

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

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE -
TELECONFERENCE MEETING

200 East Riverside Drive
Bldg. 200, Room 1A1
Austin, Texas 78701

Thursday
July 24, 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Michelle Bloomer, Chair
J.R. Salazar, Vice Chair
Glenn Gadbois (telephonically)
Rob Stephens

TxDOT PARTICIPANTS:

Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN
Steve Wright, Public Transportation Division (Presenter)
Casey Dusza, TTP (Presenter)

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to order	Page 03
Safety Briefing	Page 03
Approval of Minutes	Page 09
Division Director's report	Page 05
Legislative Appropriations Request	Page 10
Texas Transportation Plan 2040 (TTP)	Page 21
Public Comment	Page 73
Sarah Cook, Southwest Area Regional Transit District	Page 75
Judy Telge, Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living	Page 78
Confirm Date of Next Meeting	Page 85
Adjourn	Page 86

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BLOOMER: 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.

1 If you wish to address the committee in our public comments
2 section, please fill one of those out and drop it off to me
3 and I'll get them to Michelle. And those are all right on
4 the table by the door. That is our safety briefing.

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

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

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

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

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

18 MR. GLEASON: He's probably on mute.

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

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

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

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

23 --

24 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

25 MR. GLEASON: -- and come back.

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

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: I'm back in.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, are you back?

10 MR. GADBOIS: I'm back.

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

14 MR. GADBOIS: Good, thanks.

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

22 You know, I think that we're entering into a
23 timeframe with public transportation in Texas, particularly
24 in the rural, small urban areas of the state, where there
25 are a number of issues and situations that are converging at

1 the same time or coming together at the same time that will
2 really make the next six to 12 months to two to three years
3 very, very challenging. The first of those, and we've
4 talked about this before, continues to be a concern that I
5 have about our capacity as a state with these programs to in
6 any sort of a predictable, sustainable fashion, asset
7 maintenance and replacement programs.

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

25 We were very fortunate the last six or seven years

1 to be able to put quite a bit of money into fleet
2 replacement that was all through discretionary program
3 opportunities at the federal level. And with those
4 opportunities not a part of the current authorization, and
5 although part of the discussion perhaps, certainly not part
6 of any sort of emerging solution in Washington to restore
7 those kinds of funding opportunities.

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

14 That's kind of the backdrop for this. And then in
15 addition to the asset maintenance and replacement issue, we
16 have a very, very important and critical issue right now
17 with the Medicaid medical transportation program as HHSC
18 proceeds to finalize the elements of its new procurement
19 with managed transportation organizations. I think they're
20 working with five or six managed transportation
21 organizations. And under the capitated risk approach there
22 is a lot of concern that the resulting contract
23 opportunities for traditional providers will be relatively
24 limited. And, you know, this represented about 28 million
25 dollars of contract service revenue last year for the state

1 for agencies operating in the state. They can use that
2 money for match, they can use it for cash, and they can use
3 it to help from a cash flow standpoint get through the times
4 when they may be waiting for federal and state
5 reimbursements.

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

12 And then the final thing I mention is we have in
13 large areas of the state where the shale development, the
14 energy sector development efforts are booming. While the --
15 for the state as a whole, the economic benefit of that is a
16 good thing, there are a lot of costs that aren't necessarily
17 being internalized or addressed in that effort that
18 communities and in particular transit agencies are having to
19 address. And, you know, wage rates don't -- aren't
20 competitive to hire or keep operators or vehicle maintenance
21 employees, physical wear and tear on vehicles, roads that
22 are damaged from the energy sector activity. Congestion is
23 adding to travel time and becoming more and more expensive
24 to provide the same level of service that they've always
25 provided.

1 And so those three specifics against the backdrop
2 of reduced per capita spending I think really, you know,
3 could dramatically alter what rural and smaller public
4 transportation looks like in the next three to five years.
5 So I need to work and I've committed to working with the
6 industry and the Commission to try and do those kinds of
7 things that TxDOT can do in this situation. And we also
8 recognize that a lot of the solutions are beyond our
9 capacity to address as well.

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

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

17 (No audible responses)

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

20 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

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

24 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

25 MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

1 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

2 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

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

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

6 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, from J.R. Michelle, yes. And
8 Rob?

9 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Alrighty. So the minutes are
11 approved. Moving on to Item 5 on the agenda, legislative
12 appropriations request discussion.

13 And, Eric, who will be leading this --

14 MR. GLEASON: I think I am.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Great.

16 MR. GLEASON: So we put this item on your agenda
17 because it's that time again where the department is
18 considering the -- its legislation -- legislative
19 appropriations request for the 2016-2017 biennium. And in
20 your packet we included a letter that this committee sent to
21 the Commission back in 2012 when it was at that time
22 considering the appropriations request for '14 and '15.

