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PROCEEDINGS

MS. BLOOMER: So we’ll go ahead and call the meeting to order. Josh is going to give us the safety briefing. So, Josh, I will turn it over to you.

MR. RIBAKOVE: If there’s a need to evacuate this room the main -- the way that we’re going to do it is out through those same doors you came in and straight out to the parking lot. Then we're going to turn right and head back towards the apartment and meet over there and wait for further instructions. If for some reason it's not safe to go out that way, we're going to go out this door here and the same thing, to the end of the hall, out the back of the building and come around and, same thing, to the same kind of place.

In case of inclement weather, if we need to shelter in place, this is the room for sheltering in place in this building so we will just stay here. As long as we're talking about safety briefing and stuff like that, the restrooms are out by the receptionist and just right across from the desk, you can see a little hallway, and men's and women's are right there.

And we do have some sign-in sheets on the table right by the door that you came in. We'd love to know who you are and where you're from. If you're not already on there, please do sign in. And we also have speaker sheets.
If you wish to address the committee in our public comments section, please fill one of those out and drop it off to me and I'll get them to Michelle. And those are all right on the table by the door. That is our safety briefing.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you, Josh. Before we get started I would just like to thank everybody for coming today to our PTAC meeting. And I apologize, we have our backs to you for the whole meeting, but this way everybody will get to see the screen and the presentation.

We'll move on to approval of the minutes from the May 27th, 2014 meeting. Has everybody had a chance to review the minutes? And if yes, I'll take a motion.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I'll move to approve.

MR. STEPHENS: This is Rob. I'll second.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Let's just go through, since we have somebody on the phone. Glenn? Do we still have Glenn?

MR. GLEASON: He's probably on mute.

MR. RIBAKOVE: No. No, he's --

MR. GLEASON: No, no, he's probably on mute.

MR. SALAZAR: He might be. Hey, Glenn?

MR. GLEASON: We can go to the Director's report --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- and come back.
MS. BLOOMER: Well, we'll move -- since we don't have a quorum. I did hear it go, like the bleep, when we were through the safety briefing, but okay. So we'll go on to the Director's -- Division Director's report.

MR. GLEASON: This won't take long, so hopefully Glenn will come back shortly. I'm Eric Gleason, the Director for the Public Transportation Division.

MR. GADBOIS: I'm back in.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, are you back?

MR. GADBOIS: I'm back.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, we lost you, so we moved onto the Division Director's report. As soon as Eric's done we'll go back and take action on the minutes, okay?

MR. GADBOIS: Good, thanks.

MR. GLEASON: All right. So I'll keep this short. I didn't have a written report in your packet. Not because Josh didn't try to get me to write one, but I just simply ran out of time. But I will talk a little bit about some topics that most everyone in the room with us today heard me talk about yesterday, but I think for the committee's benefit I'll put them out there so they are on the record.

You know, I think that we're entering into a timeframe with public transportation in Texas, particularly in the rural, small urban areas of the state, where there are a number of issues and situations that are converging at
the same time or coming together at the same time that will really make the next six to 12 months to two to three years very, very challenging. The first of those, and we've talked about this before, continues to be a concern that I have about our capacity as a state with these programs to in any sort of a predictable, sustainable fashion, asset maintenance and replacement programs.

We desperately need to come together and to find the ability to identify resources that we can program in some sort of a deliberate and strategic fashion to make sure that we are able to take care of such basic things as fleet and facilities. Our fleet right now, although right now, today, it's in reasonably good shape. If nothing changes about the financial situation that we're in, then three years from now about a third of the fleet in the state for the rural and the small urban programs that we have grant funds in, about a third of those 2200 vehicles will be beyond 150 percent of their useful life mileage. And, you know, each year that goes by without some additional capacity to address that -- you know, this issue is not a linear kind of an issue, it tends to build and feed on itself, and every subsequent year without some kind of a solution in place, the challenge gets even greater. So I'm very concerned about that.

We were very fortunate the last six or seven years
to be able to put quite a bit of money into fleet replacement that was all through discretionary program opportunities at the federal level. And with those opportunities not a part of the current authorization, and although part of the discussion perhaps, certainly not part of any sort of emerging solution in Washington to restore those kinds of funding opportunities.

We're in a -- you know, from the state standpoint, state funding has been flat since 2000, relatively flat since 2000, and you know, again, transit agencies operating in the rural and the small urban areas of the state have seen well over a 50 percent reduction in the per capita expenditure on public transportation of state funds.

That's kind of the backdrop for this. And then in addition to the asset maintenance and replacement issue, we have a very, very important and critical issue right now with the Medicaid medical transportation program as HHSC proceeds to finalize the elements of its new procurement with managed transportation organizations. I think they're working with five or six managed transportation organizations. And under the capitated risk approach there is a lot of concern that the resulting contract opportunities for traditional providers will be relatively limited. And, you know, this represented about 28 million dollars of contract service revenue last year for the state
for agencies operating in the state. They can use that money for match, they can use it for cash, and they can use it to help from a cash flow standpoint get through the times when they may be waiting for federal and state reimbursements.

So very concerned about the loss of those funds and the potential loss of those funds. I know there are a number of agencies who have traditionally been the prime contractors for those services that are going through plans and actual efforts to scale back their operations with that new reality. So very, very concerned about that.

And then the final thing I mention is we have in large areas of the state where the shale development, the energy sector development efforts are booming. While the -- for the state as a whole, the economic benefit of that is a good thing, there are a lot of costs that aren't necessarily being internalized or addressed in that effort that communities and in particular transit agencies are having to address. And, you know, wage rates don't -- aren't competitive to hire or keep operators or vehicle maintenance employees, physical wear and tear on vehicles, roads that are damaged from the energy sector activity. Congestion is adding to travel time and becoming more and more expensive to provide the same level of service that they've always provided.
And so those three specifics against the backdrop of reduced per capita spending I think really, you know, could dramatically alter what rural and smaller public transportation looks like in the next three to five years. So I need to work and I've committed to working with the industry and the Commission to try and do those kinds of things that TxDOT can do in this situation. And we also recognize that a lot of the solutions are beyond our capacity to address as well.

But those are just, I think, some things that are out there right now that I think could be of interest to the committee. Could have important policy implications for the program and I offer those to you for the record. And if you wish, we can talk about them more at future meetings.

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

(No audible responses)

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Hearing none, thank you, Eric.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: We'll go back to Item 3, approval of the minutes. We had a motion and a second. So we're going to call the vote. Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?
MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: -- it has to be here and aye.

MS. BLOOMER: So I have a yes or an aye from

Glenn.

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, from J.R. Michelle, yes. And

Rob?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Alrighty. So the minutes are

approved. Moving on to Item 5 on the agenda, legislative

appropriations request discussion.

And, Eric, who will be leading this --

MR. GLEASON: I think I am.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Great.

MR. GLEASON: So we put this item on your agenda

because it's that time again where the department is

considering the -- its legislation -- legislative

appropriations request for the 2016-2017 biennium. And in

your packet we included a letter that this committee sent to

the Commission back in 2012 when it was at that time

considering the appropriations request for '14 and '15.

So we're at that point in time again. The general

question for the committee is do you wish to weigh in on

this process. The Commission is scheduled to get from staff
a draft proposal at their commission meeting next week. And they are scheduled to take action on an LAR at their August commission meeting. So this is the timeframe for the committee, if it so desires, to weigh in on funding issues that it thinks should be addressed in the LAR. And so I'll just leave it at that.

You all have seen the -- had a chance to read the letter that was sent last time. And I'll turn it back over to you, Madam Chair, and let you lead the discussion to determine what you all want to do.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Eric.

I guess do we have any thoughts or comments? I think from my standpoint I would like to try again to send a letter. I think probably need to update a few numbers, and based on what you had mentioned, maybe highlighting three of the issues, maybe adding those to the letter as well.

My only concern is we've done this -- I think this is the third time or will be the third time we have sent the letter.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: With very little results. The one time we did have results was when it was specifically tied to the census. And if we can figure out something we can tie it to, that we might have a better chance of getting an incremental increase. Those are just my thoughts.
MR. GLEASON: No, I agree. I think we need to --

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Michelle, this is Glenn.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: Michelle, I agree with you and can I at least lay out on the table an idea for a strategy that we ought to talk about and decide whether we want to do.

Not last session but the session before, the Senate passed a rider, Rider 42, providing some amount of money, I think it was a hundred million dollars, to look at most congested sections of the system. And the money was to go for discussion and/or planning for how those congested areas might be solved differently or might be solved at all.

As a consequence, each region did some work to decide who to distribute their money, but that money went for the planning and the development of projects such that they could come back with a much more solid case for funding the actual projects. Right?

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: Can I suggest we look at that kind of incremental step as something we ask for such that a rider provides some amount of money to look at funding solutions -- well, actually, to look at what needs to be done and look at potential funding solutions for that and/or develop a price tag to go back to the legislature. Does
that make sense?

MS. BLOOMER: Let me -- so we would go and we would ask for funding to come up with -- to identify the needs and to come up with how much we think that would cost and then go back at the next session to ask for the funding?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, I -- yeah, I mean -- so I don't see that getting into TxDOT's -- that we're going to have much impact on TxDOT's budget at this point. I also don't see that a general request is going -- to the legislature is going to make much of a difference unless we're willing to work hard for it. But what we might be able to do is get them to fund a way to develop an approach that they might fund. Or would fund.

