

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Room 323  
Building 6  
3712 Jackson Avenue  
Austin, Texas

Tuesday,  
September 24, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN AUSTIN:

Michelle Bloomer, Chair  
J.R. Salazar, Vice Chair  
Glenn Gadbois  
Brad Underwood

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT BY TELEPHONE:

Rob Stephens

COMMITTEE MEMBER NOT PRESENT:

Christina Crain

STAFF:

Eric Gleason, PTN Director  
Bobby Killebrew, PTN Deputy Director  
Kelly Kirkland, PTN

<u>AGENDA OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE</u>		
<u>ITEM</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1.	Call to Order	3
2.	Approval of Minutes from July 9, 2013 meeting	3
3.	Division Director's report to the committee regarding public transportation matters	4
4.	In accordance with 43 TAC §1.83(c), final review of proposed revisions to 43 TAC Chapter 31: amendments to §31.3 (General); §31.11 and §31.13 (State Programs); §§31.16 - 31.18, §31.21, §31.22, §31.26, new §31.30, amendments to §31.31, §31.36, and §31.37 (Federal Programs); new §31.38, amendments to §§31.40 - 31.45, §31.48 and §31.49 (Program Administration); new §31.51 and amendments to §31.57 (Property Management Standards)	12
5.	Presentation and discussion of TxDOT's implementation of the Section 5310, Formula Grants for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program	43
6.	Review and discussion of PTAC Work Plan consistent with committee duties as described in 43 Texas Administrative Code §1.84(b)(3) and update on current activities related to work plan elements	53
7.	Discussion and comment of additional public outreach efforts for PTAC	56
8.	Public comment	none
9.	Confirm date of next meetings	68
10.	Adjourn	69

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MS. BLOOMER: We will officially call the  
3 meeting to order. We'll to item 2, approval of the  
4 minutes from the July 9 meeting.

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

6 MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion.

7 MR. SALAZAR: I'll second that.

8 MS. BLOOMER: One item I did want to clarify.  
9 On agenda item 2, Rural Transit Districts is abbreviated  
10 RDS instead of RTD, so if you'll accept a friendly  
11 amendment to make that change. Glenn and J.R.?

12 MR. SALAZAR: Sure.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

14 MS. BLOOMER: Did we have somebody join us?

15 MR. STEPHENS: Yes. I'm sorry, Michelle, I'm  
16 late. This is Rob Stephens here.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Hi, Rob. That's okay. We're on  
18 agenda item 2, approval of the minutes. We have a motion  
19 and a second and we're getting ready to do roll call.

20 Brad?

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye.

23 J.R.?

24 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

25 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

1 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And Rob?

3 MR. STEPHENS: Aye.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Before we move on to the  
5 division director's report, I did just want to let  
6 everybody know, Bobby sent out a letter; one of our  
7 members, Mr. Al Abeson, has resigned from the committee.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Doctor.

9 MS. BLOOMER: He doesn't like to be called Dr.  
10 Al. Al has resigned from the committee. I did ask Bobby  
11 to send out the letter, so you saw that, but Al could not  
12 make it here today; he is packing for a big trip to Paris.

13 So we thank him for his service and look forward to  
14 seeing him -- at least I do, in the Fort Worth area on  
15 some regional coordination efforts that are going on.  
16 He's not here, but thank you, Al.

17 Okay, Eric, we'll turn it over to you for the  
18 division director's report.

19 MR. GLEASON: All right. For the record, I'm  
20 Eric Gleason, director of Public Transportation at TxDOT.

21 You all have a copy of the director's report.  
22 It highlights four items of interest, I hope, for the  
23 committee. We have totally closed and finished off our  
24 Recovery Act grant projects here, and 130 different  
25 projects, we procured over 400 vehicles, constructed or

1 rehabbed 41 facilities, and were part of 22 information  
2 technology projects. So that was a significant effort on  
3 our part, and in large part, I think it worked so well  
4 because of the collaboration we have with the rural  
5 transit districts throughout the state to get it done. So  
6 that's a milestone.

7 FTA state management review. This is our  
8 version of the 5307 review. They come around once every  
9 three fiscal years and they review our program. They tell  
10 us it's not an audit. And anyways, in my view, we did  
11 very, very well for the size of the program, and the  
12 consultants who did it were very complimentary of the  
13 program we have here in Texas. They're not allowed to put  
14 any of that into the report because they're only paid to  
15 report on the findings they had.

16 So we were able to close about half of a  
17 handful of minor deficiencies they had identified before  
18 the final report was issued, and we have, I think, three,  
19 maybe four more to wrap up before the end of October. So  
20 it was a good review, by and large.

21 2010 census impacts, we have a call for  
22 projects out similar to what we did last year. Proposals  
23 are due back this Friday, and I think we're targeting the  
24 November commission meeting, the November 21 commission  
25 meeting for award of those funds.

1           And then finally, we're in the middle of  
2 conducting a number of workshops around the state to talk  
3 about local match. This is the result of some research  
4 that the department funded with PPRI through A&M, and four  
5 regional workshops and this is just some general  
6 information for folks who want to learn about where to  
7 find match and how to use it. We have had a workshop in  
8 Corpus. I think the Lubbock one is tomorrow. I know  
9 Darla is on her way there. And Houston is when, Kris?

10           MS. DUDLEY: Houston is the 2nd and 3rd and  
11 Dallas is the following week.

12           MR. GLEASON: We had a great one down in Corpus  
13 Christi. I think a lot of folks who attended found it  
14 very useful. And it's a kind of a combination of general  
15 knowledge by PPRI staff and then some more specific  
16 knowledge on the part of our staff to help the  
17 conversation. So those seem to be going well.

18           The one other thing I will add at this point  
19 that's not a part of the report is with Al's departure  
20 from the committee, it's a reminder that now with Al  
21 having resigned, we have three openings on the committee,  
22 and I have written our State Legislative Affairs Division  
23 to alert them that we need to be contacting the Governor,  
24 the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker's Office to get  
25 those three appointments made as soon as we can.

1           The Governor has an opportunity to appoint a  
2 transportation user representative, as does the Lieutenant  
3 Governor, and the Speaker has the opportunity to appoint a  
4 general public representative, so two users and one  
5 general public. And the Governor's Office has been very  
6 responsive in the past, the other two offices it's been  
7 kind of hit and miss. They've got a lot on their plate  
8 and getting them to focus on the appointments has been a  
9 challenge, but we will try again. Whatever we end up  
10 sending out, I'll copy the committee members on so you can  
11 see.

12           And I would be interested, it's not on our  
13 agenda necessarily to talk about at this time, if members  
14 wanted to think about and send to me criteria or thoughts  
15 they had on not necessarily names as much as the kinds of  
16 people we might be looking for to kind of round out the  
17 committee, that would be helpful. We'll let these offices  
18 know that an appointment needs to be made and then we  
19 would volunteer to provide them with any information they  
20 might need, including potential names, if they would like.

21           The Governor may take us up on that; we've not had either  
22 of the two offices call us and ask for more information on  
23 that.

24           Anyway, that concludes my report.

25           MS. BLOOMER: Eric, do the other two offices,

1 like the Governor's Office, have an appointments staff  
2 person?

3 MR. GLEASON: Certainly not to the extent the  
4 Governor does; the Governor has pretty well staffed up to  
5 make appointments, the others not so much.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Any comments or questions for  
7 Eric?

