lot of times it's not necessarily the transit
8 provider who is receiving the mobility management funds.
9 That position could be with the -- the triple A association
10 on aging. It could be with the ADRC. And it could also be
11 with the Center for Independent Living.

12 MS. BLOOMER: So what portion of the 5310 funds in
13 2015 went to traditional versus nontraditional providers?

14 MS. BANTA: The -- I guess I don't have that
15 number specifically. I have -- because -- because the local
16 transit districts qualified for capital funding if they
17 partner with one of the what is now defined as traditional,
18 one of the nonprofits or state agencies, the -- in that
19 case, the transit districts would be included under the
20 capital funding. So that -- that would be what shows up in
21 my statistics. Only 10 percent of the funds went into the
22 other category which includes operating and then any -- any
23 non-partnering agencies who applied for one. I hope that
24 clarifies it.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, did that -- did that

1 answer your question? Kind of sort of?

2 MS. BLOOMER: A little. I guess the -- where I'm
3 coming from and I guess my concern is there -- there wasn't
4 sufficient funding in the 5310 program prior to this change.
5 And now if the change -- and it's not necessarily a bad
6 thing. But less of the funds are going directly to the
7 transit providers to provide service. And now they're
8 funneled through other entities which is encouraging
9 coronation, but decrease in the amount of funds that are put
10 into actual provision of service.

11 MR. STEPHENS: I got you.

12 MS. BANTA: Yeah.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Kind of curious how that's going to
14 play out.

15 MS. BANTA: The only -- the only comment I would
16 make along those lines is that by doing the purchase of
17 service, is that the 80-20 federal match instead of the --
18 the operating -- if the funds were going directly the local
19 transit district. And that's only at a 50-50 match. So in
20 some areas, that -- that may play out in favor, but that's
21 definitely something that's going to vary locally.

22 MR. GADBOIS: We -- in -- in Michelle -- so you've
23 -- you've done it -- you've done -- God, I'm losing my
24 voice. You've done a good job of -- of tracking that one
25 and I've got -- I've got one other that I just want to --

1 and I don't even know how we come out on this, but I know
2 that I'm not getting enough data to really understand what's
3 going on.

4 So -- so the mobility management investment, you
5 know, it's a good thing to have mobility management
6 facilitating coordination between partners and bringing in
7 new partners and that creates an opportunity for new
8 investment, yadda, yadda. So -- so I can see purpose for
9 that.

10 It's also a good investment for mobility
11 management when that mobility management can help users and
12 customers of the system to actually access, right? The one
13 thing I can't parse from that, is this some of the mobility
14 management going to now have to pay for the transit
15 operator's ability to go and do the coordination to get the
16 5310 grant money out of the door as well as those other two
17 things?

18 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. If I can jump in,
19 Glenn. I think that -- we actually confronted that -- that
20 situation with this -- with this call, because we got
21 proposals for both kinds of mobility management that you
22 described.

23 What we tried to do is to focus on the latter.
24 Focus on the one for this program and these funds, focus on
25 the one that connect people to rides leaving the other part,

1 the coordination part, for the regional coordination
2 planning program. We got both, but we tried to separate
3 them exactly as you've described them focusing this program
4 on staying as close to service provision as it could be.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And -- and I mean, for the
6 record, I don't know that I would even mind which one of
7 those three kind of functions we're getting paid for in the
8 mobility management stuff. I know there's an additional
9 requirement as they're having to pull in new partners and
10 they're having to help them, as John has often described he
11 does help them to actually comply with all the grant
12 requirements, et cetera.

13 I just don't understand or see clearly how much
14 might be going to that grant management kind of mobility
15 management versus the coordination mobility management
16 versus the getting people on busses mobility management.

17 MR. GLEASON: So it's the extra overhead. It's
18 kind of like --

19 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

20 MR. GLEASON: -- are we creating additional --

21 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

22 MR. GLEASON: -- overhead --

23 MR. GADBOIS: Exactly.

24 MR. GLEASON: -- just to do this thing.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Exactly.

1 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

2 MR. McBETH: Yeah, and this is John. That was my
3 question, because we're talking about under other -- looking
4 at the 6.4 million in 2015, are others roughly 1.2 million.
5 So 62 percent of that is going for mobility management. My
6 question would be is that putting -- is that putting people
7 in seats or is that money being utilized to support the
8 infrastructure, the staff, the administration to do that
9 which in the rural programs when -- when we're running it,
10 we're doing that through our 5311 program supporting that
11 infrastructure and using every bit of the 5310 money to put
12 people in seats.

13 And that -- that's my question. I -- I think it's
14 an intended consequence if it -- if it's not putting people
15 in seats. We're -- it was -- the money wasn't ever meant to
16 be utilized for the administration of -- of the program in
17 and of itself. And that's -- that's the drawback that I
18 see.

19 And I -- I don't know how we get to that. I don't
20 know how we flesh that out. It seems like you all have
21 already seen it though because of what you just said about
22 the fact that you're splitting them off so that the
23 coordinated call does one thing and this does the other.

24 MR. GLEASON: To the extent that we can understand
25 it.

1 MR. McBETH: That you can understand it, yeah.

2 MR. GLEASON: But I think if I can, you know, so
3 one possible area of improvement for us to think about would
4 be either through some language in the proposal request
5 itself that would make that distinction and, you know,
6 discourage proposals --

7 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

8 MR. GLEASON: -- that create additional overhead,
9 if you will. I don't know how it will say that, but
10 basically that would be it. And encourage proposals that
11 were more directly related to getting more people on the
12 bus. And we -- we can look at providing some guidance in
13 the application itself that would help us separate that out.

14 MR. GADBOIS: We -- which --

15 MR. McBETH: And I -- I agree with that a hundred
16 percent because it's such a small amount of money, but it's
17 an important amount of money.

18 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so we want -- we want that as
19 an outcome without a doubt. But I mean, I'm not even there
20 yet, Eric. What -- what I'm asking for is data so we can
21 see what's kind of going on and better understand it and see
22 whether it's worth significant tweaks or whether it will
23 play out over time. I just don't know yet.

24 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. What I'm hearing is a couple
25 of different things. I mean, I -- I hear your -- your data

1 questions. This is Rob. Would -- would it be helpful if --
2 if we took something like this award distribution, if it was
3 a little more specific, maybe added some categories or some
4 information that broke the data down a little further for
5 the next meeting?

6 MR. GLEASON: I don't know if we can.

7 MR. STEPHENS: You don't know if you can?

8 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

9 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

10 MR. GADBOIS: It -- well -- well, so -- so that's
11 my question to you all is -- is do we have any way to even
12 pull enough information to understand what's going on?
13 Yeah, no?

14 MR. STEPHENS: Eric, is there a problem just --
15 just compiling the data or is it just something that we're
16 -- we're -- we can't do?

17 MR. GLEASON: Well, it -- it -- it's one of these
18 things I think you have to ask for it to get it. And we
19 didn't ask for it. So for us to go and try to find it, I --
20 I -- it's not really something --

21 MR. GADBOIS: You don't really have it.

22 MR. McBETH: I think -- I think -- and this is
23 John again. Unless you -- unless you put in the call that a
24 definition of mobility management and that everything they
25 put in mobility management has to exactly match that. It

1 can't be administration, but that would be impossible for
2 you to go back. You -- you would have to have 5,000 people
3 to do that.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Well, good lord, John. That's --

5 MR. McBETH: Reading all that data. I mean, it's
6 impossible. It can't be done.

7 MS. BANTA: Can I -- can I raise a point? And
8 this is kind of a -- a larger point related to this. One of
9 the things we were talking about, Eric and I were looking at
10 setting priorities for the funding. So mobility management
11 would follow after -- after that, follow under that. We
12 would also be looking at for example prioritizing existing
13 service, sort of --

14 MR. GADBOIS: Well -- well, but see here -- so
15 here is the essential question that I have a problem just
16 same priorities right off the bat.