And so we specifically ask for a rider. We specifically ask for an amount of money that would give us the ability to develop a strong consensus for -- locally -- consensus for the kinds of projects, programs, whatever it is that we need money for, we develop a strong case for why those are needed with local data and buy-in, and that's what the money then allows us to go back to the legisla -- the commission and the legislature with for more money next session.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think I agree on the point of a general request, probably isn't going to have much impact and that's where we were going. Do any of the other
members have any thoughts or ideas on --

MR. SALAZAR: I like Glenn's idea of a variety of requests for, you know, specific things as to why we need money from the legislature. But I do think that we need to at least go ahead and submit a request. I mean, even if it is general, then at least we turned something in and they can't go back and say well, they didn't even turn anything in. So it's not going to hurt anything to submit the general request.

MR. STEPHENS: So you're suggesting we do both?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MR. STEPHENS: We do the general request and then --

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MR. STEPHENS: -- the -- okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And what I was trying to determine, is there is a way instead of having -- like we have a very general request but we also had the specific request related to the census. If there's something that is specific that we can point to, we might have a little bit more of a case to get some additional funding at the TxDOT level.

MR. STEPHENS: Could we tie it to the loss of the Medicaid funding? To the 28 million you've been mentioning about the loss of local and non-federal revenues used to match, maybe juxtapose that loss with a strategy to help us
recapture that value somewhere down along the way? I mean, maybe at least set a goal for ourselves where we're talking about what we'd like to see as far as -- you mentioned census. You know, in my area what I did is I took like -- our population rates are going crazy. Folks are coming in just faster than the infrastructure can accommodate them. So what I did is I challenged the locals to look at a subsidy per capita and a subsidy per trip and looked at kind of what we've done in the past, looking forward to what we might see as a goal, where we'd want to be and what it would take to get us there.

Where you at least challenge them to think about it that way in a goal form, where you're looking at here's where we've been, here's where we're heading, here are the matrix of the metrics we're looking at to -- of performance and see that we need some action somewhere down the way.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I think what I'm hearing is the consensus of the committee is to go ahead and submit a letter to the Commission that's both general with maybe a specific request related to the loss of the Medicaid funding. And then in addition to that, proceed with a rider request.

MR. GADBOIS: Right. Well, and Michelle, this is Glenn again. I didn't mean to make it an either/or. The two are fine and I actually think using Eric's three item,
you know, case for the (indiscernible) concerns, you know, is a strong way to make the letter speak up, right?

    MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

    MR. GADBOIS: We see these come in, you sure could use money now, but if we can't find money now, give us a tool to help us develop a stronger case. Help us understand both (indiscernible) what the impacts of this will be and innovative ways to do that.

    MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

    MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, what's out time line? Do we know what -- do we have a time line of when we've got to get all this done?

    MS. BLOOMER: Well, we probably need to get the letter to the Commission --

    MR. GLEASON: I -- this is Eric Gleason. I think to the -- I think you ought to shoot for no later than mid-August so they have it in their packets when they are reviewing the LAR just prior to the meeting. I think that would be -- it would be timely that way. And in the past what we -- what the committee has done is had this discussion, agreed on some points to be included, and then delegated the responsibility of writing the letter to one or two members.

    MS. BLOOMER: I'm thinking staff. So, Eric, I heard August. Let's see, we're the 24th, so we're looking
at next week.

MR. STEPHENS: I don't mind helping with like some data -- some of the things I was talking about. I don't mind helping put together some of the data to get people thinking about our request in a different way. I don't mind helping --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: -- with that.

MS. BLOOMER: So I think what I'd like to avoid is using the exact same letter --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: -- and just changing --

MR. STEPHENS: Exactly.

MS. BLOOMER: -- the numbers. I think at some point it's fallen on deaf ears --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: -- twice. Let's try a different approach.

So, okay, so what I'm hearing from the committee is we'll go ahead and send a letter to the Commission with the goal of by the end of the first week of August.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah, I think that -- if a draft, you wanted to have a draft by the end of the first week that would allow another week to get it into shape and get it over by mid-month.
MS. BLOOMER: Well, we'll shoot -- the end of August is next Friday. Or the first --

MR. GLEASON: End of July.

MS. BLOOMER: July.

MR. GLEASON: Is next Thursday.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: Draft. Okay. With a general request highlighting some of the points we have regarding sort of inflation reducing the buying power, decreasing per capita expenditures and the demand for service and then specifically mentioning the three items that Eric mentioned in his Director's report; capital replacement, Medicaid and shale development.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And Rob has agreed to assist.

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you. So do I have a motion or will we accept that in the form of a motion?

MR. GADBOIS: So moved. This is Glenn.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. I have a first. A second?

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. Second.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I have a motion and a second. We'll start from this end of the table. Rob?
MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, yes. Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: J.R., yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Glenn yes.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. The motion passes.

Thank you all. Okay.

We will move on to --

MR. GLEASON: And, Chair, if I may interrupt. I'm not clear. Rob offered --

MR. STEPHENS: To assist.

MR. GLEASON: -- to assist --

MS. BLOOMER: To assist.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, that's what I was thinking.

MR. GLEASON: -- and I didn't hear --

MR. STEPHENS: Who's the lead?

MR. GLEASON: -- who he was assisting in this conversation, as I'm sure he didn't either.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: So maybe before we move onto the next point the committee could have a conversation on that.

MS. BLOOMER: Didn't -- Eric, didn't you draft this original letter?

MR. GLEASON: Actually, you did.

MS. BLOOMER: I think you drafted the original and
I --

MR. GLEASON: Possibly.

MS. BLOOMER: I was Rob. I tweaked it. Is that a possibility?

MR. GLEASON: I would like your assistance as well.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And we can -- we'll offer up an initial stab that we --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- think captures the essence of the conversation. Josh, are you listening here?

MR. RIBAKOVE: I'm listening, Eric. And we are having a recording made and it's -- so we can get it right.

MR. GLEASON: And we'll have to start work on this long before we get the record from the meeting, so -- okay.

MS. BLOOMER: That will -- perfect. Thank you. And then Rob and I will --

MR. GLEASON: We'll get a very --

MS. BLOOMER: -- assist.

MR. GLEASON: -- rough outline to you and then let you kind of react to it.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And I'm kind of hearing a slimmed down version of the previous one that might just simply
bullet the highlighted portions here as opposed to all the explanatory text.

    MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.
    MR. GLEASON: And then go in a little more detail --
    MS. BLOOMER: Detail.
    MR. GLEASON: -- into the three issues that I've talked about and the suggestion for, you know, if not this then a rider to --
    MS. BLOOMER: Do you want to --
    MR. GLEASON: -- allow the additional analysis and research around these items to further quantify the --
    MS. BLOOMER: Okay.
    MR. GLEASON: -- benefits and costs to them.
    Okay.
    MS. BLOOMER: That will be great. Thank you. And thank you for clarifying that. All right.

Moving on to Item 6 is the presentation discussion of the Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning. And I believe Steve --

    MR. GLEASON: Yes.
    MS. BLOOMER: Why don't you --
    MR. GLEASON: This is a follow-up to an ongoing conversation with the committee that we’ve had about the direction of the regional coordination efforts that we've
had here in Texas since 2005, 2006. And as you know, staff has worked over the last year or so with a work group of stakeholders that have been engaged in that effort from different parts of the state. There were a number of recommendations that emerged from that effort on modifications and new directions for the program. We reviewed those with you. You requested some additional background material on the issues that the recommendations addressed and Sue provided you with those at the last meeting. And then I believe at the last meeting you indicated an interest in a different direction and looking for our sort of assessment of what that might look like; is that pretty much what we've got here?

MR. WRIGHT: What has happened on our end since the last meeting was convening of a work group to look at performance measures --

MR. GLEASON: Performance measures.

MR. WRIGHT: -- which you all had expressed an interest in last time, so I'm prepared to share some information on that this morning.

TxDOT did recently convene a nine member working group with representatives from diverse organizations across the state. I do see two of those working group members present today. I'd like to acknowledge them. Bob Schwab with El Paso County and Janis Ferguson with the Texas
Workforce Commission. So we certainly want to recognize and express our appreciation to them and the other seven members of that group that look specifically at performance measures.

What this group's charge was, was to consider and recommend performance measures for assessing the regionally coordinated transportation planning effort in Texas. The purpose of the measures is to demonstrate value and success of this effort. In particular, we hope to measure success and meeting transportation needs of those we seek to serve.

This working group approached this task under -- using the working goal of improving access for individuals throughout Texas to an effective and efficient network of public transportation services. And the -- this exercise stems in part from the broader list of recommendations from the 30-member working group that Eric referred to earlier.

Some considerations that this group took into account in discussing and crafting some draft measures were that the performance measures need to be meaningful, realistic and attainable. Having performance measures will require collecting and assessing baseline and follow-up data. Data needs to be linked to planning. The data needs to reflect that planning is part of a continuum; that is it is ongoing, it includes identifying needs and gaps and ways to meet or bridge those needs and gaps, but it doesn't stop...
there. It also includes measuring performance to see if the
identified needs and gaps are actually met and/or bridged.

Also, the FTA has recently added requirements for
recipients of FTA funded programs to report overall program
performance measures and the performance measures being
considered will add to that assessment.

So with that little bit of background I think that
you have in your meeting packet, a list of the recommended
-- a draft list of the recommendations from this working
group. There are five. I'll briefly walk through those.