8 MR. GADBOIS: Just a followup on that one, and  
9 then I do actually have a couple of questions for Eric.  
10 Generally speaking, if you know somebody that wants to be  
11 on there, if they go talk to their senator or their  
12 representative and have their senator or their  
13 representative talk to their body's boss, that's generally  
14 the way that flows. But I was going to ask you -- thank  
15 you for anticipating -- you have the opportunity to put  
16 thoughts and/or suggestions?

17 MR. GLEASON: We'll offer them. We have them  
18 if we're asked for them.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Right. Okay.

20 Can I ask the couple of quick questions, or  
21 what I hope are quick questions? On the state management  
22 review, Eric, are there any items that came up that are  
23 going to come before us?

24 MR. GLEASON: No.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And then on the local

1 match workshops, first, just generally not knowing much  
2 about it, I love the idea that you're doing that. Is it  
3 designed really to kind of be hands-on and to help people  
4 to understand how to develop local match or just help them  
5 get their minds -- what are the desired outcomes?

6 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think it's a combination  
7 of both, and it probably depends on where the individual  
8 attending the session is. It's more generally focused, I  
9 think -- the folks from PPRI are not the specific transit  
10 match experts, but they're able to give people general  
11 ideas, and then combined with TxDOT staff who are there or  
12 other peers in the room, some conversations can get going  
13 where individuals may actually leave with a very specific  
14 idea of something they might be able to do. And  
15 certainly, I think we've already had some back and forth  
16 with folks from the Corpus Christi workshop with specific  
17 ideas that they have.

18 So I think it's a conversation that has needed  
19 to happen for a while and I see this as just the first of  
20 some ongoing focus we need to bring to the whole issue of  
21 local match and how to go about structuring your  
22 organization to take maximum advantage of what you have.

23 MR. GADBOIS: And just to observe, we have some  
24 creative talent at this table and elsewhere in the state  
25 that actually do kind of an amazing job.

1 MR. GLEASON: Oh, yeah.

2 MR. GADBOIS: To the extent that that can be  
3 pulled into the conversation and shared across other areas  
4 might be really helpful.

5 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely. I think in Texas  
6 there are just an amazing variety of different approaches  
7 that have been used, and most of the challenge is just  
8 getting people hooked up with someone who's done something  
9 that they have the ability to do themselves.

10 MR. SALAZAR: And that's actually how it kind  
11 of got started, Glenn, was we had a focus group that got  
12 together -- I think I was on it, Brad is on it, Rob is on  
13 it -- several different people throughout the state got  
14 together and threw out a bunch of ideas, and from there,  
15 that's kind of how it evolved to this training that we're  
16 talking about.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: There was focus groups and  
18 surveys. I think it's been going on probably two years,  
19 I'd like to say about two years, trying to gather  
20 information and now there's going to be a resource guide  
21 that's going to be given out to everyone as well so that  
22 you can go back and look at it, and I think we have  
23 scenarios and things like that that people have done  
24 across the state.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Fantastic. That's a huge issue

1 for lots of people, so thanks.

2 MR. GLEASON: One of the things we're doing is  
3 public transportation coordinators are attending the  
4 workshops as well because, you know, they may very well  
5 start seeing some match proposals that they're not used to  
6 seeing, and so we're anticipating it's going to be kind of  
7 a new world for our staff as well.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Are you getting any folks like  
9 United Way or any of the private sector folks kind of  
10 engaging on that conversation?

11 (Nods of agreement.)

12 MR. GADBOIS: Good, good. Beautiful. Thanks.

13 MS. BLOOMER: I look forward to the I think  
14 it's October 8 and 9 one in Mesquite. I wish it was in  
15 Fort Worth, but hey.

16 Any other questions of Eric on the director's  
17 report?

18 (No response.)

19 MS. BLOOMER: I did just want to say  
20 congratulations to Eric and his staff for closing out 50.6  
21 in ARRA grants and having a successful state management  
22 review. Those were both two very large accomplishments.

23 MR. GLEASON: Appreciate that.

24 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Then we will move on  
25 to item 4, which is the administrative rule revisions.

1 Bobby, I'll turn it over to you.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: Thanks, Michelle.

3 For the record, Bobby Killebrew, deputy  
4 director of Public Transportation Division here at TxDOT.

5 This is probably the lion's share of the  
6 package you have in front of you. Don't be scared by the  
7 volume; it's not intended to scare you off, so don't  
8 leave, we still need the quorum. I'm going to just take a  
9 few minutes just to go through what you have, and then  
10 maybe we can get to some back-and-forth questions and  
11 answers, if needed.

12 Very quickly, this is agenda item number 4,  
13 Rob, in the pack that we sent you electronically, and  
14 there are several things in here. The first two pages is  
15 an updated timeline. Since the last time this committee  
16 met, we did publish the rules in the *Texas Register* --  
17 yay! We had a public hearing, we didn't have anybody show  
18 at the public hearing -- sad -- but we did conduct a  
19 public hearing. So we are now to the point in the  
20 timeline where this committee is meeting to look at the  
21 final draft of rules that are scheduled to be presented to  
22 the commission at their October 25 meeting.

23 Today the committee can do a couple of things  
24 in regards to this final review of the rules: one is you  
25 can provide comment; the other item is you can actually

1 just waive your final comment. So if you do decide to  
2 provide comment, that comment could be we endorse this  
3 package as presented, or we endorse this package as  
4 presented but with the following suggested changes. So  
5 we'll leave that up to the committee to discuss in a few  
6 minutes.

7 Any questions on the timeline as we go forward?  
8 There's very few things left on the timeline, so we're at  
9 the end of this very long, long process. Yes, Michelle is  
10 clapping, and I agree.

11 We did have two comments that we received  
12 during the public comment period. The public comment  
13 period was open for 30 days, and so we received one  
14 comment in hard copy. That's the next item in your  
15 package. It's from the Panhandle Regional Organization to  
16 Maximize Public Transportation, or as they refer to  
17 themselves, PROMPT. That is seven pages worth of comments  
18 from PROMPT. And we did receive one comment through the  
19 internet from the Alamo Regional Transit. That's actually  
20 ACOG down in the San Antonio area, and they had three  
21 pages of comments to provide to us.

22 I'm not going to go through their copies of the  
23 comments, I'll just jump straight on to what we did with  
24 those comments, if anything, and then through the rule  
25 package before you today, if that's all right.

1           As you're flipping through there, there is a  
2 page -- with a typo in the title -- The Summary of  
3 Nonsubstantive Changes to the Texas Administrative Code.  
4 It is a one-page item, and I'll give Rob a minute to  
5 locate that.

6           From the comments we received, there was some  
7 thought given to the uses of the terms not urbanized  
8 versus rural. You might remember in your previous meeting  
9 we talked quite a bit about that. MAP-21 had changed some  
10 terminology from non-urbanized to rural. We tried to  
11 follow the federal changes as much as possible so we don't  
12 have a version in Texas that differs from guidance from  
13 FTA.

14           For the most part we agreed with the comment we  
15 received, and we went through and did a scan and a search  
16 and replace if we had made a mistake and failed to change  
17 a non-urbanized term to the term rural, then we went back  
18 and did that. However, we did not go back and do that in  
19 the JARC and New Freedom pieces of the Administrative  
20 Code, and here's our logic on that. We've heard from FTA  
21 that they're not going to change their guidance on JARC  
22 and New Freedom because they considered those repealed  
23 programs, and quite frankly, they have a lot on their  
24 plate, so they're pretty much going to leave the old  
25 guidance for JARC and New Freedom alone which does contain

1 that old terminology, so we did not want to differ in JARC  
2 and New Freedom. As we continue to still spend those  
3 funds, we wanted to keep that as closely as possible to  
4 that existing federal guidance. But elsewhere in the TAC,  
5 we went and checked to make sure we were pretty  
6 consistent, and if we weren't, we went ahead and made the  
7 change.