17 MS. BANTA: Okay.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Is we're doing a shift. We're doing
19 a transition. Right. And the transition is always a little
20 more difficult, a little more time consuming, a little more
21 work for everybody. I don't mind paying for some of that if
22 in the long run it gets us where we want to go, right?

23 MS. BANTA: Uh-huh. (Affirmative). Yeah.

24 MR. GADBOIS: But picking a priority now and
25 saying we're going to do that from here on doesn't

1 appreciate the trouble of transition, right? So -- so
2 that's why I'm only asking for an assessment of what's going
3 on to kind of engage -- is that transition or is that
4 problematic of the new requirements, and they're requiring a
5 lot more overhead and they will forever?

6 MS. BANTA: Right. I wouldn't -- definitely this
7 year there was a significant burden or a significant
8 requirement for the coordination and that required -- it
9 made a lot of outrage, a lot of establishing or formalizing
10 partnerships that had existed. You know, I know that there
11 were a lot more meetings, a lot more phone calls. A lot
12 more went into giving the letters of partnership this time.

13 With those partnerships now establishing and, you
14 know, hopefully the -- the funding we've given for mobility
15 management in some cases can help enhance that. I don't
16 anticipate it being as difficult in the next year to get
17 those -- I mean, it's just a continuation -- continuing the
18 relationship instead of trying to establish new
19 relationships. So that's a good point.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Just -- I -- I mean, I guess
21 Rob I'm looking for just be sensitive to that as you're
22 going forward having conversations. And -- and if you see a
23 way to start putting that kind of thing into your grant or
24 your pre-grant meetings to try to come to a little bit of an
25 evaluation.

1 That -- that would -- I think it would be helpful
2 for everybody. And having said that, you know, I'm -- I'm
3 happy to put forward the priorities with -- the priority
4 that this money especially is about seats, people in seats
5 with some appreciation that transitions or cost. I don't
6 know how we do that, but --

7 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

8 MR. GADBOIS: -- that's your problem, not mine.
9 (Laughter).

10 MR. STEPHENS: Well, this is -- this is Rob. I --
11 I don't -- I -- I agree with -- with everyone. I just --
12 I'm not sure that I agree that it's going to be that
13 difficult to figure out what's going on. I mean, if you've
14 got a provider that is being awarded mobility management and
15 they're not involved in the coordination that are directly
16 responsible for that, I mean, it would be safe to assume
17 that they are trying to put people in seats. I mean
18 mobility management has always been important as a provider,
19 you know, whichever system I've been in. It's extremely
20 important connecting people to seats. So I think you can
21 make some reasonable assumptions about what folks are doing
22 with the funds. I mean, if you know the entity and the
23 types of business that they're involved in.

24 I don't think it would be -- I know we didn't ask
25 for that information this past application process, but I

1 think you can make some safe assumptions and just collecting
2 some data that would be able to get you to a place of better
3 understanding.

4 So that -- that's all I would ask for is just a --
5 just a little more data, whatever we have to give us an
6 understanding for what we think the funds are being used for
7 as we move forward. I -- I believe Eric and his staff can
8 include some guidance and future applications to break down
9 the mobility management in a type of administrative function
10 or putting people in seats function.

11 I know that over the years I've met lots of people
12 that -- that call mobility management all kinds of things.
13 I've always viewed it as putting people in seats. I think
14 it's a real elaborate kind of an extensive definition to add
15 all these others things that we do in calling mobility
16 management. And that -- that's fine. And -- but -- but I
17 agree with Glenn and others that we probably should figure
18 that out and figure what our priorities are.

19 But I would still like data as -- as Glenn would
20 and -- and maybe make an attempt at trying to put something
21 together that would allow us to see, you know, who received
22 what and if it was a -- if -- if it was an out -- if it was
23 an independent agency, an independent living center or a
24 provider, we can make some safe assumptions about what
25 they're doing with the mobility management funds although we

1 didn't ask them.

2 I -- I would still -- I still like the breakdown
3 and the distribution of funds. I would probably ask for
4 just a little more detail to give us some help at figuring
5 out what's going on, because that -- that would be my --

6 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

7 MR. STEPHENS: So anybody else? Anyone else,
8 J.R.? Anyone else?

9 MR. SALAZAR: No, the -- the only point I would
10 like to clarify is that Glenn mentioned that, you know,
11 TxDOT having to do the work. I am a little concerned about
12 the new now traditional providers being in the 5310 world
13 and the PTN staff and particular the PTCs out in the field
14 used to have just transit districts. And the few 5310
15 providers now we have the transit districts, the urban
16 districts. And then you have a multitude of 5310 providers.
17 And I wonder if -- if TxDOT and PTN and PTCs are -- are
18 ramping up to -- to get out into the field more and because
19 it is going to be substantial.

20 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. We had -- this
21 program has always been the source over time for a large
22 number of non-transit agency sub-recipients. It is -- and
23 -- and it is also true that this -- this process the last
24 time through resulted in some new sub-recipients for our
25 program. We -- we are working with agencies that we've

1 never worked with before.

2 It is something that is a concern, because it is
3 -- you know, as you all know, the federal program and its
4 regulations and compliances is -- is very large. It's very
5 complex and very demanding. And so actually as a -- as a
6 matter of general direction, I am looking to try and reduce
7 the overall number of different entities that we deal with
8 for all of our programs.

9 I think right now we have agreements with over a
10 hundred and fifty different entities, if not, a little more
11 than that. That's less than we used to, but it -- it's kind
12 of bumped up this last time with -- with this -- with this
13 new process.

14 Now and it's also true that 85 percent of our
15 funding goes to the 30 urban transit districts and the 38
16 rural transit districts in the state. So we're -- you know,
17 we've got 15 percent of the funding tied up in a majority of
18 the number of entities that we work with. And so there is
19 that -- that mismatch when you add to it then all of the --
20 the burden of -- of the compliance program. So we need to
21 find a way generally over time just so we can be successful
22 in -- in drinking that overall pool.

23 So I -- I appreciate -- I don't know if the
24 overall number is any bigger than it's ever been in terms of
25 impact on our staff. New agencies take more time than

1 existing ones. That's -- that's true for sure. We have a
2 ways to go I think before we're where we need to be from an
3 overall -- that's --

4 And I think -- you know, John -- John made a great
5 point. I mean, you know, each one of these individual
6 entities has their own overhead and -- and that the -- the
7 overall if we want to focus the most amount of the overall
8 programs we manage into service itself, then we need to be
9 watching that.

10 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah. Yeah.

11 MR. GLEASON: It just gets complicated to actually
12 manage to a number --

13 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

14 MR. GLEASON: -- without being arbitrary and
15 capricious about picking what that number should be.

16 MR. McBETH: Yeah, we -- and this is John again.

17 We have -- you know, because we -- we work with so many
18 non -- nonprofits that we over the year supply 5310 vehicles
19 with and we disqualify about a third of the ones that
20 request the money because they ask the question of how much
21 of the money can they use to pay for their overhead.

22 And -- and our philosophy has always been none.
23 It's -- we're buying a vehicle to carry people. That's what
24 the money's for. But I mean, we literally disqualified that
25 one-third of them because they want money to pay for

1 overhead because nonprofit corporations normally -- well,
2 they're nonprofit. They don't have a lot of money. They're
3 looking for new funding sources. So that -- that's my fear,
4 is that that 62 percent -- like I said, it's only 1.4
5 million dollars, but that's 1.4 million dollars, \$50,000 a
6 vehicle. That's -- that's 26 vehicles statewide with 15
7 seats a vehicle. That's a lot of seats.