23 So we're at that point in time again. The general
24 question for the committee is do you wish to weigh in on
25 this process. The Commission is scheduled to get from staff

1 a draft proposal at their commission meeting next week. And
2 they are scheduled to take action on an LAR at their August
3 commission meeting. So this is the timeframe for the
4 committee, if it so desires, to weigh in on funding issues
5 that it thinks should be addressed in the LAR. And so I'll
6 just leave it at that.

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Eric.

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

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

20 MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

21 MS. BLOOMER: With very little results. The one
22 time we did have results was when it was specifically tied
23 to the census. And if we can figure out something we can
24 tie it to, that we might have a better chance of getting an
25 incremental increase. Those are just my thoughts.

1 MR. GLEASON: No, I agree. I think we need to --

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

3 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

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

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

19 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

1 that make sense?

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

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

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

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

1 members have any thoughts or ideas on --

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

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

11 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

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

13 --

14 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

15 MR. STEPHENS: -- the -- okay.

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

22 MR. STEPHENS: Could we tie it to the loss of the
23 Medicaid funding? To the 28 million you've been mentioning
24 about the loss of local and non-federal revenues used to
25 match, maybe juxtapose that loss with a strategy to help us

1 recapture that value somewhere down along the way? I mean,
2 maybe at least set a goal for ourselves where we're talking
3 about what we'd like to see as far as -- you mentioned
4 census. You know, in my area what I did is I took like --
5 our population rates are going crazy. Folks are coming in
6 just faster than the infrastructure can accommodate them.
7 So what I did is I challenged the locals to look at a
8 subsidy per capita and a subsidy per trip and looked at kind
9 of what we've done in the past, looking forward to what we
10 might see as a goal, where we'd want to be and what it would
11 take to get us there.

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

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

23 MR. GADBOIS: Right. Well, and Michelle, this is
24 Glenn again. I didn't mean to make it an either/or. The
25 two are fine and I actually think using Eric's three item,

1 you know, case for the (indiscernible) concerns, you know,
2 is a strong way to make the letter speak up, right?

3 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

9 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

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

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

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

1 at next week.

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

7 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

8 MR. STEPHENS: -- with that.

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

11 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

12 MS. BLOOMER: -- and just changing --

13 MR. STEPHENS: Exactly.

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

16 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

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

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

22 MR. GLEASON: Yeah, I think that -- if a draft,
23 you wanted to have a draft by the end of the first week that
24 would allow another week to get it into shape and get it
25 over by mid-month.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Well, we'll shoot -- the end of
2 August is next Friday. Or the first --

3 MR. GLEASON: End of July.

4 MS. BLOOMER: July.

5 MR. GLEASON: Is next Thursday.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

7 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

15 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

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

17 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

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

20 MR. GADBOIS: So moved. This is Glenn.

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

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

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

1 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, yes. Okay.

3 MR. STEPHENS: J.R., yes.

4 MS. BLOOMER: And Glenn?

5 MR. GADBOIS: Glenn yes.

6 MS. BLOOMER: All right. The motion passes.

7 Thank you all. Okay.

8 We will move on to --

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

11 MR. STEPHENS: To assist.

12 MR. GLEASON: -- to assist --

13 MS. BLOOMER: To assist.

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

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

16 MR. STEPHENS: Who's the lead?

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

19 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

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

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

24 MR. GLEASON: Actually, you did.

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

1 I --

2 MR. GLEASON: Possibly.

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

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

7 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

10 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- assist.

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

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

24 MR. GLEASON: And I'm kind of hearing a slimmed
25 down version of the previous one that might just simply

1 bullet the highlighted portions here as opposed to all the
2 explanatory text.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

4 MR. GLEASON: And then go in a little more detail
5 --

6 MS. BLOOMER: Detail.

7 MR. GLEASON: -- into the three issues that I've
8 talked about and the suggestion for, you know, if not this
9 then a rider to --

10 MS. BLOOMER: Do you want to --

11 MR. GLEASON: -- allow the additional analysis and
12 research around these items to further quantify the --

13 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

14 MR. GLEASON: -- benefits and costs to them.
15 Okay.

16 MS. BLOOMER: That will be great. Thank you. And
17 thank you for clarifying that. All right.

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

21 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Why don't you --

23 MR. GLEASON: This is a follow-up to an ongoing
24 conversation with the committee that we've had about the
25 direction of the regional coordination efforts that we've

1 had here in Texas since 2005, 2006. And as you know, staff
2 has worked over the last year or so with a work group of
3 stakeholders that have been engaged in that effort from
4 different parts of the state. There were a number of
5 recommendations that emerged from that effort on
6 modifications and new directions for the program. We
7 reviewed those with you. You requested some additional
8 background material on the issues that the recommendations
9 addressed and Sue provided you with those at the last
10 meeting. And then I believe at the last meeting you
11 indicated an interest in a different direction and looking
12 for our sort of assessment of what that might look like; is
13 that pretty much what we've got here?