8 We also received a comment from the same  
9 organization that said our use of the term low income,  
10 sometimes low hyphen income, sometimes just low space  
11 income, two words, was inconsistent, so we went back and  
12 did a little check on that. And so you will not see those  
13 type of things highlighted for you in the package before  
14 you today because we just went through and did that.

15 MR. GADBOIS: Bobby, let me back you up.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes, Glenn.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Since you did some comment on  
18 your responses to the second, the Alamo Area comments, but  
19 you didn't really make any about the Panhandle comments,  
20 are you coming back to that? Can I just make sure at some  
21 point you reflect your thinking on the issue they raise  
22 about TxDOT district may be able to collapse into  
23 continuous districts and their lack of comfort with that?

24 MR. KILLEBREW: I think you can discuss that as  
25 a group today, if you'd like to talk about the way the

1 Administrative Code is drafted and how the group wants to  
2 weigh in on how the code is drafted as far as does that  
3 change need to be reflected in this final version or not.

4 I think that's probably a discussion for the committee to  
5 have.

6 To answer your question, we did not take their  
7 comment about collapsing/expanding the districts and made  
8 any changes to what this committee had already reviewed  
9 and approved.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: So the other changes that we  
12 have highlighted for the committee so you can see where  
13 they take place, are in that big piece of your packet  
14 today, and just so we all get on the same page, I'll just  
15 kind of give a little guidance, again, about how we refer  
16 to the different pages. When you actually look at the  
17 Texas Administrative Code as it's presented to you, in the  
18 lower right-hand corner you'll see Exhibit B, C, D, and so  
19 forth, in the upper right-hand corner you'll say page 1  
20 of, or 2 of, or whatever, and then along the left-hand  
21 spine you'll see line numbers 1 through 23. And so what  
22 we've done in the summary here is we've actually  
23 referenced where we've made the changes from the previous  
24 version already approved by this committee.

25 And so the first one is actually in Exhibit B,

1 page 11, beginning on line 23, and there's where you'll  
2 see some highlight. It's at the very last line on that  
3 page and continues on to the next page. We did receive a  
4 comment regarding the Public Transit Safety Plan. What  
5 you're looking at is the definitions section of the  
6 Administrative Code, and we had defined the Public Transit  
7 Safety Plan using several lines to define it. We also  
8 then repeated that back in a later section of the  
9 Administrative Code verbatim, and the commenter said that  
10 it doesn't seem to make sense why you would do that twice,  
11 why you would define the definition with all this number  
12 of lines of words and then go back later in the  
13 Administrative Code and do the same thing, so we agreed.  
14 So this is a truncated version of that definition, and so  
15 all we've done is take out several of those lines that  
16 were repeated in the later section.

17 The next exhibit, Exhibit C, page 10 on line  
18 12. This is a change that we actually initiated ourselves  
19 as a department and going back and rereading these rules.

20 This always shows that you can't have enough eyes on a  
21 set of Administrative Code when you're making changes.  
22 When we went back and looked at this again, we realized  
23 that we had referenced an incorrect term, talking about  
24 the agencies. We had used the term government entity, and  
25 we should have used the term public entity, as defined for

1 this section of the Administrative Code. For the public  
2 entity, that would include our rural transit districts,  
3 political subdivisions, so forth, the governmental entity  
4 definition did not. So our oversight. We're correcting  
5 this now as a final adoption to make sure that we do  
6 include all those eligible agencies as we intended to do.

7 MR. GADBOIS: Bobby, given so many of these are  
8 responses to the definitions section, do we have the  
9 definitions section somewhere?

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Yes. The definitions section  
11 is actually Exhibit B, Glenn.

12 MR. GADBOIS: B?

13 MR. KILLEBREW: B, as in boy.

14 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Got it.

15 MR. KILLEBREW: The next change that we made  
16 from the previous version this committee approved is in  
17 Exhibit D, page 38, beginning on line 8. This also is a  
18 department-initiated change. This section that you're  
19 looking at on page 38 is actually in one of the new  
20 federal programs, it's the new Section 5339 program, what  
21 kind of replaced the bus and bus facilities program. The  
22 committee wanted to add language that projects awarded  
23 under this program needed to be tied to a transit asset  
24 management plan, but we realized that the federal  
25 government, FTA, has not issued guidance, has not issued

1 any direction on a transit asset management plan, so it's  
2 difficult for the department to actually impose that  
3 requirement if we've not actually developed a transit  
4 asset management plan. However, we've got money in this  
5 program already that we're probably going to need to  
6 administer so that we make sure we do get a program.

7 So we've added some language in here that more  
8 or less says that at such time the department implements  
9 the requirement of a transit asset management plan, then  
10 the projects under this section would need to be tied to  
11 that plan. Does that make sense to the committee?

12 MS. BLOOMER: Bobby, this is Michelle, for the  
13 record. Just a quick question, trying to remember back,  
14 we know we're waiting for FTA guidance, but I thought the  
15 guidance from FTA was don't wait for their guidance. So  
16 are we still going to go ahead and proceed with developing  
17 asset management plans, or are we going to wait until FTA  
18 comes out with guidance?

19 MR. KILLEBREW: We're going to go ahead and  
20 start working on the transit asset management plan, and if  
21 FTA develops guidance and issues that guidance during our  
22 development of that, we'll have to, of course, adhere to  
23 it. But we're not going to wait for FTA to come out with  
24 something, but we also don't want to tie the awards in  
25 this program to something that may take the department yet

1 another twelve months to start implementing. The downside  
2 is MAP-21 is a two-year bill and we know we don't have  
3 appropriations for 2014 yet but we've got some '13 money  
4 in this program and we're fixing to have some '14 money --  
5 knock on wood, Congress gets their act together -- and so  
6 we don't want to tie up those funds waiting for MAP-21 to  
7 expire. It's just a race to get to the finish line right  
8 now, so we want to give ourselves as much leeway as  
9 possible.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you. I would agree. We  
11 don't want to hold the money up from being awarded, but I  
12 didn't also want to wait till FTA came out with guidance.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: I attended some meetings in  
14 August in Washington, D.C., and FTA had some timelines on  
15 some of the MAP-21 provisions. To my amazement, some of  
16 those timelines did not have implementation until 2017.  
17 Now, again, FTA has a lot on their plate and they're going  
18 to go after the big fish first because that's where the  
19 money is, and some of those smaller fish may just have to  
20 wait until they grow to priority on their list. But yes,  
21 we laughed in August, as well. They have limited staff,  
22 as well.

23 The next change is over the program management  
24 area, which is Exhibit E, and it begins on page 11 and  
25 goes forward. This happens a couple of different times in

1 Exhibit E. Page 11 is one of the pages, page 13 is  
2 another one of the pages with the changes on them where  
3 we've added some new language. Our legal counsel had  
4 another individual look at our changes in the  
5 Administrative Code, they also revisited the legislation  
6 passed by the legislature, Senate Bill 59, in regards to  
7 data we collect from the transit operators and when  
8 reports are due and so forth, and they did not feel, in  
9 our good intentions to mirror this as closely to Senate  
10 Bill 59 as possible, that we actually did that job, and so  
11 they asked us to go back in here and repeat, if possible,  
12 verbatim the language that was in Senate Bill 59.