8 MR. GLEASON: And my perspective.

9 MS. BANTA: Yeah, I would -- I would like to add
10 something. We're looking at with the coordination
11 potentially adding more sources of funds. I know at the --
12 the PTN level here in Austin, Kris Dudley has been looking
13 at getting workforce funding. We're continuing to try to
14 get the Health & Human Services money; bars. There's a
15 summer food and nutrition program that we piloted this year.
16 Try to get the kids to receive the free lunches during the
17 school year, getting them to sites during the summer which
18 would increase ridership.

19 And, you know, the key to that is getting funding
20 for the transportation. Something that we're -- you know,
21 we're trying to do this year and we're working on getting
22 done next year. So that's -- we're with -- understanding
23 the limitations of what we can do strictly within 5310 we
24 are -- and the staff is looking at -- at ways to get -- more
25 we'll need to supplement.

1 MR. GADBOIS: The division is for state
2 distribution or by the area you are?

3 MS. BANTA: By area.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

5 MS. BANTA: Because one of -- one of the aspects
6 of 5310 is that it -- it is all extremely local. Right.
7 The -- every situation is different.

8 MR. GADBOIS: So are these things like workforce?

9 MS. BANTA: Yeah, exactly.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

11 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. This is Rob. I -- this is
12 coming back next agenda, this 5310?

13 MR. GLEASON: Well, what -- what we talked about
14 is being in a position at the next meeting to describe any
15 changes in the program that we anticipate for the next
16 application process.

17 MR. STEPHENS: To include kind of some of the
18 things we've been talking about to --

19 MR. GLEASON: We will attempt to kind of draw some
20 of the things we've heard today into what we show you at
21 your -- at your next meeting.

22 MR. STEPHENS: The like -- okay. Because -- very,
23 very, very good. So what is -- Eric, what is the timeline
24 for the process to begin? So would September be good enough
25 -- will be that be quick enough for us to respond --

1 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

2 MR. STEPHENS: -- and applications and all that
3 good stuff? Because --

4 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

5 MR. STEPHENS: -- last year I think the process
6 began in around Octoberish, I guess, when you do --

7 MR. GLEASON: I think we began in November.

8 MR. STEPHENS: -- labor.

9 MS. BANTA: Yeah, released the middle of November,
10 yeah.

11 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. So it would be a few months
12 to kind of know what we need to do? Okay. All right, guys.
13 Everybody good? You guys -- J.R.?

14 MR. SALAZAR: I'm good. I just have one final
15 comment to kind of tie in back in to what Michelle said.
16 Speaking from a rural perspective, you know, we -- we have a
17 -- a minimum way of getting funding where we had the job
18 access reverse commute program where we can tie into that
19 and we had the New Freedom. We can tie into that.

20 Well, as we all know, those are gone and now we're
21 left with our federal and state funding and the 5310 that we
22 used to count on pretty -- pretty regular. And now that
23 obviously is -- is being dwindled down too. And so I have a
24 little concern on the rural areas not being able to get as
25 much money as they used to.

1 MR. GLEASON: And can I make one point?

2 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

3 MR. GLEASON: Okay. I think it's important --
4 J.R. brings up a very -- very interesting point, because I
5 think it's important to understand that as a whole the state
6 of Texas is getting every bit as much funding from these
7 programs as it ever has. But it's changing in how it comes
8 to us.

9 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

10 MR. GLEASON: You know, the JARC and New Freedom
11 program, the money didn't go away. It got consolidated into
12 other programs. And Freedom got consolidated into 5310.
13 JARC got consolidated at 5311. And we have different ways
14 of allocating funds in those programs, so you don't have the
15 potential that we had under safety lieu with JARC and New
16 Freedom of accumulating larger amounts of money for a single
17 project, because it is being spread out more uniformly
18 across the state because of the way it now comes down to us.

19 5310 in addition to that also, you know, comes to
20 the state differently with a different allocation with 60
21 percent of the overall pro amount to the state being
22 allocated to large urbanized areas. And as we all know,
23 it's difficult to move funds between those areas into other
24 areas of the state.

25 And what really complicated it for us was our

1 historic investment with that program as a compliment to
2 existing services, our historic investment was where there
3 were no surfaces which have been the rural area. And now
4 the large urbanized area where there is the most amount of
5 alternative services available has the largest share of the
6 program.

7 And so that is what is -- it's that stuff which is
8 really twisting this process for us and in addition to some
9 of the -- the changes in the federal guidance.

10 MR. GADBOIS: We lost -- we lost 60 percent --

11 MR. GLEASON: But it's really complicated.

12 MR. GADBOIS: -- right up front.

13 MR. GLEASON: As a state, we did not.

14 MR. GADBOIS: No, the state didn't, but --

15 MR. GLEASON: But in terms of what we have in the
16 remaining areas of the state under --

17 MR. STEPHENS: Exactly.

18 MR. GLEASON: -- 2000 to get done what we have
19 historically been able to do, it's less.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Right. Exactly.

21 MR. GLEASON: So that's the -- that's the
22 challenge.

23 MR. McBETH: This is listed as an action item. Do
24 you need a --

25 MR. GLEASON: No, sir.

1 MR. McBETH: You don't need --

2 MR. GLEASON: That is there in case the Committee
3 wishes to take action.

4 MR. McBETH: Oh, okay.

5 MR. STEPHENS: Anyone wish to propose a motion?
6 Or I guess -- I guess Eric's going to bring this back at the
7 next meeting, with recommendations for change based on all
8 the things we discussed here. Does anyone feel we need to
9 make a motion on that?

10 (No audible response).

11 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All right. We'll see this
12 again on the next agenda with some recommend --
13 recommendations for change from Eric and his staff. If you
14 guys are ready to move on to the next item, we'll move on to
15 Item Number 8 presentation on coordinated regional planning
16 activities.

17 MR. GLEASON: Steve -- Steve Wright, our Program
18 Manager, will provide the Committee with an overview of the
19 -- the recommendations that we are moving ahead with at next
20 week's Commission meeting just to give the Committee an
21 opportunity to -- to understand what -- what we have moving
22 forward in terms of the next major update of our plans.
23 Steve.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Good morning. Always good to -- to
25 see you all again. Just a quick status report for you. As

1 Eric mentioned, a minute order will be before the Texas
2 Transportation Commission next week for just over 1.8
3 million dollars forwards to 21 lead agencies across the
4 state of Texas. These will be for contracts that we aim to
5 have executed on September 1st of this year.

6 The funding is for the lead agencies to
7 collaborate with regional stakeholders to develop the next
8 five year public transit human services transportation plan.
9 The regions across the state will conduct a number of
10 planning activities as part of the process to develop these
11 five year plans. This includes an inventory of
12 transportation resources in each region, an assessment of
13 the public's unmet transportation needs in each region. A
14 gap analysis that will follow those activities.

15 And all of the information gleaned from those
16 activities and data will inform the development of the plan,
17 the five year plan for each of the state's planning with
18 goals, objectives and priorities that would be set. The
19 specific approach for carrying out these activities and
20 exactly how each region's respective plan will be developed
21 will vary from region to region.

22 This as you all know will be an inclusive planning
23 process. That inclusive process is at the heart of the
24 regional transportation planning effort engaging diverse
25 stakeholders including public and private transportation

1 providers, MPOs, health and human services agencies,
2 individuals 65 and older, individuals with disabilities,
3 veterans and any number of other key stakeholder groups.

4 I will mention that subsequent to the last
5 conduct, I had the opportunity to present before you all.
6 We did have a series of workshops in February and March of
7 this year across the state. They were highly successful and
8 included presentation of a new guidebook for this program as
9 well as presentations of best practices from lead agency
10 staff noticing stakeholders from across the state.