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

17 MR. GLEASON: Performance measures.

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

21 TxDOT did recently convene a nine member working
22 group with representatives from diverse organizations across
23 the state. I do see two of those working group members
24 present today. I'd like to acknowledge them. Bob Schwab
25 with El Paso County and Janis Ferguson with the Texas

1 Workforce Commission. So we certainly want to recognize and
2 express our appreciation to them and the other seven members
3 of that group that look specifically at performance
4 measures.

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

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

17 Some considerations that this group took into
18 account in discussing and crafting some draft measures were
19 that the performance measures need to be meaningful,
20 realistic and attainable. Having performance measures will
21 require collecting and assessing baseline and follow-up
22 data. Data needs to be linked to planning. The data needs
23 to reflect that planning is part of a continuum; that is it
24 is ongoing, it includes identifying needs and gaps and ways
25 to meet or bridge those needs and gaps, but it doesn't stop

1 there. It also includes measuring performance to see if the
2 identified needs and gaps are actually met and/or bridged.

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

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

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

21 The second measure that is recommended is the
22 number of individuals engaged by transportation planning or
23 education activities, including elected officials, community
24 organizations, health and human services agencies, workforce
25 programs and others.

1 The third recommended measure is the number of
2 transportation needs identified in the regional human
3 services transportation plan, which includes needs of
4 priority population groups. And those would include groups
5 such as individuals with disabilities, seniors 65 and older,
6 veterans and others.

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

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

17 So those, just briefly, those are the
18 recommendations that come from the working group. I would
19 be happy to respond to any questions that you might have. I
20 will add, I think we discussed about this before, TxDOT is
21 interested in additional input. We'll make a final
22 decision. Our plan is to finalize not only these but
23 broader guidance for this effort and we will of course share
24 this guidance, including whatever is adopted as final
25 performance measures, with lead agencies and other

1 stakeholders. And our plan is to do this probably through a
2 set of regional workshops that we're looking at conducting
3 across the state, probably in January of 2015.

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

6 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

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

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

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

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

23 MR. ROBAKOVE: I have --

24 MR. WRIGHT: -- in your packet.

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

1 --

2 MR. WRIGHT: Oh.

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

7 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

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

18 MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

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

1 served, what's the point.

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

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

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

25 So that was discussed at length and so that was

1 the reason that I heard from the group that the discussion
2 then shifted towards, well, we can't stop at just simply
3 measuring the number of partnerships that we have or the
4 number of agreements that we have or the number of meetings
5 that we have. Those are all kind of process oriented sort
6 of things. Important, but not to stop there, but to
7 actually look at how many of those projects that have --
8 where implementation has begun or that there is some level
9 of completion.

10 MS. BLOOMER: I --

11 MR. GLEASON: If I may, Michelle?

12 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

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

25 The reality of the current program we have right

1 now today is that it's a real mix of planning and
2 implementation projects that are happening. But I think the
3 perception of the program is that it's largely been a
4 planning effort and people -- and we're unable to express in
5 a meaningful way the benefit of that eight years of
6 planning.

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

13 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

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

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

25 MR. WRIGHT: December of 2016.

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

9 MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: I think I would agree.

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

25 MR. GLEASON: And where's the result? Where's the

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

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

15 MS. BLOOMER: And I would agree. And I think what
16 I would like to see is that plan to transition. Because
17 right now in my mind this is still focusing on the planning
18 piece. And I understand we're going to keep what's in place
19 now through the next update, which will be at the end of
20 2016. But we -- I think we had talked about at the last
21 meeting of let's put together the transition plan, let's
22 start going out and talking to folks and let them know that,
23 you know, this is going to be the last plan that we're going
24 to fund as far as planning money goes and we want to
25 transition into maybe more implementation planning funding.

1 And then you'll have specific projects. Instead of planning
2 at the 30,000 foot level, let's bring it down to, okay, we
3 have a coordination project and we need assistance to do a
4 planning study to move that project forward. Not a large,
5 you know, North Central has a 16 county coordination plan.

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

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

22 And we're already moving that way and agencies who
23 are interested in continuing the effort have already started
24 to internalize the fact that TxDOT isn't going to have as
25 much funding available every year as they have in the past.

1 So I think the transition has already started. And I wanted
2 the record to reflect that we have sort of addressed the
3 issue of a relatively high amount of funding not necessarily
4 associated with results we can measure.