The first of the five recommended measures is the
number of active, formal partnerships. This would be
active, formal partnerships to identify transportation needs
and gaps and develop plans to meet these needs and gaps.
This could include partnerships to leverage limited funding
and resources to close gaps. It could include collaborative
funding applications, integrated service agreements to
minimize deficient services, shared funding amongst
agencies, and on and on. Those would be the sorts of things
that would fall under that metric.

The second measure that is recommended is the
number of individuals engaged by transportation planning or
education activities, including elected officials, community
organizations, health and human services agencies, workforce
programs and others.
The third recommended measure is the number of transportation needs identified in the regional human services transportation plan, which includes needs of priority population groups. And those would include groups such as individuals with disabilities, seniors 65 and older, veterans and others.

The fourth recommended measure is the percentage of projects identified in the regional transportation plans that actually move to an implementation phase.

And the fifth recommended measure is the percentage of transportation needs identified in the regional transportation plan that are being addressed, and this would have a couple of subsets of data for projects or activities that are partially completed and projects or activities that are fully completed that are called for in the respective plans.

So those, just briefly, those are the recommendations that come from the working group. I would be happy to respond to any questions that you might have. I will add, I think we discussed about this before, TxDOT is interested in additional input. We'll make a final decision. Our plan is to finalize not only these but broader guidance for this effort and we will of course share this guidance, including whatever is adopted as final performance measures, with lead agencies and other
stakeholders. And our plan is to do this probably through a
set of regional workshops that we're looking at conducting
across the state, probably in January of 2015.

MR. SALAZAR: Besides the two that you mention
that are here on that work group, can you --

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. SALAZAR: -- tell us who else is on that work
group?

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, yes. This is a nine member
group. I mentioned Bob Schwab with El Paso County, Janice
Ferguson with Texas Workforce Commission. In addition, the
participants were Jeff Williford with the Texas Veteran's
Commission, Jessie Huddleston with North Central Texas
Council of Governments, John Hendrickson with Waco Transit,
Leon Whitley with Texas Health and Human Services
Commission, Martin Ornelas with the Transportation
Coordination Network of the Coastal Bin. Michelle Moe with
Capital Metro and Sue Fielder with the Texas Department of
Assistive and Disability Services.

MR. SALAZAR: And I was hurriedly writing that
down. Can you get that to us through email?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I think Josh sent it --

MR. ROBAKOVE: I have --

MR. WRIGHT: -- in your packet.

MR. ROBAKOVE: They're not in the packets because
MR. WRIGHT: Oh.

MR. ROBAKOVE: -- we didn't want to just, you know, make everybody's contact information public, but I've got documents with all that information and I can give that to you right after the meeting.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And I appreciate the work of the nine members and I -- it's a fairly broad ranging group. And I hate to continue to beat a dead horse, but I feel like the performance measures in the end don't measure how many more trips we provided, how much more service is provided. I mean, it's great, number of active, formal partners, but if you don't actually get anything out of those formal partnerships, is it good enough just that, you know, I have one more partnership.

MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think what we've been talking about as a committee is, you know, how much money have we spent in the past nine years on regional coordination and how many more trips has that gotten us in the past nine years. And that's where we're wanting to see the results. You know, the partnerships are great, but in the end, if they don't get you another trip or another client group
served, what's the point.

MR. WRIGHT: And I think that the group shares many of your feelings and what I heard expressed from this group, and it was discussed at length, is that to not stop, to not only measure the number of partnerships but to go beyond that and to measure needs, to number the measure of identified projects and activities that have moved from planning to actual implementation, whatever that might be. And then to actually look and measure how many of those that have been articulated in the respective regional plans have not only moved to implementation, but beyond that, how many have been partially or fully completed.

The group discussed at length whether to include ridership as a metric and there was consensus across the board that that would not be the thing to do.

What I heard from the group is that there are myriad factors that could affect ridership. Increases or decreases in population. Increases or decreases in the cost of gasoline, what have you; that might have nothing at all to do with regional planning. So they did not see that as a metric that could be -- that we could with confidence -- that we could have confidence in, that it would be a meaningful metric because of all the various other factors that would not be controlled for.

So that was discussed at length and so that was
the reason that I heard from the group that the discussion then shifted towards, well, we can't stop at just simply measuring the number of partnerships that we have or the number of agreements that we have or the number of meetings that we have. Those are all kind of process oriented sort of things. Important, but not to stop there, but to actually look at how many of those projects that have where implementation has begun or that there is some level of completion.

MS. BLOOMER: I --

MR. GLEASON: If I may, Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: The other thing that I recall from the last meeting, the committee was interested in -- I think there's a perception that we spent eight years planning and we don't really have the ability to talk at the state level about the impact of that planning. And there was a desire, I think, expressed at the committee meeting to transition over the next couple of years, or at least following the next update, to transition to a focus on project implementation from a funding standpoint. In other words, that TxDOT would fund project implementation and that that would put us or move us in a direction more focused on outcomes and results that we could measure.

The reality of the current program we have right
now today is that it's a real mix of planning and
implementation projects that are happening. But I think the
perception of the program is that it's largely been a
planning effort and people -- and we're unable to express in
a meaningful way the benefit of that eight years of
planning.

You know, the funding we've used for that planning
is not funding that could have been used for operations.
It's not funding that could have been used for facility
construction. It's funding that we get for planning and
research. Now, yes, we could have promoted project
development with some of that money by --

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: -- funding, you know, feasibility
studies and things, but I want to be clear for the
committee, these aren't funds that had we not done this that
could have been spent on operations. I mean, there -- it's
a limited source in terms of its application.

Having said that, what we have today really is a
combination of things going on. We have planning and we
have projects that have been implemented or are implemented.
I think what we want to see or what the committee wants to
see is a full transition following the next sort of
statewide update of these regional plans; which is '16?

MR. WRIGHT: December of 2016.
MR. GLEASON: To see us move toward all right, we've been funding the planning long enough. If it has a benefit, that benefit has been internalized within those regions. And the regions that have realized the benefit and internalized it will continue to do so. And what the committee was looking for was for the state to move into the mode of let's fund implementation so we can actually measure results.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: That's what I heard last time.

MS. BLOOMER: I think I would agree.

MR. GLEASON: And I think this is probably, these lists here, may be reflective of -- I wasn't at the work group but I appreciate the dilemma around taking that ridership when so many other things could influence. Now possibly we could talk about it's not overall ridership as much as can we isolate ridership benefit to a project and somehow try and isolate that from the overall things that impact ridership. But I do appreciate that.

And I think as you move down this list, four and five get closer to what I think the committee's looking for. One, two and three seem to be more like, well, you know, it's quantity, quantity, quantity.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: And where's the result? Where's the
quality? And I think we begin to get there when you talk about, okay, we're doing a lot of planning but how much of that planning is actually moving into implementation, and that's what number four is. And then, you know, we've identified needs. Well, so what. Have we been talking about the same needs for eight years or what have we really done about it.

So I think four and five begin to move in that direction, but I think we'd appreciate some feedback from the committee on this issue of, well, you don't think this goes far enough. So what are the things that you'd like to see us be able to measure, even if we can't do so now, as we transition from a largely planning funded effort to something that's more implementation oriented.

MS. BLOOMER: And I would agree. And I think what I would like to see is that plan to transition. Because right now in my mind this is still focusing on the planning piece. And I understand we're going to keep what's in place now through the next update, which will be at the end of 2016. But we -- I think we had talked about at the last meeting of let's put together the transition plan, let's start going out and talking to folks and let them know that, you know, this is going to be the last plan that we're going to fund as far as planning money goes and we want to transition into maybe more implementation planning funding.
And then you'll have specific projects. Instead of planning
at the 30,000 foot level, let's bring it down to, okay, we
have a coordination project and we need assistance to do a
planning study to move that project forward. Not a large,
you know, North Central has a 16 county coordination plan.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah, let me also say -- this is
Eric again. Let me also say that we have already moved in
the direction of during non-update years, like next year,
there is significantly less funding being applied to this
effort. At the July commission meeting next week we're
going to be awarding funds for next year's work plan on this
to agencies who requested funding. And the total award
amount is $400,000.

So I -- you know, previously we've been up in the
million, two million, three range, and I think some folks --
and we're not still continuing to do that. So we have
already sort of recognized that we don't need to fully fund
at that level of planning effort in the years not associated
with an update. And so I think we're already moving in that
direction, because we recognize the funds are scarce and
they need to be applied for other purposes.

And we're already moving that way and agencies who
are interested in continuing the effort have already started
to internalize the fact that TxDOT isn't going to have as
much funding available every year as they have in the past.
So I think the transition has already started. And I wanted the record to reflect that we have sort of addressed the issue of a relatively high amount of funding not necessarily associated with results we can measure.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think Steve shared that with us at a previous meeting, sort of the --

MR. GLEASON: Right. Exactly.

MS. BLOOMER: -- peaks and valleys of the funding.

MR. GLEASON: Exactly. Now all of this doesn't relieve us of the responsibility to the state to do the planning. And so even as we transition to may -- to a program that may be more focused on project implementation, we still have to come back and address the planning requirement.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And we talked about maybe that's a statewide plan that the state does on behalf of everybody so we can meet the requirement. Because it's the goal to meet the -- obviously we have to meet the federal requirement. We need to check that box. But in the end, we need the end result that's trying to be accomplished by doing that. You know, we don't need to spend a bunch of money just to check a box and say we did it. It's the end product that we want. And last time we had a large discussion about what, in the end, what are we trying to accomplish. Are we just trying to satisfy the federal
requirement or in addition to having to do that are we actually trying to get some significant benefit out of the coordination effort and the money that's being put towards coordination and how do we best do that.