13           So what you see in these two occurrences in  
14 this exhibit is our effort to repeat verbatim what's  
15 actually in the Senate bill that was codified into the  
16 Transportation Code. It doesn't change the meaning of  
17 this, it doesn't change our current practices because  
18 we've been doing this for years, years and years and  
19 years. We've had a rider in the appropriations bill for  
20 years that caused us to do this, as well. So we're just  
21 mirroring what was in the actual Senate bill that got  
22 codified into the Transportation Code.

23           MR. UNDERWOOD: It says specifically monthly?

24           MR. KILLEBREW: Yes, it does. And we collect  
25 the monthly data now. That was just a term that we had

1 not used in the Administrative Code, so the lawyers has  
2 suggested put it in there.

3 The last change on this package, the final  
4 package from what you reviewed and approved, is in Exhibit  
5 F, page 6, line 23, and page 8, line 3, and this was the  
6 use of the word ensure with an E versus insure with an I.

7 One of our commenters, good for them, they read the code  
8 very closely and they caught those type of items, and so  
9 we went through and made sure we did the proper use of the  
10 word ensure versus insure, and so you'll see those  
11 changes, as well.

12 Other than that, what you see before you is  
13 exactly what the committee had approved at its last  
14 meeting to go forward. So today, again, the committee can  
15 provide comment or can waive comment, and so I think now  
16 is a perfect opportunity for discussions, and I'm here to  
17 answer any questions I may be able to.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Before we get to the two  
19 comments received, are there any questions for Bobby just  
20 related to the changes that he made before we open it up?

21 MR. GADBOIS: Or clarification on this, can I  
22 ask a question about that?

23 MS. BLOOMER: What's this?

24 MR. GADBOIS: Particularly Exhibit E. Given  
25 the changes you made reflecting the Senate language now in

1 the Transportation Code, that deals with operations. One  
2 of the discussions we had talked about, Bobby -- and I  
3 just don't remember whether it's in here, whether it  
4 wasn't in here, or even what we actually decided, so just  
5 help me remember, if you will -- we discussed getting  
6 providers to do some kind of financial reporting. Some of  
7 the systems already have to do that, particularly the ones  
8 that I think don't are the rural where they have financial  
9 management plans, three-year, five-year, whatever it is.  
10 Is that in here at all, or did we decide to leave it out,  
11 or what?

12 MR. KILLEBREW: The part that I'm remember,  
13 Glenn, on that I thought dealt with some of the asset  
14 management type activity, and part of the Transit Asset  
15 Management Plan is a requirement to do some of that  
16 financial planning, so that's still in the Administrative  
17 Code.

18 MR. GADBOIS: For everybody. Well, here's the  
19 example that I remember, just to kind of make sure because  
20 I don't remember asset management as much as, somebody  
21 will get a grant from you and then won't spend it and will  
22 sit on it, and there's no way to even keep good track of  
23 that, much less to make decisions on spend it or lose it.

24 And so in my memory, part of the discussion was about  
25 that, but what I'm understanding from that is that's not

1 really dealt with in here.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: No. And to that comment, we  
3 did discuss that at one of the previous PTAC meetings and  
4 our conversation was we have some internal practices and  
5 things in place, we have milestones in the contracts, we  
6 don't like open-ended contracts, they do have a beginning  
7 and an end date, and projects are reviewed by the field  
8 staff on a regular basis to ensure that we don't have  
9 people who are issued funds and sit on it. That's not  
10 necessarily something that's Administrative Code as much  
11 as a policy of the department and a practice within the  
12 division that we need to make sure we keep on top of our  
13 projects and the awards.

14 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. KILLEBREW: yes, sir.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any comments or  
17 questions specific to the two public comments that weren't  
18 covered by the committee? I had a few.

19 Bobby, I understand these are public comments  
20 and so they go into the record, but is there any  
21 communication back to the individuals from the division?  
22 My one concern is PROMPT and on the second page their  
23 comment that they're concerned that the boundary issue may  
24 be tied up in the Medicaid boundary issue, and just wanted  
25 maybe if you could put it in the transcript that that was

1 not the intent, that there's no tie between PTAC's  
2 discussion of TxDOT being able to take the TxDOT districts  
3 and create multi-district groupings or boundaries, that  
4 has absolutely nothing to do with the Medicaid districts.

5 MR. UNDERWOOD: I thought that was interesting  
6 too.

7 MS. BLOOMER: And then I did have a question on  
8 the other one, if you could clarify the comment on Exhibit  
9 A where they say these two statements are contrary where  
10 in one we say that funding will be allocated along the  
11 district boundaries, and the second one states that TxDOT  
12 may choose to combine contiguous boundaries for project  
13 selection. Is that just their interpretation but that's  
14 not exactly what we said? We said we'll use the TxDOT  
15 district boundaries but we gave TxDOT the authority to add  
16 districts together to create multi-district for regional  
17 coordination purposes when it made more sense.

18 MR. KILLEBREW: Sure. Going back to the PROMPT  
19 comment about the Medicaid thing, what we do -- and you  
20 don't have in your packet because this is something we do  
21 in the rulemaking process for the commission -- is we  
22 actually have to do a preamble to this rulemaking process,  
23 and we have to address every public comment we've  
24 received, we also have to address comments that come from  
25 the advisory committee, if it's appropriate, so in this

1 case it's an appropriate since we have an advisory  
2 committee, so we'll put your comments today in that  
3 preamble as well, and how you vote and so forth, and the  
4 department will address those.

5           When we go through those comments from the  
6 individual organizations or receive them from individuals,  
7 if they're similar comments from several people, we'll  
8 group them, if they're not so similar, then we'll actually  
9 list them individually, and we'll say a commenter said, or  
10 Jane Little from ABC Transit commented that whatever, and  
11 we'll have a response on how we handled that comment. If  
12 the department concurs with the comment, which we did in  
13 some cases from this, and we think we need to make the  
14 change, a nonurbanized versus rural. In other cases, the  
15 Medicaid, for example, if that's outside this particular  
16 rulemaking package, then we'll say that and we won't  
17 handle it any further.

18           The person providing the comment can see that  
19 as part of the public record. It's been a mixed bag in  
20 the past. If we don't get a lot of public comments, then  
21 we do try to reach out to the organizations that did  
22 provide public comment. That's not required, it's a step  
23 we go above and beyond because we think that's good  
24 customer. Obviously, if we got 500 comments, we might not  
25 do that. In this case we will probably reach back to

1 these organizations to let them know at least the status  
2 of that and invite open conversation, if it's appropriate.

3 With Medicaid, it may not be appropriate that we have an  
4 open conversation, that's not something that TxDOT has  
5 purview over. So that's how we'd probably handle the  
6 Medicaid comment, and we're working on the preamble right  
7 now.

8 The comment about the district, whether we keep  
9 that at a very distinct district line on the map, you  
10 can't do anything but that, versus it may make more sense  
11 to consolidate for a planning process, project selection  
12 process, obviously from a project administration process,  
13 it would make more sense to consolidate some of those  
14 things. We took the guidance from the committee, as well  
15 as the department agrees, that that's probably something  
16 we still need that flexibility to do.