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

7 MR. GLEASON: Right. Exactly.

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

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

15 MS. BLOOMER: Right. And we talked about maybe
16 that's a statewide plan that the state does on behalf of
17 everybody so we can meet the requirement. Because it's the
18 goal to meet the -- obviously we have to meet the federal
19 requirement. We need to check that box. But in the end, we
20 need the end result that's trying to be accomplished by
21 doing that. You know, we don't need to spend a bunch of
22 money just to check a box and say we did it. It's the end
23 product that we want. And last time we had a large
24 discussion about what, in the end, what are we trying to
25 accomplish. Are we just trying to satisfy the federal

1 requirement or in addition to having to do that are we
2 actually trying to get some significant benefit out of the
3 coordination effort and the money that's being put towards
4 coordination and how do we best do that.

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

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

19 MR. GLEASON: Well, we have the capacity to
20 describe region-specific activities that have occurred that
21 have benefit associated with them. They don't necessarily
22 all roll up to an expression of statewide benefit. And I
23 think the trick for the future is I don't simply want the
24 statewide effort, if that's what we do, to simply be a
25 checkmark in a box either. I would like some feedback from

1 the committee on how to make that effort meaningful as well.

2 I think what we're saying is with a limited amount
3 of money available for this, that there's a desire from the
4 committee -- what I'm hearing is a desire from the committee
5 to more focus that money in the future on project
6 implementation that will have measurable results and not so
7 much on planning for planning sake. We still have --

8 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

9 MR. GLEASON: Yes?

10 MR. GADBOIS: Sorry, go ahead.

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

23 And what hasn't really been addressed are the
24 really hard issues, which is -- got nothing to do with
25 chasing after money, it's everything about this is the money

1 we have and how can we more efficiently coordinate and work
2 together to do more with what we have. And I think --

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

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

10 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

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

22 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. Glenn, I get that. I
23 get it. And moving toward a program that actually was more
24 focused on projects would be a way to provide incentive to
25 move there. I get it. That makes sense to me.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and yes, although I want to
2 kind of push and make it clear that it's not just focusing
3 on projects.

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

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

22 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

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

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

1 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

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

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

25 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

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

10 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I would just
11 add while I agree it can't be just you bring your needs and
12 -- one partner brings their needs and the other partner is
13 expected to fulfill them. I don't think it's -- I think
14 it's a little -- it's a mutually beneficial relationship
15 that -- you may have a partner, that I would consider a
16 partner, that doesn't bring any financial resources to the
17 table, but the relationship is mutually beneficial to both
18 of you. So, you know, I had a couple where they didn't
19 necessarily bring financial resources to the table but they
20 brought other resources; maybe mobility management resources
21 or we were able to work where we could agree that, okay, if
22 your clients will go at this day, during this time, that
23 will help us, because it's outside of our peak. It helps
24 you because your clients get served. But there was actually
25 no financial resources but both partners benefitted.

1 So I don't want to get just stuck on if you don't
2 bring money we're not a partner because then I think we
3 limit folks in their thought of who they go after for
4 partners. But you may have a very -- you could have a
5 partnership with a senior center, they don't necessarily
6 bring any money to the table, but they're willing to work
7 with you to get their client served, and not just coming to
8 you with a need and a demand, but willing to work with you.
9 And I would consider that a partnership.

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

16 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

20 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

21 MR. GLEASON: -- they already have to accommodate
22 a new need. And so I think there's a -- from a partnership
23 standpoint, there needs to be better acknowledgement and
24 accountability for the other party's interests. And I think
25 that's part of what's been missing in some of the

1 conversations around the state. I think some of the
2 conversations have been, well, we're all here now and we
3 have all these needs, what are you going to do about them?

4 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

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

21 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

22 MS. BLOOMER: -- under our conditions.

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

1 in a productive way.

2 MR. WRIGHT: So what TxDOT could do --

3 MR. GADBOIS: That --

4 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

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

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

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

20 One point that I wanted to share that I thought
21 that you all might find interesting in light of this
22 conversation we're having and to support the idea about this
23 working group and their acknowledging the same interests
24 that you brought up, Michelle, wanting a truly meaningful
25 metric. The group talked about that it would be ideal, an

1 ideal measure, would be the percentage of priority
2 populations, such as individuals with disabilities, seniors,
3 veterans, people who need rides to work, et cetera. The
4 percentage of the priority population who cannot get to
5 where they need to go. Employment, school, quality of life,
6 health services, due to lack of transportation. That the
7 group thought would be an ideal metric, we discussed and
8 considered it. It was taken off the list because it wasn't
9 seen as readily attainable because there apparently is no
10 data and -- to that point. And so the group did concur that
11 that is a need and to have that data would be highly
12 valuable.