11 These plans will be completed and approved by
12 February of 2017. So in this minute order next week, we
13 anticipate the funding will be awarded -- will be one award,
14 but they will be administered in two separate contracts, one
15 for FY-16 and one for FY-17 for the various lead agencies
16 across the state. One award, but two contracts for
17 administrative purposes.

18 And then again, it -- after these are completed in
19 February of 2017, it will be another five years and then
20 we'll go through the process again. Just as a refresher
21 based on what we've talked about in previous PTAC meetings,
22 subsequent to completion of this next five year plan, the
23 regional planning funds for the interim years before the
24 next five year plan is developed will be -- the bulk of that
25 funding will be for pilot projects, which is a bit of a

1 change from operations in the past and we've talked about
2 that. But just a refresh -- a fresher for -- a refresher
3 for you, for what the long term plan is after February 2017.

4 That's a quick status report for you. If you have
5 questions, I would be happy to respond.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, you still with us?

7 MS. BLOOMER: I'm still here. No questions.

8 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Let's go around the table.
9 How about J.R.? You got anything? Mr. Vice Chair John?

10 MR. McBETH: I have nothing, no.

11 MR. STEPHENS: Nothing? Glenn?

12 MR. GADBOIS: Uh, so -- so thank you, Steve. I --
13 I appreciate both the refresher and reminder of where we
14 were, because I was doing my calculation. And wait, aren't
15 we doing something different here and, you know -- okay. So
16 I'll ask my characteristic one because I'm going to keep
17 asking it for pretty much everything. As we go towards the
18 transition, have we appropriately discussed with all of the
19 folks where we're headed after this one? Do they know it's
20 coming?

21 MR. WRIGHT: If by all of the folks you mean the
22 lead agency staff?

23 MR. GADBOIS: The -- the lead -- the --

24 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

25 MR. GADBOIS: -- the lead agencies and/or they've

1 had discussions in their --

2 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

3 MR. GADBOIS: -- coordinator request.

4 MR. WRIGHT: The -- the workshops we held around
5 the state in February and March, that was a key part.

6 MR. GADBOIS: Introduced -- introduced --

7 MR. WRIGHT: That was a key part of the
8 discussion. The concept was received well. And I'm certain
9 that we will have plenty of additional communication as we
10 move forward and closer to getting to that -- that point.
11 Since we introduced that idea in February and March, the
12 bulk of our attention has been directed at the more
13 immediate need of getting these next five year plans ready
14 to -- to -- be ready to hit -- hit the ground on September
15 1st. But we certainly will have additional communication
16 and we welcome any suggestions or input on, you know, how
17 that might be done or information to the -- in part.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And -- and this -- the -- the
19 second one that I'll ask regularly is, think about the
20 evaluations of this. What are the objectives you actually
21 are trying to achieve in the transition and -- and what
22 information might you want to get from that so that you can
23 evaluate the progress?

24 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

25 MR. GADBOIS: So that we're not always in this

1 conversation of oh, we didn't, you know, we don't have any
2 data on it.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Maybe we can get ahead of that
5 curve.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

7 MR. STEPHENS: I had a quick question. Steve,
8 this is Rob. Of the 1.8 million moving forward after
9 February 2017 for pilot projects, do you anticipate -- is it
10 the total amount for pilots projects or a portion of the
11 amount for pilot projects or --

12 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, that's a good question. To
13 clarify that, the 1.8 million is the amount that is
14 available for this coming funding cycle which will be for
15 the development of the next five year plan our funding is
16 going in cycles and we have somewhat of a spike every fifth
17 year because we realize that more effort needs to go into
18 the development of these plans.

19 So that amount, that 1.8 million amount, is
20 anticipated to be less during those interim years. We don't
21 know exactly how much less, but somehow --

22 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think Stephen -- I think you
23 said it earlier. This is Eric. The -- the 1.8 million is
24 actually two years of \$900,000 --

25 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

1 MR. GLEASON: -- each year.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Correct.

3 MR. GLEASON: So it's not -- that 1.8 million is
4 not an annual number from an annual apportionment to a grant
5 program. It's 900,000. And I think generally we're
6 targeting -- I think we're generally targeting roughly half
7 that amount on an annual basis moving forward through a
8 pilot program phrase. Although we're not -- we're not --
9 that's -- that's not a -- that's not a hard stop number.

10 I think we're -- we're -- we can use the -- the
11 source of funding we use for this effort is also coming. We
12 can use to advance needed facility projects and things for
13 project development. And so we're trying to strike a
14 balance between sort of the ongoing need of this program and
15 the ever present need and growing need we have to advance
16 facility projects through a project development. So if and
17 when discretionary funding because available, we're ready to
18 go.

19 And so, you know where we'll be in 2017 is we'll
20 be -- hopefully we'll -- we'll have engaged a number of
21 pilot projects in this effort which will be generating hard
22 data for us to understand the value of the coordination
23 planning effort and we'll be able to begin to quantify
24 outcomes and results with that -- that effort. And -- and I
25 -- I don't know how much funding that's going to entail, but

1 we are going to try and strike a balance in these interim
2 years between that requirement -- or that -- that need and
3 then the need to spend it elsewhere.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Very good.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Wait. And -- and can I say
6 something? It's slightly different than you did, but I
7 don't think I disagree at all. Part of our discussion Rob,
8 was that for some people the regional planning process seems
9 onerous and/or is a -- is a perfunctory --

10 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

11 MR. GADBOIS: -- check off the box, right?

12 MR. WRIGHT: How do we know we're successful,
13 right.

14 MR. GADBOIS: As a consequence, one of the things
15 we're -- we were trying to do with pilot is, let's see if we
16 can't introduce some innovation such that locals could help
17 us find a more helpful and more productive way for them to
18 do the same thing, right?

19 MR. STEPHENS: Right. And along the lines -- this
20 is Rob. Along the lines that you were asking is, do these
21 agencies know this because they are using this to fund
22 positions that they conduct meetings, but they plan
23 together, you know, write these plans and all that, is a
24 portion of that going to be taken away from them in future
25 years to implement a project or to do -- so do they know

1 that because -- that they can make adjustments I guess
2 or --

3 MR. GLEASON: So I'm -- I'm going to say they have
4 heard that.

5 (Laughter).

6 MR. GLEASON: So I -- I anticipate that to be a
7 huge issue when it hits.

8 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Okay. Just --

9 MR. GLEASON: I -- and I -- and I don't know. We
10 will talk about that, and even with that it is going to be
11 difficult.

12 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Now this is John. I would say at
14 900,000 a year, 21 agencies, that's a little over \$40,000
15 per agency. That's significantly down from where this
16 program started years ago which I -- I find that to be just
17 wonderful. I think that's a great idea. I think limiting
18 to 40,000, I -- I would like to see them limited to 20, but
19 I think -- I think that's a good thing. By now they should
20 have it down. That shouldn't cost that much money to do an
21 update, a five year plan, from my perspective. I mean,
22 that's just my perspective. And we do a lot of planning at
23 brasses, so --

24 MR. STEPHENS: Very well. Thank you, Steve.
25 Michelle, you still with us? You got anything you want to

1 share with the community? Michelle?

2 MS. BLOOMER: I'm still here. I'm good.

3 MR. STEPHENS: You're good?

4 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

5 MR. STEPHENS: I -- I hate to keep bothering you.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

7 MR. STEPHENS: I just want to make sure that if
8 you got something you -- you just have to say --

9 MS. BLOOMER: That's okay if you're making sure
10 I'm still awake. That's good.

11 (Laughter).

12 MR. STEPHENS: All right, guys. If -- if anyone
13 has any questions or any more for Eric or Steve?

14 (No audible response).