17 We all realize that with the way MAP-21 is  
18 treating the 5310 program that some of the rural areas of  
19 Texas, based on TxDOT district boundary, are not going to  
20 have a lot of funds. We also understand that the transit  
21 operators don't have boundaries based off TxDOT lines, we  
22 know that the regional planning entities don't have lines  
23 based off TxDOT lines, so in some areas of the state, we  
24 do need that flexibility. It's more for the local input  
25 to be there. We think that that is an advantage. And so

1 we will go that direction if approved by the commission to  
2 be able to do that.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Can I explore that a little bit  
4 further? Because my understanding was we say district  
5 boundary is the preferred, but we can take district  
6 boundary and district boundary and merge them into one.  
7 That's what our rules say. Right? So I actually don't  
8 understand their comment, and really what I want help  
9 understanding is what are they actually concerned about.

10 MR. GLEASON: If I can, this is Eric Gleason.  
11 When I read their comment, I think the observation I would  
12 make is that there's language -- this committee made a  
13 recommendation to not change the formula that is used to  
14 allocate funds, and that formula is based on TxDOT  
15 districts, so step one, allocate the funding by district.  
16 Step two, then, is all the subsequent decision-making  
17 that takes place about whether to combine districts, and  
18 as you combine districts, each district brings their money  
19 to the table, so it seems like where they're confused is  
20 thinking that those two processes are somehow related to  
21 each other or conflict with each other. It's actually a  
22 very linear process, the funding decision is a district-  
23 based decision, period. If it's combined subsequent to  
24 that decision to make decisions on projects and so forth.

25 MR. GADBOIS: So you think they're just

1 confused.

2 MR. GLEASON: I believe so.

3 MR. GADBOIS: In which case, clarification can  
4 greatly help.

5 MS. BLOOMER: And will that be included in the  
6 preamble? I'm just concerned, it may not be appropriate  
7 for the preamble, but at some point we get back to them  
8 and clarify their comment and what the intent is and if  
9 it's a misunderstanding.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: It probably will not be  
11 included in the preamble to that level, but the plans are,  
12 again, we only received two comments, it's very easy to  
13 get back to these two organizations and have a  
14 conversation with them on all their thoughts.

15 MR. SALAZAR: Is it appropriate for me, as an  
16 individual, to chime in with them? Because I know Lylene.

17 MR. GADBOIS: You, as an individual, can do  
18 whatever you want.

19 (General talking and laughter.)

20 MR. SALAZAR: I kind of agree with the comments  
21 that are going around, I think they're looking at it as  
22 somebody is going to come in and take over kind of thing.

23 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

24 MR. KILLEBREW: This became public record today  
25 at this meeting, so these are public records that you're

1 looking at, these are now open to the public, and as Glenn  
2 was saying, you can do whatever you want. But obviously,  
3 you can reach out, and certainly a PTAC member, they would  
4 be reaching out to you, as well, for your guidance.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Now, here is, I guess, we go  
6 through this rulemaking process, we go through the  
7 rulemaking process every so often, it's a laborious task.

8 Right? But it also is something of an experiment that  
9 even then when law still depends on kind of how it gets  
10 implemented and how things work out, and they will work  
11 out differently in different areas. Is there tracking, do  
12 we do any kind of tracking assessment or evaluation of new  
13 rules that get implemented to see where there are hot  
14 spots, unintended consequences, things that didn't work as  
15 we thought they might?

16 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric Gleason. Glenn, I  
17 don't think I would say, and to answer your question from  
18 a formal standpoint, I don't think we have a history of  
19 formally going back six months later, twelve months later  
20 and asking ourselves what have we heard, this is what we  
21 did, have we heard anything about this one or that one.  
22 It's been more we hear from people when things aren't  
23 working for them.

24 MR. GADBOIS: That's the easy way.

25 MR. GLEASON: Now, that's not to say that we

1       couldn't, and even that this committee couldn't say we  
2       want this topic back six months from now or twelve months  
3       from now, we want to hear what, if anything, you have to  
4       report from your experience in implementing them. That  
5       might suggest that everything is great or that some  
6       changes need to be made. That would be perfectly  
7       appropriate, I would think.

8                 MR. GADBOIS: And the reason I asked that is  
9       most of the comments I've heard on these rules are, you  
10      know, they look pretty good, you know, we're pretty happy  
11      with the way they are, our worry now is implementation.  
12      Right?

13                MR. GLEASON: And if you look back at the  
14      history, it's been a fairly extensive effort to reach out  
15      to people and people have had a lot of opportunity to  
16      comment, and one of the major general things was don't  
17      mess with things too much because, on the whole, things  
18      seem to be working pretty well.

19                MR. GADBOIS: And change is scary.

20                MR. GLEASON: And change is scary. But I  
21      think, on the whole, people didn't want us to do very  
22      much, and so in part, that's perhaps why we're not hearing  
23      a lot right now. But I think we did do, and this  
24      committee certainly put a lot of effort into outreach,  
25      which is always the best way to make sure at this point in

1 the process we don't have a lot to talk about.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Very extensive outreach.

3 Bobby, can you just clarify the second comment  
4 on the strategic priorities. Was it removed or just  
5 relocated? From the PROMPT group, their second major  
6 comment, Exhibit B, page 14 to 17.

7 MR. KILLEBREW: Strategic priorities was a  
8 definition that was removed because the term is no longer  
9 used in the Administrative Code, and so when we went  
10 through the first time to see if there was any obsolete  
11 language that hit the mark on that one. It's an old term  
12 that we used to use way back in the days when we had like  
13 a set-aside program. For some people who are old, like  
14 me, there used to be a 10 percent set-aside program for  
15 what we called new starts in Texas, and that meant like  
16 newly started systems. If you remember, J.R., way back  
17 when we had those, 10 percent of funds were set aside for  
18 new starts.

19 We started getting Texas pretty much covered at  
20 some point in time, and so we renamed the new starts to  
21 being strategic priorities, so it then became other  
22 strategic priorities of the commission, so in case there  
23 was something that came up in the state that hey, great  
24 idea, let's go fund it because it's strategic priority.

25 After adopting the more recent versions of the

1 formulas, we don't have that set-aside for strategic  
2 priorities or for new starts anymore, and that was a term  
3 we just never got rid of. So that's kind of the history  
4 and why it's being deleted out of the definitions section.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So it's deleted out of the  
6 definitions section, but somewhere in those 90 pages of  
7 Administrative Code, we had like eight principles that we  
8 had listed out, and those are still included: leverage  
9 existing resources, coordination and partnerships.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: Those are the guiding  
11 principles in the 5310 program and all that is the new  
12 language that the committee decided on, and that is all in  
13 there, but that has nothing to do with the strategic  
14 priority term that was left over, and we probably should  
15 have taken it out a couple versions or changes ago and we  
16 just didn't do it.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any other  
18 changes on the PROMPT comments? And we thank them for  
19 submitting their comments.

20 Going to the Alamo Regional Transit comments,  
21 we appreciate them reading them with a fine-tooth comb.  
22 One of the recommendations under specific, they asked:  
23 "Will TxDOT create a mechanism to facilitate offering  
24 disposal property and equipment to other FTA or state  
25 recipients?"

1 I know this is a concept we had talked about  
2 when we were doing the regional coordination planning,  
3 about creating a statewide listing on the regional service  
4 planning website of vehicles that are being disposed of.  
5 I believe there actually is something out there.

6 MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. It's not on the  
7 regional service planning website, we actually have it  
8 through our PTMS system, our public transportation  
9 management system. We have a clearinghouse where we can  
10 list I hate to say used vehicles, it's like a used car lot  
11 or something, but that's what it is, so if someone has got  
12 a decent vehicle that they want to share with other people  
13 in the state, then they can certainly advertise it there.