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

23 MR. WRIGHT: You would look for --

24 MS. BLOOMER: But again --

25 MR. WRIGHT: -- a decrease in that percentage.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

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

17 So, for example, in Tarrant County a project is
18 Tarrant Rides. Tarrant Rides is a partnership between MHMR,
19 the United Way, the Area Agency on Aging, all the transit
20 providers of the Fort Worth Transportation Authority, the
21 City of Arlington's Handitran, the City of Grand Prairie's
22 Nets (ph), and Catholic Charities. And partners -- so you
23 have the partners that bring the financial money to serve as
24 match, and then you have the transit providers that serve as
25 partners to provide the service. And that's a specific

1 project that you can measure how many trips were provided as
2 a result of that project that would not have been provided
3 otherwise.

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

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

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

20 MR. GLEASON: Right. And what the partnership
21 did, the funding did in that instance, was it removed -- it
22 allowed the program -- project to move forward without all
23 of the potential partners at the table. With only a hand --
24 maybe two of the partners envisioned of the six there, the
25 funding stepped in and took away the risk to the project of

1 the others not being there to demonstrate the value so that
2 the others who weren't part of it could say there's benefit
3 in my agency joining that effort.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

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

8 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

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

11 MR. GLEASON: Exactly.

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

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

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

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

25 MS. BLOOMER: I think that's -- we had talked

1 about that being an option and moving in that direction.
2 That funding, either planning to -- let me take --
3 implementation planning. Like if you wanted to work with
4 partners to redesign your fixed routes to hit more partners,
5 or, you know, specific planning to implement -- not planning
6 to plan, but planning to implement a specific project, or on
7 pilot demonstration projects where we can actually measure
8 the -- discreet impact.

9 MR. STEPHENS: I -- this is Rob again. I take it
10 --

11 MR. GADBOIS: It --

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

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

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

24 And so I would take a moment to argue that in our
25 performance measures, either in them or as a separate

1 performance measure, we ought to recognize that the
2 experimentation and failure is something we want to
3 understand better and can learn from.

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

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

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

17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. This is not an action item,
18 but I think, Eric -- I guess what I'm trying to get my
19 handle on is -- and I know we've talked about we do the
20 peaks and valleys in funding. But I think putting that all
21 together in one page and before -- we had talked about it
22 last time, before we go out and start communicating with
23 folks about the next round of funding, which will be
24 available for planning, to update the plan, is that we have
25 in place how we're moving forward and going to transition so

1 we can communicate that to everybody at that point. That,
2 you know, this is the last time TxDOT is going to fund plan
3 updates, if that's what we're saying. Here's where we're
4 trying to go. The next year we're looking at, you know,
5 maybe this amount of money to do pilot projects or
6 demonstration projects or plan implemen -- or implementation
7 planning so people can start to think about, okay, and plan
8 for it next year, no money to update my plan because I just
9 did it, but going forward I'm going to have to bring that in
10 -- internally, and here's what TxDOT is looking for going
11 forward.

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

14 MR. RIBAKOVE: Last Tuesday in September.

15 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

16 MR. RIBAKOVE: Last Tuesday.

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

1 what happens to the planning --

2 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: I think that would be helpful.

12 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Good.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

14 MR. STEPHENS: When was that meeting?

15 MR. GLEASON: September. Last Tuesday in
16 September.

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

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

24 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

25 MR. GLEASON: But I think part of that discussion

1 is going to be what level of direction are you comfortable
2 recommending to the department. And what level of detail do
3 you need to get there.

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

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

19 So that should be deferred over to Medicaid
20 program, which is operating now independently in a different
21 way. So are those -- you know, can we develop baselines or
22 measurements of -- you know, or are our opportunities for
23 coordination decreasing, our opportunities to -- for those
24 trips that are deferred over to the Medicaid clientele. Or
25 are we increasing and they're decreasing. So I mean, you

1 know, it would be a nice time to kind of measure what's
2 happening there in the context of regional planning that
3 would be interesting.

4 MR. GLEASON: You might be surprised.

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

9 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

13 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

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

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

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

24 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

25 MR. GLEASON: -- that globally.

1 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

2 MR. GLEASON: I think that Medicaid --

3 MS. BLOOMER: Medicaid.

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

12 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

13 MR. GLEASON: But we just don't know yet. And
14 when I say you might be surprised, what I was thinking about
15 was the riders per trip number that, you know, is so
16 woefully low across the board. Assuming that that number
17 probably includes the trips associated with the current
18 Medicaid program, which is pretty much a taxi service.
19 Without that, you might actually see those numbers go up.
20 Now, the rest of the numbers may go to hell in a hand
21 basket.