And I think the consensus of the committee was we've spent enough time and money on the planning part and we needed to see if there was a way to either move towards planning for implementation, not just planning to plan, but actually moving towards implementation. And then you have specific projects that you can measure the impact of that specific project, the increase in ridership that resulted from that particular coordination project.

I'm just feeling after nine years of doing this, if I'm a member of the legislature, it's like, okay, how much have you spent, can you quantify for me the benefit. And right now, like you said, we can't really quantify the benefit. I think we got, you know, we can anecdotally say what the benefit is but --

MR. GLEASON: Well, we have the capacity to describe region-specific activities that have occurred that have benefit associated with them. They don't necessarily all roll up to an expression of statewide benefit. And I think the trick for the future is I don't simply want the statewide effort, if that's what we do, to simply be a checkmark in a box either. I would like some feedback from
the committee on how to make that effort meaningful as well. I think what we're saying is with a limited amount of money available for this, that there's a desire from the committee -- what I'm hearing is a desire from the committee to more focus that money in the future on project implementation that will have measurable results and not so much on planning for planning sake. We still have --

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MR. GLEASON: Yes?

MR. GADBOIS: Sorry, go ahead.

MR. GLEASON: Well, and then I'll say we still -- and it's not only -- and I keep coming back to this. It's not only the federal program requirements for this, it's the state statute that requires this as well. And quite frankly, that is a more over-arching requirement at the state level than it's ever been at the federal level. It's just that we've always had -- the money that we've had to work with to implement these efforts has been federal. And in fact, we -- some acknowledgement of the effort might be that the effort, until now, a lot of it has turned into how can we come up with projects to compete for those federal funds.

And what hasn't really been addressed are the really hard issues, which is -- got nothing to do with chasing after money, it's everything about this is the money
we have and how can we more efficiently coordinate and work
together to do more with what we have. And I think --

MR. GADBOIS: Well -- and, Eric, I want to
slightly disagree with that or at least put a third item on
that list.

We have been chasing after federal money and
that's been a lot of what the planning is about. I would
argue that some systems have done a really good job of
looking for access to other money.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Or at a minimum, making themselves
competitive, more competitive for the existing pots of money
by bringing much larger local matches, by bringing much more
diverse partnerships to the table when they go after that
money. And really what I was hoping that we would get to is
focusing the locals on kind of that next step.

We've got increasing need and decreasing dollars.
How can you -- you know, how do you want to bring in the
partnerships, maximize your local funding and/or increase
that investment such that you're making headway on the need
and/or bringing more money and more service into the area.

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. Glenn, I get that. I
get it. And moving toward a program that actually was more
focused on projects would be a way to provide incentive to
move there. I get it. That makes sense to me.
MR. GADBOIS: Well, and yes, although I want to kind of push and make it clear that it's not just focusing on projects.

Part of the frustration with the regional planning has been that the group has been sitting around, the same people, figuring out how to divide up the same pie roughly the same way in most cases. In some cases that isn't what's happened and that's what we want to encourage more of. As a consequence, it's projects that bring in more partnership, more local buy-in, and make them more competitive for the smaller amount of money that's available state and federal. So it's not just projects.

MR. SALAZAR: And this is J.R. I know that, Eric, you bring up that there have been successes throughout the state and, Steve, you mentioned that many times too. I think individually as a member of this committee I would like to see some of those successes. Because quite frankly, in my area we've struggled with regional coordination and where we're going from here, what we're doing to do and that kind of stuff. So I know, me personally, I would like to see some --

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: And it doesn't necessarily have to be a big, long process, but --

MR. WRIGHT: No, we'll be happy to compile that.
MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: This is Rob and I'll make just one comment. I really don't want to beat this horse up either, but you know in the context of what partnership means, guys, you know, I've been told I -- in the current environment I'm in, there's a business boom. And in the business world partnerships mean someone brings money to the table. And what I see partnerships happening, that we describe as partnerships here, are people bringing their needs to the table. And as he described, you know, looking at competing for the same pot of money that's already on the table, so that's not a true partnership. You know, the partners need to bring resources to the table, not just people and time, but money and those kinds of things to develop projects because all you're doing is playing a shell game of shifting responsibility of the cost of a current transportation need that's already there with an existing pot of money, or you're looking for help to sustain a planning effort to keep looking for an opportunity to find money or not or a real true partnership. So that's all I'll have to say about that. Thank you.

MR. GLEASON: The other -- this is Eric. The other thing I would add to the concept of partnership is, at least in my view, is the notion of shared risk --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.
MR. GLEASON: -- for gain. And it's -- so it's more than just bringing more money to the table to allow a provider to do more of what they do. I think part of the partnership element is a recognition that the agency is willing to take on challenges and service models that may represent something new and different for them as well as a way of addressing someone's need. So there's the shared risk element that is associated with a partnership that is important too.

MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I would just add while I agree it can't be just you bring your needs and -- one partner brings their needs and the other partner is expected to fulfill them. I don't think it's -- I think it's a little -- it's a mutually beneficial relationship that -- you may have a partner, that I would consider a partner, that doesn't bring any financial resources to the table, but the relationship is mutually beneficial to both of you. So, you know, I had a couple where they didn't necessarily bring financial resources to the table but they brought other resources; maybe mobility management resources or we were able to work where we could agree that, okay, if your clients will go at this day, during this time, that will help us, because it's outside of our peak. It helps you because your clients get served. But there was actually no financial resources but both partners benefitted.
So I don't want to get just stuck on if you don’t bring money we’re not a partner because then I think we limit folks in their thought of who they go after for partners. But you may have a very — you could have a partnership with a senior center, they don't necessarily bring any money to the table, but they're willing to work with you to get their client served, and not just coming to you with a need and a demand, but willing to work with you. And I would consider that a partnership.

MR. GLEASON: But the conversation needs to recognize that this isn't about the current provider then just doing more with what they have. And I think that's part of it. You can comment on all these kinds of things and talk, talk, but in the end it, some of the experience has been that there -- since there's no new money --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- that the expectation is that the provider will somehow do something different with the limited resources --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- they already have to accommodate a new need. And so I think there's a -- from a partnership standpoint, there needs to be better acknowledgement and accountability for the other party's interests. And I think that's part of what's been missing in some of the
conversations around the state. I think some of the
conversations have been, well, we're all here now and we
have all these needs, what are you going to do about them?

    MS. BLOOMER: Right.

    MR. GLEASON: And if I -- well, I don't have
anymore. I thought -- I didn't think that's what this was
about. You know, this is like, you know --

    MS. BLOOMER: And that's why I get back to it, it
has to be mutually beneficial. I would agree that I think
in a lot of the regions the regional coordination
discussions have focused on, well, here is our need, transit
provider, fix it. Or, you know, meet the need. And that
can't be the discussion given. There's no financial
resources coming from that partner or from the outside to
address that need. So then you get to, okay, well, I would
like to help you meet that need, but there has to be some
sort of conversation where both entities are willing to
give. And a lot of areas it's -- there isn't. It's you
need to serve our clients and you need to serve them under
our -- what's the word I'm looking for -- under our --

    MR. GADBOIS: Well --

    MS. BLOOMER: -- under our conditions.

    MR. GADBOIS: Although that ought to -- that may
take some training, Michelle, because, you know, a lot of
people just simply aren't used to having those conversations
in a productive way.

MR. WRIGHT: So what TxDOT could do --

MR. GADBOIS: That --

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

MR. GADBOIS: That may not be just setting out a
guidance and/or you know criteria.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think it goes back into, you
know, giving the individual entity some flexibility in
defining what a partnership is that meets their need. But
again, there has to be some benefit that that partner
brings, not just one -- another person from this agency
sitting at the table once a month that doesn’t bring any
benefit to that group or to the initiative.

MR. WRIGHT: This could certainly be an
opportunity for us to incorporate some sharing of best
practices from those regions in the state where this is
working really very beautifully and maybe have, you know, a
new opportunity for some of that sort of information
sharing.

One point that I wanted to share that I thought
that you all might find interesting in light of this
conversation we're having and to support the idea about this
working group and their acknowledging the same interests
that you brought up, Michelle, wanting a truly meaningful
metric. The group talked about that it would be ideal, an
ideal measure, would be the percentage of priority populations, such as individuals with disabilities, seniors, veterans, people who need rides to work, et cetera. The percentage of the priority population who cannot get to where they need to go. Employment, school, quality of life, health services, due to lack of transportation. That the group thought would be an ideal metric, we discussed and considered it. It was taken off the list because it wasn't seen as readily attainable because there apparently is no data and -- to that point. And so the group did concur that that is a need and to have that data would be highly valuable.

MS. BLOOMER: I won't argue that that would be good information to have. I'm not quite sure how that is a performance measure for regional coordination because it just -- if I'm understanding it, it's the percent of the priority population, so older adults, individuals with disabilities, veterans, et cetera, that can't get where they want to go. Well, that should be something that's already in the plan, because that's your gap in service. The measurement would be, okay, how from one plan to the next has that shrunk.

MR. WRIGHT: You would look for --

MS. BLOOMER: But again --

MR. WRIGHT: -- a decrease in that percentage.
MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. WRIGHT: But there's no baseline data to gather follow-up data to measure that decrease. I just thought that it would be interesting to share because the group did talk about it.