14 We also have a very strong internal network through our  
15 PTCs, and I guarantee you if someone is giving up a  
16 vehicle, another PTC is asking for it, and so we have  
17 moved vehicles across the State of Texas, we will relocate  
18 them if they still have some useful life left and they're  
19 still safe to operate.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Great. The next comment  
21 was: "We realize MAP-21 prescribes a definition of  
22 "senior." Nonetheless, we ask that you ask FTA if this  
23 makes sense when considered against work transit agencies  
24 perform to coordinate activities with the Area Agencies on  
25 Aging which define an older adult as somebody who is 60 or

1 above."

2 I think we talked a little bit about that last  
3 time, but given the federal coordinating committee or  
4 council on coordination, it kind of flies in the face that  
5 we have one federal agency defining older adults as 65 and  
6 another federal agency defining older adults as 60. Is  
7 that something that TxDOT can weigh in on and recommend  
8 that we pick one?

9 MR. KILLEBREW: I'll address it as far as this  
10 goes. That was a MAP-21 change, it is in federal statute,  
11 so we can't change what the federal statute says in our  
12 implementation of these particular programs that deal with  
13 that definition. Now, can any organization weigh in and  
14 say I don't like the federal law, reauthorization is  
15 coming up, you federal agencies get together, you all  
16 decide what is the cutoff, is it 60, is it 62, is it 65,  
17 whatever it is, make sure it's all there, because we do  
18 run local programs in my system. I think that's an  
19 advocacy type avenue that people can go through the  
20 associations at the national level or individually through  
21 their Congress folks they can advocate one way or the  
22 other.

23 We understand the difficulty that this may  
24 cause and probably will cause some transit systems; there  
25 are some, I know, in the Metroplex that are probably going

1 to have difficulty with this. But it is something that we  
2 don't have the ability to say we're going to go against  
3 what federal statute says, they say 65, we're going to  
4 change it to 60 in Texas. This is unique to the 5310  
5 program so we are going to have to follow that particular  
6 law.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And if I can jump in on  
8 Michelle's question, I don't think she was asking you to  
9 ignore federal law, I think what she's asking is can the  
10 State of Texas or TxDOT communicate to the federal  
11 agencies that it sure would be helpful to the state and  
12 programs within the state if they would get their act  
13 together and give us one definition, either 60 or 65.

14 MR. KILLEBREW: And Eric sits on a coordinating  
15 council, a recent appointment for him, here in Texas, and  
16 I think there are some avenues -- not to speak for you,  
17 Eric -- but I think there are some avenues there as well  
18 because that supports coordinating here in Texas, so if  
19 Texas wants to speak with one voice, we have to remember  
20 not just TxDOT speaking but Texas as a whole needs to  
21 speak we'd like to have one definition. Because then it's  
22 just, well, this one agency in Texas says change it, this  
23 other agency says no, keep it at 60, we like it just fine.

24 MR. GLEASON: While you're talking for Eric,  
25 can you just says yes, I'll take that to the Texas

1 coordinating council?

2 (General laughter.)

3 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I don't  
4 think we need to make a recommendation if it should be 60  
5 or 65, I would just ask that we highlight it to the  
6 federal agency that's responsible for coordinating across  
7 all the federal agencies that you have two federal  
8 agencies defining it different.

9 MR. GLEASON: And if I may, I think we did  
10 include that in our comments that we submitted on the 5310  
11 program, so we're trying but we can try more, for sure.

12 MR. GADBOIS: Good. Thanks.

13 MS. BLOOMER: So Bobby, back to your point,  
14 it's the 5310 program so those funds can no longer be used  
15 to transport individuals who are 60 to 64 and 364 days  
16 old?

17 MR. KILLEBREW: Not speaking for FTA -- because  
18 I know some folks will be getting their 5310 funds  
19 directly from FTA, they won't be coming through TxDOT --  
20 my advice to individuals that I have spoke with, including  
21 some of my federal partners, is that if there's capacity  
22 on the vehicle that you let anybody, because if there is  
23 capacity, the general public can ride, and anyone below  
24 that age group is certainly the general public. And so my  
25 advice to people is to consider that when you're doing

1 your schedule and dispatch and your route planning and  
2 your coverage areas and so forth, be very flexible at that  
3 end.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions for the  
5 Alamo? Any other questions or comments on what the  
6 committee would like to do? Our two options are to  
7 provide comment, we can either endorse as presented or  
8 endorse as presented with changes, but I don't think we've  
9 talked about any, or waive our final comment. So I'd be  
10 happy to entertain a motion.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: What did we do last time? Did  
12 we vote to comment?

13 MR. KILLEBREW: The last time the committee  
14 unanimously voted to take the package as drafted. We had  
15 considered all the comments from the committee and made  
16 those changes, so it was the package as discussed and  
17 agreed to by the committee.

18 MR. GLEASON: If I may, I think what the  
19 committee talked about last time was whether or not at  
20 that point to formally comment to the commission at the  
21 meeting, and the committee decided to wait until final  
22 rules were before them before they would formally comment  
23 at the meeting. So we can talk about that when you're  
24 done with this.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: It would be my motion that we

1 approve this as presented or recommend approval as  
2 presented. Is that what you want?

3 MS. BLOOMER: Provide comment, endorse as  
4 presented?

5 MR. UNDERWOOD: Endorse as presented.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I have a motion.

7 MR. GADBOIS: I'll second that.

8 MS. BLOOMER: And a second. We will do roll  
9 call. We'll start with Rob.

10 MR. GADBOIS: Can we have one moment of  
11 discussion? My second is contingent on actually you  
12 looking at ways to just kind of keep your ear to the  
13 ground on how this gets implemented and do some level of  
14 tracking. Let us know if it -- I mean, if it goes really  
15 awry, we'll all hear about it, but if there are any  
16 lessons to be learned. Appreciate it.

17 MR. GLEASON: Thank you. And if I might say,  
18 the next topic on the agenda will give you a little bit of  
19 a glimpse into how we're moving forward with the 5310  
20 program.

21 MS. BLOOMER: So we have a motion and a second.  
22 Rob?

23 MR. STEPHENS: Aye.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Brad?

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye.

2 J.R.?

3 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

4 MS. BLOOMER: And Glenn?

5 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

6 MS. BLOOMER: So the motion passes unanimously.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. GLEASON: Before we move on, do you want to  
9 talk about how you want to organize your effort in front  
10 of the commission in October?

11 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. I guess at the last one we  
12 talked about having PTAC members at the meeting. Do we  
13 have anybody who would like to represent PTAC? What's the  
14 date again?

15 MR. KILLEBREW: October 25, last Thursday of  
16 the month.

17 MS. BLOOMER: It's usually on a Thursday, isn't  
18 it? The 24th, October 24. J.R., would you like to  
19 represent as the vice chair?

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'll be there to support you  
21 morally, if you need me to, J.R.

22 (General talking and laughter.)

23 MR. GADBOIS: And what are we talking about  
24 that we would do?

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: I think it's just a matter of

1 we stand up and say we think this is a good thing, we've  
2 worked on it for many months, we're recommending that you  
3 take this final adoption last step, thank you very much.

4 MR. GADBOIS: If that's all you want, I'm here  
5 in town and I'm happy to reflect that for the committee,  
6 if that's your will.

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm available, Glenn is  
8 available, Rob is available -- I mean, J.R. is available.