22 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, yeah. Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

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

1 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

2 MR. GLEASON: -- solo trips anymore.

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

4 MS. BLOOMER: But I would agree with Rob, I think
5 we're in a position now to collect the before data and then
6 --

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

8 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

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

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

14 MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

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

18 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

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

22 MR. STEPHENS: And here's theirs.

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

24 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

25 MS. BLOOMER: -- you know --

1 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, or something, yeah.

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

4 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

5 MS. BLOOMER: -- except for this piece.

6 MR. GLEASON: Right.

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

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

12 MR. GLEASON: And that's been that way since
13 forever. Well, no, I'll say that at least since -- for the
14 last 10 years. So, yeah, we can look at that stuff and, you
15 know -- but as I said earlier, the contract service revenue
16 from Medicaid is more than just -- well, you know, it's a
17 match issue because a large portion of it is match.

18 Because, you know, you're supposed to cover your costs of
19 that service with what you get. And -- but you can use the
20 entire amount of what you get from match, but only the
21 amount above and beyond the cost is real cash for you. But
22 there is some element of that happening.

23 And then the third thing is, is this ability from
24 a monthly standpoint to manage your cash flow. When you
25 have a monthly reimbursement coming in from Medicaid that is

1 cash, when it comes in, you can pay your vendors with it
2 while you're waiting for reimbursements from us. And so
3 that's what makes it complicated and that's why putting a
4 single number on its impact is so hard, because we're going
5 to have isolate those three things.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

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

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

22 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

23 MR. GLEASON: And then we're going to have folks
24 that will sign deals because they need the funding and it
25 will wash out, three, four, five, six months later when

1 they're not getting the number of trips that they need. See
2 it's a combination of getting a good price per trip, but you
3 also have a certain quantity you need.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

10 MS. BLOOMER: And I -- it's probably hard to
11 measure too, but I think one thing -- and I heard it
12 yesterday as well, and with the last transition in Medicaid
13 -- is what clients' transit providers are currently serving
14 that are Medicaid eligible that will go over to Medicaid and
15 then will come back. Then the transit system's 5310, 5307,
16 5311 funds will be subsidizing those trips when they should
17 be over here in this bucket.

18 MR. GLEASON: It's hard --

19 MS. BLOOMER: So --

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

22 MR. STEPHENS: Why --

23 MR. GLEASON: -- need the Medicaid?

24 MR. STEPHENS: Right. That's what I've always
25 told Medicaid. Once they ride with us and we don't have

1 agreements with you, they're my client, they lose their
2 Medicaid identity. I don't care if they have money or not.
3 I mean, I don't -- well, I do have to pay the fare, but I
4 mean, that's not our -- that's not our eligibility to screen
5 them for services. You know, so once they're my passenger
6 they lose their Medicaid identity.

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

9 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

10 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

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

12 MR. STEPHENS: That's right.

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

14 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

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

17 MR. STEPHENS: Other funds.

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

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

22 MR. STEPHENS: Right.

23 MR. GLEASON: -- want to go down right now because
24 it's complicated. But, I mean, it depends. On a fixed
25 route system that may not be a bad thing. The dollar ride

1 systems, where every time you have one or two or three more
2 people that need to take a trip, you've got to put another
3 vehicle and a driver on the road --

4 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

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

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

10 MR. GADBOIS: Well, I think --

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

12 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, that's --

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

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

1 once removed, I think, from HHSC under this model.

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

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

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

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

20 MR. GADBOIS: Right, but only some, or you know --
21 there's a lot of shifting going on as far as -- at least is
22 what I understand or what people think is happening. And in
23 fact a lot of Medicaid providers, you know, pressure clients
24 to try public transportation before anything else. And if
25 clients aren't trained to say no, I don't have it, I need

1 your ride, then they may get pushed off to public
2 transportation. And my only suggestion is if we have a way
3 to find out anywhere close to what that number is, we then
4 have a better argument for them sharing some of the cost for
5 the public transportation services.

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

9 MR. GADBOIS: Well --

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

14 So I think we'll go ahead -- and just for the
15 folks -- I do have a couple public -- folks that would like
16 to make public comments. We'll go ahead and do that on Item
17 8 on the agenda.