MS. BLOOMER: But I -- again, I think back to Eric's point, I think it's really hard from that high level to manage impact. And I would agree, you know, an increase in ridership, well, certain things could have changed. You know, fuel goes up, our population, you know, really increased, so even though we served -- we addressed the gap, well, our population doubled so the gap widened, even though we made progress. And that's why I think going back to more of a project, okay, let's take a coordination project, not a plan, and let's measure performance and impact based at the project level.

So, for example, in Tarrant County a project is Tarrant Rides. Tarrant Rides is a partnership between MHMR, the United Way, the Area Agency on Aging, all the transit providers of the Fort Worth Transportation Authority, the City of Arlington's Handitran, the City of Grand Prairie's Nets (ph), and Catholic Charities. And partners -- so you have the partners that bring the financial money to serve as match, and then you have the transit providers that serve as partners to provide the service. And that's a specific
project that you can measure how many trips were provided as a result of that project that would not have been provided otherwise.

So I think there's a way to measure that, you know, or you can go back and say, okay, how much would it have cost or how many rides would we have been able to provide if we didn't have the partnership. And look at things --

MR. GLEASON: And the key there was reducing the cost per trip.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Which would allow the same budget to do more.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And so not only do you get an increase in number of trips, you can measure a benefit in leveraging, you can measure the number of partners. And I think it becomes easier to measure impact when you're at that level versus let's look at your plan and what impact has that had.

MR. GLEASON: Right. And what the partnership did, the funding did in that instance, was it removed -- it allowed the program -- project to move forward without all of the potential partners at the table. With only a hand -- maybe two of the partners envisioned of the six there, the funding stepped in and took away the risk to the project of
the others not being there to demonstrate the value so that
the others who weren't part of it could say there's benefit
in my agency joining that effort.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And so that to me completes the
partnership.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And it allows it, the --

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: -- pilot piece of that to then move
on to a much larger --

MR. GLEASON: Exactly.

MS. BLOOMER: -- coordination initiative where the
regional coord -- it wasn't regional coordination money but
sort of that pilot project will allow that to grow. And
then you'll have other folks that now would not have come to
the table with money. They've seen --

MR. GLEASON: They see the benefit of being there.

MS. BLOOMER: -- they've been able to, without the
risk, see that it works, and now moving in that direction,
you can take that small project and grow it into something
larger.

MR. STEPHENS: This is Rob. Michelle, are you
suggesting maybe we move to funding pilot and demonstration
projects on this planning process?

MS. BLOOMER: I think that's -- we had talked
about that being an option and moving in that direction.

That funding, either planning to -- let me take --
implementation planning. Like if you wanted to work with
partners to redesign your fixed routes to hit more partners,
or, you know, specific planning to implement -- not planning
to plan, but planning to implement a specific project, or on
pilot demonstration projects where we can actually measure
the -- discreet impact.

MR. STEPHENS: I -- this is Rob again. I take it
--

MR. GADBOIS: It --

MR. STEPHENS: Go ahead. Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, it was -- so, Rob, sorry. Let
me just jump in for one quick minute.

One of the things that is important for innovation
and something that would be kind of new for this industry is
recognizing the -- that risk and failure are important parts
of innovation. And what we haven't talked about at all in
terms of performance measures is any recognition of what
you've tried that you decided didn't work. Because most
industries fail nine times out of ten, at a minimum, right?
But you learn a lot from what didn't work, as well as what
does.

And so I would take a moment to argue that in our
performance measures, either in them or as a separate
performance measure, we ought to recognize that the experimentation and failure is something we want to understand better and can learn from.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Glenn. Yes, I would agree. And I think we had talked about at the last meeting -- and I don't have the work plan in front of me. That's not part of our -- but I think that was part of one of the work plan goals, is to encourage innovation and to try. And in order to do that, you have to be willing to fail. Or be able to change as you go along.

But I think that gets back to Rob's point of, you know, maybe we look at more pilot projects and demonstration projects as an opportunity to move regional coordination forward.

MR. STEPHENS: Who's willing to take a risk? A real risk?

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. This is not an action item, but I think, Eric -- I guess what I'm trying to get my handle on is -- and I know we've talked about we do the peaks and valleys in funding. But I think putting that all together in one page and before -- we had talked about it last time, before we go out and start communicating with folks about the next round of funding, which will be available for planning, to update the plan, is that we have in place how we're moving forward and going to transition so
we can communicate that to everybody at that point. That, you know, this is the last time TxDOT is going to fund plan updates, if that's what we're saying. Here's where we're trying to go. The next year we're looking at, you know, maybe this amount of money to do pilot projects or demonstration projects or plan implementation planning so people can start to think about, okay, and plan for it next year, no money to update my plan because I just did it, but going forward I'm going to have to bring that in -- internally, and here's what TxDOT is looking for going forward.

MR. GLEASON: So let me recap. Our next meeting is September time frame?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Last Tuesday in September.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Last Tuesday.

MR. GLEASON: So we could prepare for that meeting a description of where we are with the program in terms of today, and then moving forward, say over the next three to four years, how we see it changing, consistent with this conversation. And we will include in there our insights into what we think makes sense and we can -- and we'll provide that to the committee for their -- for your conversations and discussions. And I think we will also include in there a description of if there's a -- you know,
what happens to the planning --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- process and try and address that for the committee as well. I don't -- and I'm fairly confident we'll have the transition picture for you. I'm not sure how much of what happens to the planning we'll have, but we'll take a crack at that. And, you know, hopefully provoke a good conversation at your September meeting that maybe can be wrapped up at that next one. Sort of a smooth transition that way.

MS. BLOOMER: I think that would be helpful.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Good.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: When was that meeting?

MR. GLEASON: September. Last Tuesday in September.

MS. BLOOMER: With the goal being wrapping it up at the September meeting or the meeting after having discussion?

MR. GLEASON: Well, that will be up to the committee. I think it will depend on how much we'll be able to get together for you and how much more you think you might need.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: But I think part of that discussion
is going to be what level of direction are you comfortable recommending to the department. And what level of detail do you need to get there.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other comments or question on Item 6?

MR. STEPHENS: I think -- Michelle, this is Rob. One last comment I'd like to make. There's an opportunity -- Steve was talking about a baseline of trips and all this good stuff. We don't have that, but we have an opportunity now where the Health and Human Services Commission, usually a coordination partner, or at one time envisioned to be, I don't know where we would all couch that or describe that relationship with them going forward as public transportation providers, but it might be a good time to try to look at measuring what's actually happening. Are those trips -- that burden decreasing from the operator standpoint, so it should cost you less money to operate your systems.

So that should be deferred over to Medicaid program, which is operating now independently in a different way. So are those -- you know, can we develop baselines or measurements of -- you know, or are our opportunities for coordination decreasing, our opportunities to -- for those trips that are deferred over to the Medicaid clientele. Or are we increasing and they're decreasing. So I mean, you
know, it would be a nice time to kind of measure what's happening there in the context of regional planning that would be interesting.

MR. GLEASON: You might be surprised.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, I would want -- I'd want to be surprised. I'd want to be very surprised. So maybe it's an opportunity to build a baseline there and find out what are we doing there, what's happening.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. STEPHENS: Are we seeing a decrease in expenses, therefore this move worked out wonderfully. It's a whole --

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

MR. STEPHENS: -- other pot of money doing a whole bunch of things that we thought we could help with and no longer have to worry about.

MS. BLOOMER: That's an interesting point. Is there a way to sort of do a before and after? Because initially, at the state level, coordination was supposed to be across all. And what I heard you say yesterday, Eric, is that we've sort of now reverted where HHSC has been removed.

MR. GLEASON: Well, I don't think we should say HHSC --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- that globally.
MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: I think that Medicaid --

MS. BLOOMER: Medicaid.

MR. GLEASON: -- medical transportation program, which has always been somewhat problematic for coordination because of its trip requirements, none of those trip requirements parameters have necessarily moved into the direction to facilitate coordination. And in fact, the current procurement in my opinion has elements to it that seem to even further isolate those program trips from anything that might look like coordination.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: But we just don't know yet. And when I say you might be surprised, what I was thinking about was the riders per trip number that, you know, is so woefully low across the board. Assuming that that number probably includes the trips associated with the current Medicaid program, which is pretty much a taxi service. Without that, you might actually see those numbers go up.

Now, the rest of the numbers may go to hell in a hand basket.


MR. GLEASON: But, you know, you may see some of the performance numbers move in a positive direction because you're not carrying these --
MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- solo trips anymore.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, I'd be curious.

MS. BLOOMER: But I would agree with Rob, I think we're in a position now to collect the before data and then --

MR. GLEASON: Well, we have what we have.

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: We're not going to be able to collect anything more than what we already have.

MS. BLOOMER: But going forward we'll want to track to see how that changes based off the impact of Medicaid going forward.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think that might help if we go back to the legislature the next biennium and have some, you know --

MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

MS. BLOOMER: -- we're asking for more money, but you know, we're not being efficient in how we're spending the money because here's our cost per trip --

MR. STEPHENS: And here's theirs.

MS. BLOOMER: -- and here's --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: -- you know --
MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, or something, yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: -- the whole goal is to be coordinated --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: -- except for this piece.

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: That's a big chunk of the pie.

MR. GLEASON: Keeping in mind that the Medicaid program has never, ever fully been in that kind of place where coordination could really take place.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And that's been that way since forever. Well, no, I'll say that at least since -- for the last 10 years. So, yeah, we can look at that stuff and, you know -- but as I said earlier, the contract service revenue from Medicaid is more than just -- well, you know, it's a match issue because a large portion of it is match. Because, you know, you're supposed to cover your costs of that service with what you get. And -- but you can use the entire amount of what you get from match, but only the amount above and beyond the cost is real cash for you. But there is some element of that happening.