9 MS. BLOOMER: I didn't hear from J.R. that J.R.  
10 was available.

11 MR. SALAZAR: No, you didn't.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So Glenn and Brad, if you  
13 can attend and represent us and let the commission know  
14 the support of PTAC, as well as the transit industry, and  
15 as well as appreciation for TxDOT PTN and all the hard  
16 work and outreach to get this where it is today. I do  
17 think all the outreach that was started probably, I think,  
18 last year has a lot of impact on what comments we have  
19 received. I think we received a lot of comments along the  
20 way and we threw things out that people didn't really  
21 like, they let us know, and we didn't get a whole lot of  
22 comments to that point at this juncture, so I think that's  
23 a reflection of all that work that was done up front, and  
24 I do appreciate that.

25 All right. So Brad and Glenn will represent

1 PTAC at the October 24 meeting

2 MR. STEPHENS: Is it October 24 or 31?

3 MS. BLOOMER: 24th.

4 MR. STEPHENS: On the TxDOT website the  
5 commission meeting is listed on the 31st.

6 MR. GLEASON: It's the fourth Thursday of the  
7 month, not the last necessarily.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Rob, are you looking at the TxDOT  
9 website?

10 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

11 MS. BLOOMER: And it says the 31st?

12 MR. GLEASON: I've got it on the 31st as well.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: I stand corrected.

14 MR. GLEASON: Good catch, Rob. Thank you.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn and Brad, are you available  
16 on the 31st? That's Halloween.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: It's just a little spooky but I  
19 think I can be there.

20 (General talking and laughter.)

21 MS. BLOOMER: All right. If for some reason  
22 that doesn't work, let us know.

23 So let's move on to agenda item 5, which is the  
24 5310 program presentation, and we'll turn it over to  
25 staff.

1           MR. GLEASON: Kris Dudley is here, who is our  
2 program manager for 5310. Kris has been working hard to  
3 implement 5310 as it's reorganized under MAP-21, and as we  
4 were going through our rulemaking process, we were having  
5 to also make decisions along the way on how to move ahead  
6 with this program that was consistent with the direction  
7 and the rules that having them not in place yet, we went  
8 ahead and hopefully made some good assumptions. We  
9 thought it would be helpful for the committee to simply  
10 hear from Kris at this time about how we are moving ahead  
11 with implementing the program. This is not an item that  
12 we're looking for action on the part of the committee, but  
13 I think in the spirit of valuing your feedback and  
14 insights into things, we thought we would share this with  
15 you and kind of treat it as a first report back.

16           MS. DUDLEY: Good afternoon. For the record,  
17 my name is Kris Dudley. I'm the 5310 program manager. I  
18 want to point you to your handout in your book. It's the  
19 very, very last page, it's on the back of agenda item  
20 number 5.

21           As Eric intimated, FY 14 is a transition year,  
22 and the FY 13 funds are administered already based on  
23 projects selected prior, so this is clearly a transition  
24 year into the new MAP-21 guidance and to the new TAC  
25 rules. And so we're including the TAC information that

1 you guys have approved to include operating expenses, as  
2 well as the PTAC directed overarching goals, guiding  
3 principles, and I've listed them there: leveraging  
4 existing resources; the only public transportation option  
5 for a proposed service area; the projects are sustainable  
6 over time; demonstrate efficient use of resources; involve  
7 partnerships that include organizations and for-profit  
8 transportation providers; or provide service continuity.  
9 So you'll see these also referenced in the application.

10 The federal guidance is very clear that we have  
11 public outreach, good public outreach, and so all PTCs  
12 coordinated with this match training is an afternoon of a  
13 couple of hours of public outreach training with the  
14 Office of Public Involvement from here at TxDOT, and the  
15 PTCs have been really happy about that. And so the PTCs  
16 are going to work very hard to engage members of the  
17 targeted population, specifically seniors and persons with  
18 disabilities, and so we're giving different tips on how  
19 they might engage those folks.

20 The application process. Historically, the  
21 application was just part of the regular 5311 application  
22 part 1, and it was kind of disjointed and all over the map  
23 and it was about 30-plus pages, and you had to skip back  
24 and forth. So what we've actually done is we've  
25 consolidated that and it will look like, those of you that

1 are familiar with the coordinated call for projects, the  
2 first part is language directly from the TAC, talking  
3 about the 5310 process, and then the rest of it is  
4 evaluation criteria which takes those questions that were  
5 previously asked, there are no new questions, we're just  
6 asking that it be done in a narrative format.

7 The one thing different is we are also asking  
8 for a budget. Historically, it was just kind of a little  
9 how much money do you need and then it was a one-liner, so  
10 we're asking for a bit of a budget this time.

11 The schedule. Historically, the schedule has  
12 run from May, the application is put out on the street,  
13 and then the program of projects is due in Austin on  
14 October 1, and that's in line with the federal funding.  
15 So what we're looking at this time to kind of align  
16 ourselves a little bit with the new rules and be in place,  
17 we are looking at October we're having a VTC, video  
18 teleconference with the PTCs on October 3 to talk about  
19 the new application, and they'll all have had, for the  
20 most part, their public outreach training. So the process  
21 will start in October, applications will be accepted  
22 through the end of January, February 1 the program of  
23 projects will be due here. And that's just for FY 14  
24 only, then we'll go back to the regular process May  
25 through October, in the event that maybe one day we'll

1 have a federal budget on October 1.

2           So once the applications are turned in by the  
3 local areas, the state staff will review the applications,  
4 make sure that they are in line with the criteria,  
5 especially those overarching principles or the guiding  
6 principles. And the funding, just like we talked about  
7 earlier, will be given on a TxDOT district basis, and as  
8 Bobby mentioned earlier, some areas have limited funds and  
9 now how the funding is allocated in small urban and rural  
10 and then the large urban projects, if you're a rural area  
11 and you don't have a small urban area, you really don't  
12 have a lot of money, especially if you're bordered by a  
13 large urbanized area.

14           We've been working collectively with the PTCs  
15 and the local areas, if you have a small urban and a rural  
16 pot, you could perhaps work with those dollars  
17 interchangeably and look at the needs of the regions. And  
18 then as we've been working with the major metro areas,  
19 we've been talking about historically with JARC and New  
20 Freedom we talked about trip origination to determine  
21 which pot of money we would use, but now we're looking at  
22 maybe trip destination -- there's nothing written in the  
23 TAC -- it's just how we might work better with our major  
24 metropolitan areas.

25           Houston is very amenable to that because

1 Houston has about \$3 million and so they're looking at  
2 trip destination as far as being able to fund some of the  
3 rural projects out of the urbanized money.

4 And I just kind of want to recap what happened  
5 with the FY 13. The rural allocation alone was  
6 \$2,666,157, and the requests from the rural area was  
7 \$5,682,214. And what happened there was we didn't have a  
8 lot of applications from the small urban areas, so we were  
9 able to certify that the needs were met in small urban and  
10 transferred those dollars to the rural areas. In  
11 addition, we had about a million dollars left from FY 12  
12 that we were able to help other projects with. So it  
13 looks like this is going to be a lot different this  
14 particular year.

15 MR. GADBOIS: To fully fund requests.

16 MS. DUDLEY: And so one of the considerations  
17 that we'll be talking to PTCs about -- and you guys may  
18 want to comment on this -- is how they use their TDCs.  
19 Historically, the projects have used TDCs for any of the  
20 funding categories, the vehicles, the purchase of service,  
21 the preventive maintenance, any of those we allowed TDCs  
22 to be used. Some areas chose not to use TDCs for  
23 preventive maintenance.