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

22 MS. DUSZA: If it's possible, since most of you
23 saw, it's the same presentation that was given yesterday
24 during the transit operator's meeting, I thought it might be
25 good for us to --

1 MR. GLEASON: I just want to check in. Glenn?
2 I'm sure you're not seeing this.
3 MR. GADBOIS: I'm not seeing this.
4 MS. DUSZA: Oh, and my name is Casey Dusza. I'm
5 with TxDOT-TTP.
6 MR. GLEASON: Okay.
7 MS. DUSZA: Hi Glenn.
8 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.
9 MS. DUSZA: Are you in front of a computer, Glenn?
10 MR. GADBOIS: I am.
11 MS. DUSZA: I can send you the -- or I can tell
12 you the link and you can go through the tool as we do it
13 here, if you'd like.
14 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. My browser's up. What's the
15 link?
16 MS. DUSZA: Okay. It's TxDOT.MetroQuest.com.
17 MR. GADBOIS: MetroQuest?
18 MS. DUSZA: Yep.
19 MR. GADBOIS: Q-u-s-t-e?
20 MS. DUSZA: Q-u-e --
21 MR. GADBOIS: Dot what?
22 MS. DUSZA: Q-u-e-s-t.com. And, if I may, may I
23 bring up the --
24 MR. GADBOIS: Initializing driver.
25 MS. DUSZA: Okay.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Got it.

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

3 (Pause - setting up presentation)

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

6 (Pause)

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

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

23 The tool is set up to gauge the public and
24 stakeholder's opinion on their investment priorities. What
25 they'd like to see the money spent on. And then at the end

1 they're given a budget to actually move money towards the
2 type of scenarios that they'd like to see the money spent
3 on.

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

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

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

25 So if you were to put transit and rail options up

1 top, you just click and -- yeah. And can you do transit
2 condition, right above the bar. There. And whatever one
3 you would like to add to that. You can do job creation or
4 traffic congestion. Okay.

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

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

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

25 And then on the right-hand side you can see that

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

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

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

25 And then the third one is connectivity and freight

1 mobility. This one is where the money is being spent more
2 on the rural areas and the freight connectivity between the
3 urban areas. So this one not so much on the inner-city
4 transit but more of the connection between the metropolitan
5 areas. And as you can see, it's pretty straight down the
6 middle on all three of your top priorities. We're right in
7 the middle. And this one has a cost of 450 billion through
8 2040. Okay. Next.

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

18 So here is your budget. And as a part of this, as
19 you -- after you move your money into the areas that you
20 think that you would like to see TxDOT spend an additional
21 five billion if we got it -- not saying where it comes from,
22 not saying that we're going to get it, just if we had it,
23 this is where I personally would like to see it spent. You
24 are going to be able to see the performance of our system.
25 So after you fund it you can go over to the system -- or

1 performance tab, see how we're doing, and then go back to
2 the budget and move a little bit more money around to make
3 your arrows go where you want them to be, more in the green
4 rather than in the red. Yes, so that's as it is right now.
5 So highest we get is the yellow, some in the red. Jobs are
6 in the orange.

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

14 MS. BLOOMER: You got five million or --

15 MS. DUSZA: Five billion.

16 MS. BLOOMER: -- five billion to spend, Josh.

17 MS. DUSZA: Yeah. Get crazy.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Spend it wisely.

19 MR. RIBAKOVE: Going insane.

20 MS. DUSZA: You can do a little --

21 MR. RIBAKOVE: Well --

22 MS. DUSZA: -- on each one if you want. You can

23 --

24 MR. RIBAKOVE: It's going to let you do that?

25 MS. DUSZA: Not to put you on the spot.

1 Everybody's watching you. Glenn, are you able to --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Put it on transit.

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

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

6 MS. DUSZA: Oh, thank you, Glenn.

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

10 (Laughter.)

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

15 MS. DUSZA: Yeah.

16 MR. GADBOIS: It actually going into.

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

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

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

24 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

25 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, transit condition was yellow

1 and now it's not. And the ridership is green.

2 MS. DUSZA: Good job, Josh.

3 MR. STEPHENS: Congestion.

4 MR. RIBAKOVE: Congestion still kind of sucks.

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

10 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

11 MS. DUSZA: -- to address all our congestion
12 needs. I mean, there are some areas that -- I mean, it's
13 going to cost billions to buy all the right-of-way needed to
14 add an additional lane or make improvements. It's just --
15 the money that we need is just --

16 MR. STEPHENS: Astronomical.

17 MS. DUSZA: Yes. Which kind of then shows the
18 point that maybe we should start spending money on other --

19 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

20 MS. DUSZA: -- options to address congestion.

21 MS. BLOOMER: So if you put all five billion in
22 traffic and roadways, it doesn't move the red arrow a single
23 bit.

24 MS. DUSZA: No.

25 MS. BLOOMER: So the moral of the story is don't

1 put a single penny there, put it elsewhere, and see where
2 you can move at all.

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

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

5 MS. DUSZA: -- red.

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

7 MS. DUSZA: In red, yes.

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

10 MS. DUSZA: Yes.

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

14 MS. DUSZA: Correct.

15 MS. BLOOMER: All right.

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

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

21 MS. DUSZA: There's a submit.

22 MR. GADBOIS: So --

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

25 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, okay.

1 MS. BLOOMER: -- through the last number five,
2 stay involved.

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

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

7 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay.