15 MR. STEPHENS: if we have no others, we'll move
16 on. Thank you, Steve.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

18 MR. STEPHENS: Move on to Item Number 9, a
19 discussion and development of Public Transportation Advisory
20 Committee work plan based on PTAC's guiding principles and
21 comments made at the January 22nd, 2015 meeting. Mr. Eric
22 Gleason.

23 MR. GLEASON: This is mine? Okay.

24 MR. STEPHENS: Do you want to get that? I guess I
25 -- will you help intro -- I -- I don't -- or --

1 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think it's an opportunity
2 for the Committee to revisit their work program, what --
3 what specific areas that were identified in the principle,
4 do they want to continue to focus on in subsequent meetings.
5 This item is on every agenda.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

7 MR. GLEASON: And it is there just to allow the
8 Committee to discuss it to -- to confirm what it is it's
9 interested in working on. So it's really a Committee
10 discussion.

11 MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, can I lean on you for
12 this one just a little bit as a previous chair? I know I
13 remember past meetings where this was something that you're
14 involved in trying to put work committees together. Do you
15 have any comments about our work -- our work plan or guiding
16 principles?

17 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I think based on
18 our conversation last time we -- it would be up to you, but
19 I think we need to take -- we would need to take another
20 look at where we are on the work plan and where we wanted to
21 focus on efforts going forward. And if I kind of recall the
22 last meeting, I think we started to do that with identifying
23 the 5310 and the urbanized area issue, the two priorities.
24 But we may want to look at putting more details to each of
25 those.

1 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. I -- I have questions about
2 the difference between a work plan and guiding principles.
3 You know, I -- I -- when I asked for this stuff from the
4 office, they said well, we don't have a work plan but we
5 have guiding principles. So I don't know. Do we need to
6 make it a work plan or can we keep the guiding principles?

7 MR. GLEASON: It's up to you, sir.

8 MR. STEPHENS: I -- okay. It's up to me I've --
9 I've heard. So I've read through the guiding principles.
10 They look broad enough to me. They look direct and succinct
11 and broad enough to -- to be able to do the work here at the
12 Committee level. Has everyone else had a chance to view
13 those? You guys? J.R. --

14 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

15 MR. STEPHENS: -- you got any? I'm -- I'm pretty
16 good with them for now. Michelle, I'll let you -- I know --
17 I know you were pretty active in it, so I'm going to depend
18 on you for any changes or any -- any comments you want about
19 --

20 MS. BLOOMER: That I think --

21 MR. STEPHENS: -- our work plan.

22 MS. BLOOMER: I would agree. I think the guiding
23 principles are fairly broad and could be used to incorporate
24 anything the Committee chose to look at. I think that was
25 the intent sort of to get down our -- our core -- our core

1 beliefs as such. But then the work plan I get -- and that
2 doesn't have to be anything formal. At least it was never
3 in my mind. But sort of okay, it was in our guiding
4 principles.

5 Here are the two or three we're going to focus on
6 and here are the one or two specific things we're going to
7 be looking at, because it doesn't say if I recall the
8 guiding principle like the 5310 program, but there is like
9 coordination. And within coordination we could look at the
10 coordinated call. We could look at the 5310 program and how
11 the changes are impacting coordination and service, et
12 cetera. But was just when -- how when I was here my brain
13 works. It's -- like Eric said, it's all you now.

14 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Well, my brain works pretty
15 -- pretty similar, Michelle, but I --

16 MR. GLEASON: That's a scary thought.

17 MR. STEPHENS: It's a scary thought Eric says.

18 (Laughter).

19 MR. STEPHENS: But I think --

20 MS. BLOOMER: I'm sorry.

21 MR. STEPHENS: Listen. No, I would --

22 MR. GLEASON: I wouldn't direct that to you,
23 Michelle.

24 MR. STEPHENS: No, I -- I appreciated your
25 leadership as a previous chair. I -- what I would like to

1 do is just -- we'll accept the guiding principles as it is.
2 We'll -- as we continue to talk about them and refine them.
3 I'm -- I'm happy with the way they look now and unless
4 anyone has any changes they want to make or suggestions for
5 change, they look -- broad enough for us to be able to do
6 the work that we're doing and -- and we can make progress
7 moving forward on those topics. I think we're -- we're
8 good.

9 MR. GADBOIS: And -- and so Mr. Chair, if I can
10 just remind, we decided at last meeting and they're kind of
11 in our minutes, but we ought to keep this fresh in our mind.
12 They were going to focus on three things, 5310, which we
13 just did and will continue to do. The second is a look at
14 Census. And that's supposed to be coming up in September.
15 And kind of get in front of Census, you know, 2020 changes
16 and how that might affect us; what the issue are. And the
17 third one is, you know, kind of looking towards TxDOT --
18 TxDOT's long range plan and -- and how that's implemented,
19 progressed towards and et cetera particularly where we
20 transfer concern, right?

21 MR. STEPHENS: Right. I remember those now.

22 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so if we just keep, you know,
23 making sure we're making progress on those, that's enough of
24 a work plan for me.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. What I'll -- What I'll --

1 what I will do for the next meeting, I -- I'll take a look
2 at those guiding principles and see if I can add something
3 in here for consideration in our next meeting and streak
4 them so we can remain focused on them. Good enough, fair
5 enough?

6 We have -- someone in the audience wants to speak.
7 Paulette Shelton. Stand up here. With Fort Bend County.
8 In the public comment section for the work plan item.

9 MS. SHELTON: Yeah, and I'm a little bit confused
10 now in terms of the work plan that whenever you say I want
11 to comment actually on two things and that is the work plan
12 and what's included in that work plan and secondly on the
13 topic -- topic process.

14 In regards to the work plan, I'm a little bit
15 confused about the guiding principles and whether or not you
16 have a specific work plan. But in as far as specifically
17 what I would encourage you to do is to move forward with
18 this issue of urbanization and the effects that it's going
19 to have on us.

20 Not only here, but we've got a specific issue that
21 we need to be able to hear in -- in access. I've done the
22 research. If you look on the double perspective all the way
23 back to 1990 there has been a variety of fixes that have
24 been implemented after a Census process to take care of the
25 issues that have been, and we'll call that a transportation

1 system as a result of Census bandwidth changes.

2 We have also seen local initiatives come through
3 in 2000 in the Harris County region put something in place
4 to take care of their problems that happened then. We just
5 heard a discussion this morning about 2010 and what we're
6 trying to do with -- with 2010. It happens at the federal
7 level and it's happening at the state level. At the state
8 level and across the country, we are no longer in a
9 situation where it is large metros providing service in a
10 large urbanized area.

11 We are no longer in a situation to where we see
12 pretty much everything remains the same over a period of
13 years. We saw here in Texas, systems move -- grow up into
14 small urban and large urban. We saw system drop down as
15 population and -- and Census boundaries changed and we saw
16 what that did to our formula allocations and -- and how we
17 struggle to deal with that.

18 When I look at Fort Bend County specifically and
19 -- and this goes to the -- the nature of this is so
20 complicated, the first thing that I look at is the amount --
21 the amount of the area in Fort Bend County that is in an
22 unincorporated area.

23 The second thing that I consider is our
24 responsibilities to come up with a local match. Well, how
25 do I do that? Typically you're going to look at sales tax.

1 You're going to look at special view districts and other
2 things.

3 We have a state constitutional cap on sales tax of
4 eight and a half percent. And most of our cities are
5 already there. I've got one or two that aren't there, but
6 there -- one of them was just created a few years ago and
7 there's not very many people there yet for me to provide
8 service to.