And then the third thing is, is this ability from a monthly standpoint to manage your cash flow. When you have a monthly reimbursement coming in from Medicaid that is
cash, when it comes in, you can pay your vendors with it
while you're waiting for reimbursements from us. And so
that's what makes it complicated and that's why putting a
single number on its impact is so hard, because we're going
to have isolate those three things.

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. GLEASON: If you want to legitimately get at
the issues. You know, so a year from now are people going
to have trouble drawing down federal money because they
don't have match. You know, are we going to have systems
that are going to be running into financial issues from a
cash flow standpoint, falling behind on vendor payments
because they don't have this other source of income that
they've used in the past to kind of float through those
periods.

Those are the ones that are going to be difficult
and those are the ones that aren't going to immediately pop
as something immediately attributable to the Medicaid
program because it's so much a part of their budgets and the
way they do their business that it's going to be really hard
to separate that.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And then we're going to have folks
that will sign deals because they need the funding and it
will wash out, three, four, five, six months later when
they're not getting the number of trips that they need. See it's a combination of getting a good price per trip, but you also have a certain quantity you need.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And all that's going to play out over a long time. And it's just going to be very hard to isolate. We can certainly track it and try and figure it out, but it's going to -- it's -- there's a lot of variables in it.

MS. BLOOMER: And I -- it's probably hard to measure too, but I think one thing -- and I heard it yesterday as well, and with the last transition in Medicaid -- is what clients' transit providers are currently serving that are Medicaid eligible that will go over to Medicaid and then will come back. Then the transit system's 5310, 5307, 5311 funds will be subsidizing those trips when they should be over here in this bucket.

MR. GLEASON: It's hard --

MS. BLOOMER: So --

MR. GLEASON: If they can take a trip on the regular system, why do they --

MR. STEPHENS: Why --

MR. GLEASON: -- need the Medicaid?

MR. STEPHENS: Right. That's what I've always told Medicaid. Once they ride with us and we don't have
agreements with you, they're my client, they lose their Medicaid identity. I don't care if they have money or not. I mean, I don't -- well, I do have to pay the fare, but I mean, that's not our -- that's not our eligibility to screen them for services. You know, so once they're my passenger they lose their Medicaid identity.

MS. BLOOMER: But then you lose the ability to access anything other than the fare --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

MS. BLOOMER: -- to help provide that service.

MR. STEPHENS: That's right.

MS. BLOOMER: And so you're using 5307 funds --

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: -- or 5310 or 11 to provide that trip when there are --

MR. STEPHENS: Other funds.

MS. BLOOMER: -- HHSC funds available to support that trip.

MR. GLEASON: Well, and we're getting -- we're going down a road we probably don't --

MR. STEPHENS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- want to go down right now because it's complicated. But, I mean, it depends. On a fixed route system that may not be a bad thing. The dollar ride
systems, where every time you have one or two or three more
people that need to take a trip, you've got to put another
vehicle and a driver on the road --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- that's where you see these
impacts becoming really, really expensive.

MR. STEPHENS: And we might be overlooking that
may be an over-arching goal is to reduce trips on Medicaid,
then to defer that to public transportation.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, I think --

MR. GLEASON: Yeah, I mean, that's --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, that's --

MR. GADBOIS: I understand that the public transit
side wouldn't be able to track Medicaid eligible users in
trips that just got on a vehicle. You're -- certainly fixed
route but maybe even demand. Does Medicaid track that?

MR. GLEASON: Yes and no. I mean, that's part of
this -- under the current or the new model, Glenn, it's
really going to be, you know, HHSC determines the Medicaid
population in each of the MTO areas. And based on that,
does an actuarial calculation of what -- how much money
they're going to give to the managed transportation
organization for that area. And then it really becomes the
responsibility of that organization to manage all those
trips in a way that it sees fit. And so it's going to be
once removed, I think, from HHSC under this model.

MR. GADBOIS: What -- but so then but as that shifts or even right now, when an eligible client gets a trip and they've shifted it to public transportation, you know, and so basically paid little or no cost, are they tracking that at all or are they only tracking the trips they pay for?

MR. GLEASON: I don't know. I don't know the answer to that, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Because if they were tracking all trips, we have all these clients and they've gotten to these services and X number of them have gotten by tran -- public transportation, then I would say that's a good argument for going back to HHS and legislature saying some portion of your transportation money ought to get reinvested in the public transportation system.

MR. STEPHENS: Good point, Glenn. You can track the fixed route passes that they're purchasing from operators. You can track that.

MR. GADBOIS: Right, but only some, or you know -- there's a lot of shifting going on as far as -- at least is what I understand or what people think is happening. And in fact a lot of Medicaid providers, you know, pressure clients to try public transportation before anything else. And if clients aren't trained to say no, I don't have it, I need
your ride, then they may get pushed off to public
transportation. And my only suggestion is if we have a way
to find out anywhere close to what that number is, we then
have a better argument for them sharing some of the cost for
the public transportation services.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Glenn. I have
been -- we're a little off topic, so I need to bring us back
to --

MR. GADBOIS: Well --

MS. BLOOMER: -- the regional coordination
planning. Are there any more items for discussion? My
understanding is, is Eric, staff has a clear understanding
in what we're going to come back with? Okay.

So I think we'll go ahead -- and just for the
folks -- I do have a couple public -- folks that would like
to make public comments. We'll go ahead and do that on Item
8 on the agenda.

So we'll go ahead and move on if there is nothing
else on Item 6, we'll move on to Item 7 on the agenda, which
is a presentation and discussion of TxDOT's Texas
Transportation Plan 2014.

MS. DUSZA: If it's possible, since most of you
saw, it's the same presentation that was given yesterday
during the transit operator's meeting, I thought it might be
good for us to --
MR. GLEASON: I just want to check in. Glenn?
I'm sure you're not seeing this.
MR. GADBOIS: I'm not seeing this.
MS. DUSZA: Oh, and my name is Casey Dusza. I'm with TxDOT-TTP.
MR. GLEASON: Okay.
MS. DUSZA: Hi Glenn.
MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.
MS. DUSZA: Are you in front of a computer, Glenn?
MR. GADBOIS: I am.
MS. DUSZA: I can send you the -- or I can tell you the link and you can go through the tool as we do it here, if you'd like.
MR. GADBOIS: Okay. My browser's up. What's the link?
MR. GADBOIS: MetroQuest?
MS. DUSZA: Yep.
MR. GADBOIS: Q-u-s-t-e?
MS. DUSZA: Q-u-e --
MR. GADBOIS: Dot what?
MS. DUSZA: Q-u-e-s-t.com. And, if I may, may I bring up the --
MR. GADBOIS: Initializing driver.
MS. DUSZA: Okay.
MR. GADBOIS: Got it.

MS. DUSZA: May I bring up the -- our browser.

(Pause - setting up presentation)

MS. DUSZA: And if you're looking to find this later on, this is how you find it.

(Pause)

MS. DUSZA: So we are currently in the process of updating our long-range transportation plan 2035. We are in our second round of public outreach for our Texas Transportation Plan 2040. As part of our outreach, this second go-round, we will be visiting all 25 TxDOT districts. We are almost done. We have -- next week we're going up to the panhandle and then the first week in August we're hitting Austin and San Antonio.

As part of our meetings, we are doing a -- holding a stakeholder meeting and then a public open house. And as part of these meetings, what we're really trying to do is focus everyone on going to our tool. It's an interactive investment tool. We do have laptops set up at the meetings for participants to come in and actually walk through the tool and we will be there to assist them if they do have any questions.

The tool is set up to gauge the public and stakeholder's opinion on their investment priorities. What they'd like to see the money spent on. And then at the end
they're given a budget to actually move money towards the
type of scenarios that they'd like to see the money spent
on.

As part of this tool, we are able to capture
participants' selection choices, so every time that they
partic -- or every time a person goes in and then submits
their answers we will be able to determine what their
priorities and where they would like to see their money
spent. So it's quite a nice interactive tool.

Have any of you gone to our website and messed
around with our tool, participated in the tool? Oh,
wonderful. And as part of this we are asking that you help
us disseminate this to your members that you do have because
it is really important that we capture everybody's opinions
on where they would like to see the money spent and what
their priorities are.

Okay. On the second screen, plan, we're on the
tab two priorities. This tab lets you select your top three
priorities. You have job creation, bridge condition,
transit and rail options, pavement conditions, traffic
congestion and transit condition. And as you go through
each one of the priorities, the tool will explain a little
bit more about each priority and which ones you'd like to
see.

So if you were to put transit and rail options up
top, you just click and -- yeah. And can you do transit
condition, right above the bar. There. And whatever one
you would like to add to that. You can do job creation or
traffic congestion. Okay.

So we're going to put transit condition, traffic
congestion and transit and rail options as our three top
priorities. And then you can go to the next one. The
scenarios, the tab three.

Okay, so this explains that we are providing three
investment example approaches. These are in no way
approaches that are going to be followed through on our
plan. They're just kind of examples to show the different
types of approaches that we could spend our money on, okay,
over the next 25 years.

Okay, so approach one is our system preservation.
This approach is where we're going to focus putting our
money towards preserving the system. It's going to preserve
everything. It's not really going to adjust congestion by
putting money towards that capacity. It's going to be more
taking care of what we currently have. And part of this is
going to make sure though that we are taking care of our
obsolete deficient bridges and stuff like -- to make
everything up to code. We're not going to let anything fall
apart.