8 MS. DUSZA: -- selections.

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

11 MS. DUSZA: Yep. Yep, yep, yep.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

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

16 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

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

24 And that's our tool. That's what we've been
25 promoting at our public outreach this round. This kind of

1 goes along with like I guess a little more further
2 demonstration on the presentation that we made yesterday.
3 That's where we're at. And we are really asking that you do
4 promote this to your areas, to your members, so we get their
5 input on how they'd like to see TxDOT spend their money and
6 what they think their priorities are, so.

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

9 (No audible responses.)

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

11 MR. SALAZAR: Thank you very much.

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

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

19 MS. COOK: Sarah Cook.

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

22 MS. COOK: Okay.

23 MS. BLOOMER: -- just so we can get it on the
24 record. And I believe you signed up to talk about Item 5
25 and Item 6.

1 MS. COOK: Pretty much the same issue. Actually,
2 I'm aggressively trying to advocate on the subject of the
3 Eagle Ford Shale and our area.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Can you just introduce yourself --

5 MS. COOK: Sure. I'm sorry.

6 MS. BLOOMER: -- for the record.

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

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

1 transportation is concerned.

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

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

13 One, it's going to be a population factor come
14 2020. Especially in our region, Eagle Pass, Texas, where
15 they were on the flag already to possibly become a small
16 urban in 2010 and missed it. Chances are that is a big
17 possibility come 2020.

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

1 population, being impacted negatively by the shale is going
2 to increase.

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

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

24 Let's not be negative, let's be proactive. But
25 keep in mind that this is happening already. It's growing.

1 It's going to continue 20 to 50 years on down the line, so
2 it's not going to go away. So that's -- I just wanted to
3 let the committee know that this is something that I hope
4 that you keep on your radar and understand that it's not
5 going away. And that's it.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Sarah.

7 MR. GLEASON: Thank you, Sarah.

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

11 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

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

18 MS. BLOOMER: In the November --

19 MR. GLEASON: I'm thinking --

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- meeting?

21 MR. GLEASON: -- yeah.

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

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

25 MS. TELGE: Thank you, Madam.

1 MS. BLOOMER: -- Number 6?

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

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Stepped up.

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

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

24 I helped two Texas state legislative -- Silver-
25 Haired Legislators put together a resolution at the recent

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

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

22 And then you don't know what you're going to get
23 locally. We have a mish-mash of good, bad and ugly. Okay.
24 And I won't go into those differentiations. Too bad we
25 don't -- and I know we have some best practices too. At any

1 rate, the resolution is something I would love to see you
2 all consider. When you talk about planning and getting a
3 rider, how about a rider to Texas legislature to do
4 something of this sort?

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

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

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

1 well as statewide efforts.

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

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

23 So I'm here to hope that there's an effort to at
24 least look at a coordinating council at state level. In our
25 area we have -- we approached two legislators. One a state

1 rep, totally, totally excited about it and wants to support
2 it. And a state senator who says, huh, I think we have a
3 good job of coordinating here. Well, what we said was we're
4 not just talking about here, we're talking about throughout
5 the state where there's such a disparity between regions.

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

19 Us, as a center for independent living, we have
20 money to bring to the table. We have aspects that we can
21 bring to the table that no other entities have. And then
22 transit ends up being much less of the one that requires to
23 pick up the burden. At that state level, same thing. If
24 you do a coordinating council at the state level, guess
25 what, it's not all Eric's fault.

1 MR. GLEASON: Well, that's a start, but I mean --

2 MS. TELGE: Right.

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

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

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

22 So that's my pitch. You'll get more -- you'll
23 have -- you will have much more participation from centers
24 for independent living. There's five us in the state that
25 are doing some really creative things at our local levels

1 and we're going to expand that. And we appreciate the
2 opportunity.

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

8 MS. BLOOMER: All right.

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

10 MR. GLEASON: Thank you very much.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Judy.

12 MS. TELGE: Thank you.

13 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Judy.

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

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

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

21 MR. RIBAKOVE: 30th.

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

24 MR. RIBAKOVE: 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon at
25 the --

1 MS. BLOOMER: At Jackson Street?

2 MR. RIBAKOVE: At Jackson Street.

3 MS. BLOOMER: At Jackson Street. Okay.

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

5 MS. BLOOMER: So, Glenn, Tuesday, September 30th,
6 1:00 p.m. Put it on your calendar now. Glenn? Did we lose
7 him?

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

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

11 MS. BLOOMER: Oh.

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

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

16 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

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

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

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, CET, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 86, constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the Texas Transportation Commission meeting held at 200 East Riverside Drive, Austin, Texas, on Thursday, July 24, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

DATED this 4th day of August, 2014.



Kimberly C. McCright, CET