9 In terms of special districts that a county might
10 access to generate and/or even a transit district to attempt
11 to generate revenues, existing law allows one special
12 district to be in there and not necessarily another one to
13 be overlaid on top of it. So if there's already an EMS
14 district or a fire district or something like that, an
15 unincorporated area, we're not going to necessarily be able
16 to go in and do anything that can generate revenues.

17 When I look at the amount of area that I have that
18 is in unincorporated areas, I can't necessarily turn to my
19 cities for help out of their general revenue and sales tax.
20 Most of them, if they got something going towards economic
21 development, it's very difficult to pull off of that. So
22 those funds are committed.

23 We need to begin to look at what's happening with
24 this and what we do as we grow up and the fact that it's no
25 longer the -- the major metro that is providing service at

1 the large urbanized area. We've got to look at what we've
2 done in the state. I'll do the research on state public
3 transportation support. In the beginning, there was support
4 there on the state level for systems operating in large
5 urbanized area. At some point it was moved away from like
6 to marry the federal programs.

7 But what are we going to do and how are we going
8 to do it? We saw yesterday a presentation that encouraged
9 us to plan. We saw yesterday what's happening with the
10 state with population. What we know is that as Linda put
11 it, we got two sessions left before the Census. We're
12 usually about three sess -- three years behind in terms of
13 that data coming out, and the boundaries actually telling us
14 doing it. If we're lucky, we may have three sessions. We
15 need to begin to whittle away at this and affect some sort
16 of solution before we're faced with this again in the 2020
17 Census changes that we'll deal with.

18 I don't know if you want me to make my comments
19 now on the public comment process or if you would like me to
20 wait until that agenda item.

21 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, let -- let's -- let's wait a
22 little bit. Let's --

23 MS. SHELTON: Okay.

24 MR. STEPHENS: Let's let the Committee chime in on
25 some of those comments. I -- I appreciate those. The --

1 are you -- are you -- have you seen our -- our work plan or
2 guiding principles?

3 MS. SHELTON: No.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Are you aware of them? Okay.

5 MS. SHELTON: No, I haven't.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Are -- are you liking what you're
7 hearing so far? Glenn kind of recapped last time what our
8 -- what our focus was, 5310, the Census, Texas -- TxDOT's
9 long range plan. Does that --

10 MR. GADBOIS: When -- when -- and Paulette, so
11 we've got on September for our meeting from Linda to come
12 and start the initial kind of landscape presentation. It
13 sounds like she did that for you all yesterday.

14 As -- as I would anticipate this and not only --
15 we haven't agreed as a committee, but, you know, the first
16 thing is wrap your mind around what the issues and problems
17 are and then we'll start parsing out what we as a committee
18 can do. You -- you and anybody else for the public are very
19 welcomed to come and provide your -- your great advice and -
20 - and kind of expertise or experience at any one of those
21 meetings.

22 MS. SHELTON: I appreciate that. I just encourage
23 you to leave that on here in general and let's get to work
24 on it.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Well, the --

1 MS. SHELTON: And we'll get the total comments on
2 -- on that.

3 MR. McBETH: This -- this is -- this is John.
4 And, you know, the -- the next meeting Linda's going to be
5 giving us a report based upon the subject that I was the one
6 that first brought it up which was there's -- there's a --
7 there's a gigantic iceberg that is rising in the next senate
8 -- in the next Census. We've already encountered it in the
9 last Census and that is the 200 -- the cities of -- of 50 to
10 200 that go about 200 that are still receiving state funds.

11 And that's -- that's what encouraged me or
12 prompted me to ask that we take a look at that, because it's
13 -- it's a very big issue. I'm not saying we take their
14 state funds away. We have to recognize it's there. 200,000
15 and plus cities do not get state funds or -- or are not
16 supposed to under the current law. And so we're going to
17 have to deal with that. Whether that's creating a new
18 funding source and getting the legislature to fund it
19 because I don't think TxDOT has the money laying around to
20 do it. That's -- that's why we want TTI to -- to tell us
21 what's going to happen, because in the next Census we're
22 going to see the same thing happen again and it's going to
23 be a lot more of the 50 to 200s that go above the 200,000.

24 I think right now those that are above 200,000 are
25 using what, about one-third of the entire 5307 state funds,

1 about one-third. And that's what, five, six cities?

2 MS. SHELTON: Yeah.

3 MR. McBETH: Five cities. So they're using a
4 third. So --

5 MS. SHELTON: And not all of those -- not all of
6 those operators that are operating in a large urban area are
7 part of that.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and --

9 MS. SHELTON: So there's some -- it's -- it's a
10 complicated issue.

11 MR. McBETH: Yeah, it is. And -- and it's -- it
12 -- it would -- you know, when I first started the business,
13 the Metropolitan Transit authorities received 80 percent of
14 the public transportation funds in Texas, that -- that there
15 was a public transportation fund and 80 percent of those
16 state funds went to the MTA. Over the years they gave up
17 percentage after percentage after percentage and finally one
18 year they just said because they were in trouble with the
19 legislature we said we don't want any more state funds.
20 Leave us alone. You all can have them all, the amount
21 between the rurals and the small urbans. And so that's how
22 that happened.

23 So in the -- Linda's right. We've got three
24 sessions and that -- that seems like a lot, but as Liz can
25 tell you, no, it's not. One session goes by like this.

1 It's -- it's very difficult to convince the people over
2 there in that big building to give you more money.

3 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so but do we --

4 MR. McBETH: It's a little bit --

5 MR. GADBOIS: -- do we have this as a September
6 discussion not a --

7 MR. McBETH: I think this is on -- I think this is
8 on the agenda for September that --

9 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

10 MR. McBETH: -- that Linda's coming back to --

11 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

12 MR. McBETH: -- talk about this -- this very
13 issue. We're -- we're aware of the issue. What we're doing
14 is reaching out to -- to TTI to get them to tell us what's
15 the direction to go. What -- what are you all's
16 recommendations so that we as a -- as a committee can make a
17 recommendation that Eric can carry out the line to -- to
18 tell others here -- here is the iceberg and let's try not
19 to be the Titanic. Let's not hit it. Let's -- let's melt
20 it and figure out a way around it.

21 MR. GADBOIS: It's a position on global warming.

22 MR. McBETH: Yeah. Yeah, global warming.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Paulette --

24 MR. McBETH: And I'll -- and I'll take position on

25 --

1 (Laughter).

2 MR. STEPHENS: You -- you are a large urban that
3 does not receive funding? You're a large urban that does
4 not receive state funding?

5 MS. SHELTON: That's correct.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

7 MS. SHELTON: And again, those -- you know, it's
8 -- it -- it bears the federal process in regards to, you
9 know, if you -- if you get out there and get ahead -- ahead
10 of it like it happened in the Harris County region back in
11 2000. There was a special provision in there that took care
12 of that issue in Harris County and what has happened with
13 this issue of these large urbans being in there now hard to
14 deal with what they were able to do to affect that change
15 when it happens.

16 So, you know, it's -- it -- it's -- it's a -- it's
17 a process oriented thing is the way that it -- that it came
18 about. And I think what I'm trying to advocate is that we
19 take a more planned approach. We're all aware of the issues
20 and what they are. We're all aware of -- of where we are
21 now and why we got there and how we got there.

22 What we're trying to do now is kind of get -- get
23 ahead of this triangle -- or iceberg or -- or whatever it is
24 and in my mind develop an approach that has to do with what
25 we know is going to happen and what those issues are with

1 each of the providers. Whether they're real small or
2 larger, because large urban providers are no longer the
3 large metro supported by sales tax, they're just not.

4 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so Mr. Chairman, I need to do
5 a point of order here.

6 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, sir.

7 MR. GADBOIS: Because we can't really do work on
8 this. It's not an agenda item. Paulette, can you come back
9 in September?