And then on the right-hand side you can see that
your priorities are up on top and it shows you in this condition if you spend the 230 billion that it would cost until 2040, traffic condition, not so great. You have transit condition in the green, which is good. And the transit and rail options, not so good, because we're not spending any money to put forth towards expanding transit. Just pretty much taking care of what's going on there.

And then at the bottom of each one of these approaches you're able to rate which ones you -- which ones that you would prefer. If you think I would rather to spend the 230 billion and keep things the way they are moving, then you could give it a five star. But if you think, well, I -- you know, my priorities really aren't being addressed, I'm going to give it a one or two star. And then if you can go right down to Metro, the second tab. Yeah.

And then the Metro Mobility, this one is actually putting money towards making improvements in the metro area. You are putting more money towards the added capacity in the metropolitan areas. You're putting money in the transit, increasing ridership and services in the metropolitan areas. So you can see that both transit condition and transit and rail options are doing fairly well in this approach, but the cost of this one is 475 billion. So this one is a lot more expensive than the first option. Okay. Yeah.

And then the third one is connectivity and freight
mobility. This one is where the money is being spent more on the rural areas and the freight connectivity between the urban areas. So this one not so much on the inner-city transit but more of the connection between the metropolitan areas. And as you can see, it's pretty straight down the middle on all three of your top priorities. We're right in the middle. And this one has a cost of 450 billion through 2040. Okay. Next.

And then here's part of the tool that you are able to create a budget. You are given an additional five billion dollars to put towards different type of -- excuse me -- different type of options. You are capped, so you're not going to be able to put in 500 billion towards bridge condition because you don't need that much money to make all the bridges sufficient. So it's going to cap you at how much money you're actually going to be able to put on each one. So you can continue. Okay.

So here is your budget. And as a part of this, as you -- after you move your money into the areas that you think that you would like to see TxDOT spend an additional five billion if we got it -- not saying where it comes from, not saying that we're going to get it, just if we had it, this is where I personally would like to see it spent. You are going to be able to see the performance of our system. So after you fund it you can go over to the system -- or
performance tab, see how we're doing, and then go back to
the budget and move a little bit more money around to make
your arrows go where you want them to be, more in the green
rather than in the red. Yes, so that's as it is right now.
So highest we get is the yellow, some in the red. Jobs are
in the orange.

So if you go back to the budget tab you can grab
the gold bars that are on the left-hand side and click and
drag them into pavement, bridge, roadway reconstruction and
expansion, transit maintenance, transit and rail service
expansion and port and freight intermodal projects. So if
you want, you can go ahead and move some money around. Keep
going.

MS. BLOOMER: You got five million or --
MS. DUSZA: Five billion.
MS. BLOOMER: -- five billion to spend, Josh.
MS. DUSZA: Yeah. Get crazy.
MS. BLOOMER: Spend it wisely.
MR. RIBAKOVE: Going insane.
MS. DUSZA: You can do a little --
MR. RIBAKOVE: Well --
MS. DUSZA: -- on each one if you want. You can
--
MR. RIBAKOVE: It's going to let you do that?
MS. DUSZA: Not to put you on the spot.
Everybody's watching you. Glenn, are you able to --

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Put it on transit.

    MS. DUSZA: -- to enter some of your budget ideas?

    MR. GADBOIS: Yes, it -- and this is actually the
second time I've done this.

    MS. DUSZA: Oh, thank you, Glenn.

    MR. GADBOIS: I just find it frustrating that I
can't put all of it into increasing transit. That would be
the --

    (Laughter.)

    MR. GADBOIS: Again, I seem -- regularly though
find that I get to have, you know, two -- 250 million dollar
little stacks that I can't figure out where to put until I
figure out which category I'm left with.

    MS. DUSZA: Yeah.

    MR. GADBOIS: It actually going into.

    MS. DUSZA: Well, and that you don't necessarily
have -- if you think that you only want to spend an
additional one billion, you can say, oh, I think that's
good.

    MR. STEPHENS: You can click on performance now
and see what changed.

    MS. DUSZA: Yeah, see where we are on performance.

    MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

    MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, transit condition was yellow
and now it's not. And the ridership is green.

    MS. DUSZA: Good job, Josh.

    MR. STEPHENS: Congestion.

    MR. RIBAKOVE: Congestion still kind of sucks.

    MS. DUSZA: And part of this I think you -- if you
do mess around and go back to the budget and start adding
all the money to the roadway add a capacity, you're going to
notice that the traffic congestion doesn't leave the red.
Because we just don't have enough money --

    MR. GADBOIS: Right.

    MS. DUSZA: -- to address all our congestion

needs. I mean, there are some areas that -- I mean, it's

going to cost billions to buy all the right-of-way needed to

add an additional lane or make improvements. It's just --

the money that we need is just --

    MR. STEPHENS: Astronomical.

    MS. DUSZA: Yes. Which kind of then shows the

point that maybe we should start spending money on other --

    MS. BLOOMER: Right.

    MS. DUSZA: -- options to address congestion.

    MS. BLOOMER: So if you put all five billion in

traffic and roadways, it doesn't move the red arrow a single

bit.

    MS. DUSZA: No.

    MS. BLOOMER: So the moral of the story is don't
put a single penny there, put it elsewhere, and see where you can move at all.

    MS. DUSZA: You're still going to be --

    MS. BLOOMER: Because you're still going to be --

    MS. DUSZA: -- red.

    MS. BLOOMER: -- right where you are now.

    MS. DUSZA: In red, yes.

    MR. GADBOIS: Well, the big drivers on congestion are going to be the metro areas.

    MS. DUSZA: Yes.

    MR. GADBOIS: And so you can still invest some money in road improvements just, you know, understand it's not going to really do anything for congestion.

    MS. DUSZA: Correct.

    MS. BLOOMER: All right.

    MS. DUSZA: So then at the next step, that would be your -- the fifth one.

    MR. GADBOIS: Now when you get to the end and there's no comp -- there's no way to kind of finish this out. There's no, you know, done, close button.

    MS. DUSZA: There's a submit.

    MR. GADBOIS: So --

    MS. BLOOMER: Hold on, Glenn. She's going to walk us --

    MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, okay.
MS. BLOOMER: -- through the last number five, stay involved.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, the next -- for the next steps then where's the button you can click?

MS. DUSZA: After question four there's a submit and that submits all your --

MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay.

MS. DUSZA: -- selections.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And so in the next step there isn't really -- you're done, goodbye.


MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. DUSZA: And part of it, if you scroll to the top just a little bit, there's the compare yourself. So you can click that --

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MS. DUSZA: -- and kind of see how your selection ranked about -- everybody else who has taken it, you can see, you know, well I thought, you know, transit should be number one but only 20 percent of those who have taken this tool thought that transit was number one. So it kind of gives you an idea of how you stand compared to the others that have participated in the tool.

And that's our tool. That's what we've been promoting at our public outreach this round. This kind of
goes along with like I guess a little more further demonstration on the presentation that we made yesterday. 
That's where we're at. And we are really asking that you do promote this to your areas, to your members, so we get their input on how they'd like to see TxDOT spend their money and what they think their priorities are, so.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions of the committee?

(No audible responses.)

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you for sharing.

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you very much.

MS. DUSZA: Thank you. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to come talk to you about this.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. All right. We're moving onto Item 8 on the agenda, which is public comment. Again, if you'd like to speak, we just need you to fill out the form and submit it to Josh. The first person we have signed up to speak and we'll just -- Sarah.

MS. COOK: Sarah Cook.

MS. BLOOMER: Good. Oh, and you can just come over here --

MS. COOK: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: -- just so we can get it on the record. And I believe you signed up to talk about Item 5 and Item 6.
MS. COOK: Pretty much the same issue. Actually, I'm aggressively trying to advocate on the subject of the Eagle Ford Shale and our area.

MS. BLOOMER: Can you just introduce yourself --

MS. COOK: Sure. I'm sorry.

MS. BLOOMER: -- for the record.

MS. COOK: Sarah Cook, general manager of Southwest Area Regional Transit District. And we are in the Middle Rio Grande Region of the state of Texas. And I'm just aggressively trying to advocate on the issue of the oil shale, the energy industry that has impacted our area and other areas in the state of Texas. And what I mean by aggressively advocating, I'm not just advocating towards TxDOT but to other groups as well because this a regional problem. And so I'm glad to hear that it's something that will be considering in the upcoming request. And it's also part of regional planning as well.

And I want to reiterate, on the planning side, for us the last nine years of planning have been forming those partnerships regionally within our local communities. And we have been successful in some areas and not so successful in others. But over the last -- here in the last few years we have used original planning funds to go back and we're in the process right now of a regional needs assessment and how the oil shale is impacting our region as far as public
transportation is concerned.

The second step to that is hopefully we should actually have a completed needs assessment by the end of August and carry that in to revision of our plan. The plan that we submitted in 2012 no longer even mimics what's going on in our region at all. And so that was just hindsight and foresight together on our part as SART.

But one of the other things, and it's not just about wages and it's not just about travel time, it's not just about wear and tear on our vehicles and the amount of money that we're spending in maintenance, but it's two factors.

One, it's going to be a population factor come 2020. Especially in our region, Eagle Pass, Texas, where they were on the flag already to possibly become a small urban in 2010 and missed it. Chances are that is a big possibility come 2020.