10 MS. SHELTON: I will do my best, yes.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you. So can we, you know,
12 save this till a time we can --

13 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

14 MR. GADBOIS: -- actually do work on it --

15 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

16 MR. GADBOIS: -- and have a discussion about it?

17 MR. STEPHENS: Sure, you bet.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

19 MR. STEPHENS: You bet. Is there anyone else?
20 That's -- that's -- well, I'm -- I'm actually -- we've got a
21 speaker that wants to be -- I'm trying to actually trying to
22 keep us going just a little bit so I can have this other
23 person come in, but we can move on if -- if we're done.

24 If Paulette you're done with that one, I know you
25 had additional comments under the public comment section for

1 Number 10. If we're done with Number 9 and there's no other
2 discussion on that one, then we'll -- we'll move onto the
3 Public Comment session. I would like to encourage anyone
4 out there that wants to make public comment please come up
5 here and see Josh and sign up and -- and give us -- give us
6 your words of wisdom. So with -- with that, Paulette, will
7 you -- we'll go ahead and take your comments under the
8 public comment section number -- number 10, Item Number 10
9 on the agenda.

10 MS. SHELTON: Yeah, I just wanted to encourage
11 you. I don't know to what extent you control this or
12 whether it was the type that controls it. When you have a
13 public comment section here that first of all is at the
14 agenda -- end of the agenda. It's really not clear how to
15 make public comment or when to not -- I struggle with that
16 here and I handed in my papers at the beginning of the thing
17 or the meeting or what.

18 More importantly, I -- it was interesting to me
19 the last month and the month before when I made inquiries on
20 how to make a public comment. And I discovered that we have
21 a meeting that most of the time is held in Austin, but it --
22 this is the -- a public meeting affecting matters of the
23 entire state.

24 But public comment is only accepted in person. We
25 know that we have a very big state and it's very expensive

1 to travel. And the technology is certainly there today that
2 would allow public comment at least by telephone or some
3 other means. Public comment I'm sure can be accepted ahead
4 of time in writing, but when we look at the agenda book
5 using -- I'll see if there's an email address.

6 I just think that there needs to be some thought
7 in the manner in which this Committee accepts public comment
8 and the accessibility and the availability of people to do
9 that. And I just -- I just didn't -- I didn't find that. I
10 couldn't attend one of the meetings and I wanted to send
11 something in. It was like well, no, you've got to be there.
12 I can't call in, I can't do any of that. No -- no, you've
13 got to be there and you've got to do it there. And then
14 when you look and you consider that, you do have action
15 items on there. But even if the public were here to do it,
16 it's not necessarily on the agenda that they can make
17 comment on that and then of the action. That's really not
18 clear.

19 So those were my comments on the public comment
20 process and I would encourage you to -- to kind of think
21 about that and the accessibility of it.

22 MR. McBETH: Yeah, this is John. I -- I would make
23 comment. I think that that's not something that this
24 Committee can address. I think that's something that the
25 Department would have to -- relative to public comments, the

1 Department would have to ask your general counsel if -- if
2 in a public meeting you can take public comments.

3 I know in the legislative session those of you
4 that -- that didn't have the misfortune to be there, there
5 was huge, an absolutely huge fight because of some -- one --
6 one legislator had allowed or had encouraged other people
7 --

8 MR. STEPHENS: Oh, yeah.

9 MR. McBETH: -- who were not at the hearing to
10 register public comments. And they -- they were not there.
11 And evidently the techno -- the Texas Administrative Code
12 does not allow you to make a public comment if you were not
13 there in person. You're not allowed to do it over a
14 computer, over the wire.

15 So I would -- I would -- before we get into this, I
16 would suggest that we get a meeting from -- from your
17 general counsel and I -- I have -- I have a feeling what
18 that opinion is going to be based upon all of the things
19 that happened at that -- that one brief 15 minute, also fist
20 fight on the floor of the house.

21 MS. SHELTON: And I would certainly understand
22 that the attack may --

23 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

24 MS. SHELTON: -- may do that and I can --

25 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

1 MS. SHELTON: -- certainly understand the reasons
2 why. So perhaps the solution is -- is some sort of a -- of
3 a way to do it in writing ahead of -- of the meeting, you
4 know, a --

5 MR. McBETH: I --

6 MS. SHELTON: -- an email address that's set up
7 for that purpose and it's included in your packets and read
8 into the record or something.

9 MR. McBETH: I don't know. I'm not an authority
10 on it. I just -- I just know what -- what's required in the
11 legislature and if you're not -- if you're not in that room
12 --

13 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so that isn't completely true.
14 You can do --

15 MR. McBETH: You can do written --

16 MR. GADBOIS: -- written testimony to the
17 Committee.

18 MR. McBETH: You can do written and -- and submit
19 it. Yes. You can do written testimony.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Right. And -- and in which case,
21 you know, all we're doing Eric is have a conversation with
22 general counsel or whomever, see if there are opportunities
23 to expand our ability to give public engagement including in
24 writing. And make sure that's on every agenda, yadda,
25 yadda. Yeah. Thanks.

1 MR. STEPHENS: Very well, I understand we have a
2 public comment, Regina from Independent Living Center, State
3 Independent Living Council. So before we move on, I would
4 like to give Regina a chance to -- to give us --

5 MS. BLYE: I'm coming.

6 MR. STEPHENS: I know. I know. We're just --
7 we're waiting patiently for you. So what we'll do is --
8 well, just sit right here.

9 MS. BLYE: Okay. I need to -- I have some --

10 MR. STEPHENS: You got it.

11 MS. BLYE: I have some things I want to bring the
12 floor.

13 (Laughter).

14 MS. BLYE: Thank you. There's two different sets.
15 I -- I made more than one copy so if others were attending.
16 Hi, my name is Regina Blye. I'm the Executive Director of
17 the Texas State Independent Living Council. And I'm here
18 today just to give some comments about our organization as
19 well as the Centers of Independent Living. I was listening
20 on the phone on the way over here and I heard the Centers
21 for Independent Living mentioned a few times. And also
22 wanted to talk about our summit that we have coming up in
23 November -- next month, August 16th through 18th.

24 I have passed out an overview of our organization.
25 Basically you're the first one to get kind of a peek of what

1 our -- our report is going to look like. And I thought it
2 would be safe right now to at least give you the independent
3 living philosophy approach and background of our
4 organization.

5 But our organization is statewide. We focus on
6 independent living making sure that people with disabilities
7 are able to maintain or become independent in the community.
8 And one of the things that our organization does primarily
9 is writing a new year plan called state plan for independent
10 living. And in that plan that's current we identify
11 transportation as a major barrier for people with
12 disabilities. And we wanted to look at services and
13 agencies that the Centers for Independent Living could
14 connect with and hopefully try to fill in the gaps for the
15 consumer base.

16 And so what we did was look at writing a series of
17 grants that would do two things. We wanted to try to get
18 more sales involved in TxDOT services by finding non-
19 traditional partners. And so we started that off with
20 Odessa Midland. And we here at Center for Independent
21 Living, started the process and then we moved over the Leah
22 Beltran who is with Disability in Action in Abilene. And
23 she has a voucher program and has several service trips that
24 she's provided now with at -- with at least year on our
25 project.

1 Our second phase was to look at transportation
2 from people with disabilities in rural areas and look at the
3 state of transportation to see if it's adequate and if it's
4 doing its job for people with disabilities in rural areas
5 that are looking to work. So we received JARC funding which
6 we all know is also farther away. And we wanted to see what
7 it looks like.

8 So over the last year, we've submitted over 10,000
9 surveys. We have had over 24, almost now 30 public
10 engagement events to give feedback from primarily consumers
11 which we call people with disabilities, seniors and people
12 who work with that population to give their feedback about
13 transportation at their end of the state.

14 The excerpt that I was referring to is a piece of
15 that report. Right now we're working on trimming it down.
16 We're at a hundred and forty pages. So you can say we
17 weren't doing anything. But I think it's a really
18 comprehensive report that kind of looks at what people say
19 transportation looks like in the state. And we're hoping
20 that that information is just a blueprint for people to say
21 -- it's interesting with the comments that we received and
22 what can we do moving forward. And these are some of the
23 things that we're going to discuss at the summit that's
24 going to take place in -- in Lubbock.

25 I do want to say that I appreciate working with

1 TxDOT. I've had a wonderful pleasure of working with the
2 liaison such as Vanessa Owens, Christa Lee, Kara. We -- I
3 think we have a wonderful relationship and from both sides
4 we learned a lot. Coming in we didn't know much about how
5 TxDOT functioned or how the funding came across, but one
6 thing that we did know was our consumer base and the things
7 that they needed. And so we hope that both sides can
8 collide and we would be able to have stronger services for
9 people with disabilities.

10 I am encouraged by your efforts for funding. I
11 was told that there were several seals that provide -- that
12 submitted applications to be able to continue that non-
13 traditional type funding. And I'm hoping that those efforts
14 continue. I know that we have a few that we're looking at
15 wanting to do mobility management and other types of things.
16 And so I'm hoping those things will now -- will come to
17 fruition.

18 I do want to state on Tuesday -- it's public
19 comment for the DARS and TWC transition that is going to
20 take place starting 2016. And there were about 30 people
21 that gave public comment. And the majority of the people
22 that gave public comment, they talked about transportation
23 being a barrier. Majority of the people that were there
24 were live or have a vision, and they had comments about that
25 it was difficult for them in the rural areas being able to

1 get into the city or even in the area to be able to have a
2 nominal transportation.

3 And so I made comments to DARS and TWC to have
4 transportation as the focus. And I asked them at least try
5 and set aside funding specifically for transportation so
6 that there was coordinated efforts between the agencies
7 because with the authorization of WIOA, Workforce Innovation
8 and Opportunities Act, the president signed that in July
9 2014. And it's a push for people with disabilities to be
10 gainfully employed to have inclusive and competitive
11 employment.

12 And I -- I know that they're throwing a lot of
13 money at people trying to get to work -- I mean, trying to
14 work. And if that's going to be successful, they want to
15 make sure that transportation is available and that it's
16 reliable.

17 So I -- I put that on the forefront. When it was
18 over, I had several people from Texas Workforce Commission
19 come over to me and state that they have heard
20 transportation as a barrier by many people and they were
21 wanting to look at that and trying to figure out ways to be
22 able to make sure that they address transportation needs and
23 try to set some funding aside. Who knows how long that
24 takes, but at least they know that it's on their radar and
25 they're wanting to look at trying to do something to make

1 sure that people with disabilities are successful.

2 I was here basically again to let you know that we
3 had the summit. There's also another page here. I wanted
4 you to be aware of if you didn't get it. It's a -- I guess
5 you would call it a stipend report that is available to
6 transportation providers. Kris Dudley was sending that out
7 to the transportation providers saying that there's funding
8 to cover expenses for providers who were wanting to go to
9 the summit. It's one person per agency. And so I have
10 copies of that. If you didn't know about it, you are able
11 to access it.

12 We're hoping that we have target people in the
13 room. We want transportation providers. We want feedback
14 from consumers which we call people with disabilities,
15 centers for independent living, any organization that is
16 interested in transportation to be able to tell you, well to
17 talk about what currently is going on with transportation
18 for people with disabilities and brainstorming what we can
19 do in the future with all these new people that are wanting
20 to be involved in this process.

21 Again, I apologize. I'm under the weather and I
22 was trying to get here in time. And thank you all for
23 allowing me to speak. If you have any questions, I'm more
24 than happy to speak.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Any questions for Regina?

1 MR. McBETH: Thank you. Thank you. We do a lot
2 of work in my organization, Bryan College Station Center for
3 Independent Living.

4 MS. BLYE: Yes.

5 MR. McBETH: And yes. So this is John. And I --
6 I know -- I know what a wonderful job you people do and what
7 a great resource you are for the community and for those --
8 for those people in the community that are consumers. So
9 thank you very much for bringing this to us.

10 MS. BLYE: Oh, no problem. Thank you.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Good to see you, Regina.

12 MS. BLYE: Good to see you. Thank you all.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

14 MR. STEPHENS: You bet. You bet. Okay. If there
15 are no other public comments, those are all the comments, we
16 will move to agenda -- agenda item Number 11 proposing --
17 discussing agenda items for the next meeting; confirm date
18 of the next meeting. So I have 5310 updates. I have
19 federal legislation. I have a work plan or guiding
20 principle edits or tweaks or whatever.

21 Are we going to talk about public comment update
22 on direction there?

23 MR. GADBOIS: And -- and Linda's --

24 MR. McBETH: Linda's urban --

25 MR. STEPHENS: Linda's urban report.

1 MR. GLEASON: Linda's urban -- yeah, we'll put
2 down for --

3 MR. McBETH: Linda's urban report.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Linda's urban report. The
5 urbanization of -- a Texas Census --

6 MR. McBETH: An LU -- an LUR.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And actually --

8 MR. McBETH: You would have to give it letters so
9 that she can understand it, but she speaks in alphabets.

10 MR. STEPHENS: Some more -- some more alphabets.

11 MR. McBETH: And you are --

12 MR. GADBOIS: Actually, would you put it down as
13 Linda's iceberg?

14 MR. STEPHENS: You want Linda's iceberg?
15 Urbanization Titanic report. All right, guys. I -- I would
16 like to add -- Eric, if not in your Director's Report next
17 time, a separate agenda item for the -- the effects of the
18 energy sector, the fracking report. If we could do that.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Fracking report?

20 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

21 MR. GLEASON: It's not a report yet. It's just
22 --

23 MR. STEPHENS: It's not a report yet?

24 MR. GLEASON: -- research getting under way.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Research getting under way. I

1 apologize. It's not a report yet. A report on our progress
2 on the research to put out here next time. All right.

3 Anybody else have any other items? Nothing else?

4 (No audible response).

5 MR. STEPHENS: All right then. I -- if no other
6 business here at the Committee, I adjourn the meeting.

7 Everyone want to vote on a motion? We can. I don't know if
8 it's not --

9 MR. GADBOIS: So -- so moved.

10 MR. STEPHENS: -- a good as a motion. We can do
11 it either way, but --

12 MR. GADBOIS: Happy to first or second, whichever.

13 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. So maybe you want a motion
14 --

15 MR. McBETH: If you want to make a motion then
16 I'll second.

17 MR. STEPHENS: All right. We may be adjourned.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

19 MR. McBETH: Otherwise we have to sit here.

20 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

21 MR. McBETH: That's the one -- I think the one --
22 the one thing a chair can't do.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Now --

24 MR. McBETH: Well, that -- well, that -- but
25 that's fine.

1 REPORTER: Let's just -- let's just confirm the
2 date for the next meeting.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Folks. Folks. The next meeting,
4 September what?

5 REPORTER: Thursday, September 24th is what's on
6 the schedule if that's all right with everybody.

7 MR. GLEASON: Works for me.

8 MR. STEPHENS: September what -- what?

9 MR. GADBOIS: September the 24th?

10 REPORTER: September 24th.

11 (Whereupon, at 10:27 a.m. the meeting was adjourned)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, CET, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 90, constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the PTAC meeting, held at 200 E. Riverside Drive, Auditorium, Austin, Texas, on Thursday, July 23, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.
DATED this 6th day of August, 2015.



Kimberly C. McCright, CET