Two, looking at the population that is being hindered by the shale, everybody seems to feel that the economic development that is formed or has grown in our area is a plus. But there is a population base that is -- that it is impacting on a negative, and that is the elderly. There is not much that they're getting out of the shale, and let's be honest, the baby boomers population has continued to grow, and so that means that the population, elderly
population, being impacted negatively by the shale is going to increase.

And so I just wanted to bring that up. I'm really trying to invite anybody that would like to come together as a group to not look at just threats, because I don't want to be negative about it, but I want to look at the possible opportunities that we have across the state of Texas in being aggressively active in the oil and energy industry by joining consortiums, telling your stories. But I think that a lot of -- those of us who are in rural areas that we put out fires every day and we're actually driving buses on a day to day basis because of the shortage of drivers in the counties.

But to come together to see what our options are. Be creative. Think outside the bus. The bus. And I say bus, I don't say box. I say bus. Okay. And also look at how not to go into this subject or this arena as being the be all powers of know what's going on. But to take the stance that we are the support system to what's going on within those regions. And that's what I wanted to address the committee about really what is a growing issue that others might think is a positive thing, but as far as our industry's concerned, it has negatively impacted us.

Let's not be negative, let's be proactive. But keep in mind that this is happening already. It's growing.
It's going to continue 20 to 50 years on down the line, so it's not going to go away. So that's -- I just wanted to let the committee know that this is something that I hope that you keep on your radar and understand that it's not going away. And that's it.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Sarah.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you, Sarah.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Eric, I know we talked about it yesterday at the semi-annual meeting about forming a working group around this issue.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And is that something that we can bring back sort of the discussion and work with that group back to PTAC just so we can stay updated on what's going on?

MR. GLEASON: If that's what the committee would like, you bet. I suspect perhaps not at your next meeting but maybe the meeting after that.

MS. BLOOMER: In the November --

MR. GLEASON: I'm thinking --

MS. BLOOMER: -- meeting?

MR. GLEASON: -- yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think that would good.

Okay. The next public comment we have is Judy Telge. Thank you, Judy. And Item --

MS. TELGE: Thank you, Madam.
MS. BLOOMER: -- Number 6?

MS. TELGE: Yes, thank you Madam Chair, and members of the committee. And, Glenn, I'm sorry you're not here. It would have been nice to see you. This is Judy Telge from Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living in Corpus Christi, Texas. I founded a center for independent living in 1996. I'm no longer the executive director. I've stepped down into --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Stepped up.

MS. TELGE: Stepped down, or rather up, actually, into transportation and housing. Two very big and connected issues for people with disabilities, spending a great deal of time with that. And that's why I'm here. I do want to bring to the committee a perspective that is specifically people with disabilities and seniors who are continued not to be served by transportation in our region.

Now we have recognized the needs not only in a region wide, coordinated plan, we've recognized it in plans I would say with COG for the past 20-plus years. Area Agency on Aging for the past even more years; how these needs are not being met and yet we continue to kind of see business as usual. And that, in our perspective, from centers for independent living, that has to change.

I helped two Texas state legislative -- Silver-Haired Legislators put together a resolution at the recent
-- their recent event in April. This was Rudy Cantu, Dr. Richard Garnett out of Fort Worth, Mark Walsh out of a rural community in our area. I have brought the resolution that was submitted, that was approved, but did not come out among the top 20 to be promoted by the Silver-Haired Legislature at this next session. I wanted to bring it. It's not the official resolution, but it's close to being the official resolution. It just doesn't have some of the signatures on it in terms of the approving.

But basically what it does is it maintains the requirement to have a coordinated effort for planning in the state of Texas for transportation. We did a lot of research in finding a way to address this issue. And what we came up with was to establish a statewide interagency mobility coordinating council. What we saw was that unless you've got the funding sources, the funding entities, the policy at that level, unless you have all those folks engaged at the state level, you're not going to be able to truly do the coordination at the local level because they don't -- they're not the source of money. They're not the source of power. They're not the source of policy. Okay.

And then you don't know what you're going to get locally. We have a mish-mash of good, bad and ugly. Okay. And I won't go into those differentiations. Too bad we don't -- and I know we have some best practices too. At any
rate, the resolution is something I would love to see you all consider. When you talk about planning and getting a rider, how about a rider to Texas legislature to do something of this sort?

There's lots of good information out there. There's lots of other states, Colorado was one that we looked at.

And I do want to mention that Doug Birnie, some of you know who he is, was -- is now retired with FTA. And the reason I got involved in this was through our National Mobility Management conference call where he said the states that do the best job in coordinating public transportation are the ones that have something at the state level, whether it's under the governor, whether it's through the governor's office, whether it's some other statewide effort.

What we thought would be a good effort in Texas would be to have this set up and it would have to go through the legislature, so we're urging the 84th Texas Legislature to establish this statewide coordinating council for comprehensive coordination of human service transportation for seniors and individuals with disabilities through the authority of the Office of the Secretary of State. That takes it out of the gubernatorial politics, the second level, and puts it into an area which actually is very good at coordinating inter-country or international efforts as
well as statewide efforts.

What we're concerned about is the fact that people with disabilities and seniors, even though that's what public transportation dollars is set up as priority populations, they still don't get included to the level that they should. And there's several reasons why they don't, part of it is planning. They're not as engaged in planning as they should be. Centers for independent living are not at the table as they should be. If they were -- and that's kind of a chicken-egg kind of thing. If they were you would see a lot more consumer directed efforts in terms of how that funding is utilized.

Is it going to be big bang for your buck type projects? No. It can't be because there's no big bang for the buck type population among people with disabilities. They're individuals. They have individual needs. Yes, it may look more like utilizing taxi, but it also looks like utilizing volunteers. It also looks like utilizing public funding in different ways than the way it is being used. It looks like people with disabilities being mobility managers because they understand. They get it in terms of what the needs and the issues are.

So I'm here to hope that there's an effort to at least look at a coordinating council at state level. In our area we have -- we approached two legislators. One a state
rep, totally, totally excited about it and wants to support it. And a state senator who says, huh, I think we have a good job of coordinating here. Well, what we said was we're not just talking about here, we're talking about throughout the state where there's such a disparity between regions.

Let me say one minor -- one final thing. And I know I'm going to get cut off. The -- I think one of the best things that our regional coordinating effort, and I say effort, has done has been to get some of us outside that arena, because it hasn't been a benefit to us for most likely political reasons, but others. It has gotten us outside that realm and gotten together to do some really creative stuff together in terms of -- and you talk about risk, assuming risk -- cost sharing that has the consumer paying a portion of what they can afford. That's critical to this. Cost sharing in that if it's a human service transportation or human service provider, they belly up to the bar with their money.

Us, as a center for independent living, we have money to bring to the table. We have aspects that we can bring to the table that no other entities have. And then transit ends up being much less of the one that requires to pick up the burden. At that state level, same thing. If you do a coordinating council at the state level, guess what, it's not all Eric's fault.
MR. GLEASON: Well, that's a start, but I mean --

MS. TELGE: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- it's not all Eric's job to get it
done either.

MS. TELGE: Exactly. He gets TxDOT, he gets to
share the risk with -- guess who one of the big partners
would be at the coordinating council that is now going to be
interesting; HHSC. They have got to be the big partner at
the statewide level. So does Texas Department of Housing
and Community Affairs. Absolutely critical. So does
workforce at the state level. Absolutely critical.

That's where you're going to get something done
and they can monitor and oversee what happens in the
regional areas in terms of the plans. Did they actually
develop a plan that has the meat to it that you guys want to
see, that we all want to see, and are they actually making
headway towards those performance measures that get sit --
set at the regional level. You don't want to take away that
local, obviously. But you got to have some sort of a real
skin in the game from the authority and the money and the
policy level.

So that's my pitch. You'll get more -- you'll
have -- you will have much more participation from centers
for independent living. There's five us in the state that
are doing some really creative things at our local levels
and we're going to expand that. And we appreciate the opportunity.

Love the fact that these meetings are now open by phone. We can listen and then get geared up to come to the next one to make comments. I will leave this with you, Madam Chair, even though it's not quite official, but it's got everything in it you need to know.

MS. BLOOMER: All right.

MS. TELGE: Thank you all very, very much.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you very much.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Judy.

MS. TELGE: Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Judy.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And, Josh, if you could just scan and email it out to all the members, that would be great.

All right. I don't see that we have any other public comment. Going once, going twice. All right.

Item 9 is confirm the date of the next meeting. I understand, if I recall, it's Tuesday, September 10th.

MR. RIBAKOVE: 30th.

MS. BLOOMER: Oh, 30th. Where did I get the 10th? Tuesday, September 30th. Is it at 1:00 or 1:30?

MR. RIBAKOVE: 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon at the --
MS. BLOOMER: At Jackson Street?

MR. RIBAKOVE: At Jackson Street.

MS. BLOOMER: At Jackson Street. Okay.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Yep. It will be six room 323.

MS. BLOOMER: So, Glenn, Tuesday, September 30th, 1:00 p.m. Put it on your calendar now. Glenn? Did we lose him?

All right. Hearing no other items, we're --

MR. GADBOIS: So sorry. Oops, sorry, Madam Chair, I was on mute.

MS. BLOOMER: Oh.

MR. GADBOIS: I just did put it on my calendar.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thanks, Glenn. Hearing no other items for discussion, we will adjourn the meeting. Thank you all for coming.

MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Glenn, for participating via phone.

(Meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.)
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