24 The only thing is when you use TDCs, you use a  
25 lot more of the federal money a lot quicker, because if

1 you use the TDCs, because it's like phantom match, the  
2 full cost of the vehicle or the purchase of service has to  
3 be subtracted from the actual allocation. So you guys  
4 might have something to say about that. We're going to  
5 talk to the PTCs to make sure that everybody knows when  
6 you use TDCs you go through the money a little bit  
7 quicker.

8 So there you have it. Do you have any  
9 questions?

10 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Kris. Any questions  
11 for Kris?

12 MR. SALAZAR: I have one. When you talk about  
13 consolidation of districts, is that going to be a transit  
14 provider, are we going to request that, or are the PTCs  
15 going to look at that, or how is that?

16 MS. DUDLEY: That's interesting you should ask,  
17 J.R. We've discussed that a lot up here. Currently, the  
18 only districts that have actually done that historically  
19 are in the east region, Houston, Beaumont and some parts  
20 of Lufkin and Colorado Valley, they've all kind of come.  
21 But right now, transit providers, PTCs, folks can make  
22 recommendations, but it will have to be blessed by us up  
23 here at the state level at the PTN, department level. So  
24 if you have a recommendation, you know.

25 MR. GLEASON: If I may. We're not necessarily

1 looking as a department to impose a decision of ours on a  
2 group of stakeholders or districts, our preference would  
3 be that it sort of be the result of a bubble-up  
4 communication. I talked to staff about this specific  
5 year, fiscal year 14, not wanting to jump into that too  
6 quickly and needing some time to think about how we'd  
7 actually identify the opportunities, but my preference  
8 would be to hear from stakeholders. And so as I sit here  
9 and think about this right now, one thing we might talk to  
10 PTCs about is as a part of this process is engaging their  
11 stakeholders not for this fiscal year but for next fiscal  
12 year if they think it could be helpful to combine, and we  
13 could get some information about of the current process to  
14 help us with next year.

15 MS. DUDLEY: Because as I went through the FY  
16 13 projects, what I saw, like in your case, J.R., and in  
17 your case, Brad, you all had to kind of go to lots of  
18 different areas and get bits and pieces and bits and  
19 pieces. So when I was thinking about it, you know, to  
20 kind of eliminate all that duplication on your part, but I  
21 think, to take Eric at his word, that you guys might look  
22 at that this year as you're working and work with your  
23 PTCs to make some recommendations.

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: Would the PTCs then work  
25 together to do the 5310 meeting, I'm assuming?

1 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

2 MS. DUDLEY: That's how they do it in the east.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: Like I have four districts to  
4 go to this year and if we were to combine, say, Paris and  
5 Wichita Falls, that would be Susan and Sonia, and yet  
6 neither one of them manage the contract and Bobby would  
7 get the contract.

8 MR. GLEASON: We can work through that, that's  
9 fine. I mean, I would be looking for it as an opportunity  
10 for not only our staff to work together but all of you, as  
11 well. So it's whatever makes the most sense.

12 MS. DUDLEY: It's worked quite well in the  
13 Houston east area, having everybody around the table and  
14 understanding those needs.

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: But even though you combine the  
16 district doesn't mean that you could take any more out of  
17 one district than what you would have been allotted for.  
18 So if we were to combine Paris and Wichita Falls,  
19 providers out of the Wichita Falls District couldn't take  
20 any more money from the Paris District than they would  
21 have been allotted out of the Wichita Falls District  
22 funding pot. Correct?

23 MR. GLEASON: What I would say to that is that  
24 I would hope that the dynamic of the combined stakeholder  
25 group would allow them to reach a decision that may or may

1 not result in that happening. So in other words, in an  
2 ideal world it's not really about my fair share when you  
3 come through the door for the first time. That is going  
4 to be some of the dynamic, and absolutely, if that is  
5 something that is part of it, it will have to be  
6 addressed. My preference, because it's been the  
7 experience of the program before it got split up from an  
8 allocation standpoint, is people sat down and did the  
9 right thing, they did what needed to be done with the  
10 money.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

12 MR. GLEASON: And so if it is an issue for the  
13 group of stakeholders, then we will need to respect that  
14 issue; if it's not, then there's no need to lay it out  
15 there up front as a condition of the decision-making.

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay. But it's trying to get  
17 needs met across the area.

18 MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And Kris, so one of the things  
20 you said is in metro areas that they get their own  
21 allocation. Correct? Does this line up fairly well in  
22 terms of timing with metros' decisions for how they  
23 allocate their money?

24 MS. DUDLEY: Well, as they all have each their  
25 own designated recipients, some of them -- what they have

1 to do as a designated recipient for 5310 in the metro  
2 area, the first thing they have to do is a program  
3 management plan. Many of them accepted the projects for  
4 FY 13 that we had laid out. But now that we're looking at  
5 FY 14 and sometimes balances of FY 13, they're going to  
6 have to do their program management plans. And we're  
7 working collegially with them to get those done because  
8 what's going to happen is if they don't get them done and  
9 they don't get their processes in place, those agencies  
10 that used to receive money from us and are used to that  
11 regular process might be in a little bit of trouble.

12 So as soon as we finish this process, I intend  
13 to get a call together with all the designated recipients  
14 in the urbanized area to kind of talk about what we had  
15 done. And I found it interesting, I was talking to one of  
16 those areas today and they talked about maybe doing a  
17 combined call for projects in FY 15 so that urbanized area  
18 would stick to the schedule that TxDOT does so everybody  
19 could be in sync. We tried to do that with JARC and New  
20 Freedom, Glenn. Some areas chose to play, some didn't, so  
21 we're going to try again.

22 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm sure you know better than  
23 I do the opportunities missed when they don't align.  
24 Right?

25 MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions for Kris?

1 No?

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: Sounded good.

3 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you, Kris.

4 Moving on to the next item on the agenda, which  
5 is review and discussion of the PTAC work plan. We had a  
6 little trouble finding the work plan. If you all recall,  
7 we had developed -- and this was thanks to Bobby, and I  
8 think Karen was able to find it -- a hard copy of the work  
9 plan. We had been moving along as a PTAC group to develop  
10 the work plan.

11 MR. KILLEBREW: Ask Rob if he got a copy?

12 MS. BLOOMER: Rob, did you get an emailed copy  
13 of the PTAC guiding principle document? I believe Karen  
14 sent it to you before the meeting started. Rob, are you  
15 still there? We might have lost Rob.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, if I may. What Eric  
17 handed out, the way it's stapled, the two pages on top is  
18 the history as best we could put together, and the last  
19 three pages is actually the work plan.

20 MS. BLOOMER: And I will take thoughts from the  
21 committee, but what I was thinking, since it's been quite  
22 a while and we haven't had a chance to read either one of  
23 the two items, is we might want to think as the committee  
24 where we want to go. We had sort of developed the work  
25 plan and were moving forward, and then MAP-21 came out and

1 sort of sidelined. We wanted to see how the dust sort of  
2 settled, and then the administrative changes to the rules,  
3 so I think we can put the rules behind us, go back and  
4 look at the work plan, see what areas we want to focus on.

5 We had our committees, Working Group 1 and Working Group  
6 2, but I think we've lost some members and those may not  
7 be the appropriate committees to be on. But get your  
8 thoughts on how you would like to proceed with the  
9 committee's work from this point forward.

10 MR. GADBOIS: And can I make some observations?

11 Even ignoring the work plan specifically, I actually  
12 think we've made headway on some of these items, and the  
13 first thing to do may be to kind of update and/or  
14 acknowledge the headway we've made.

15 MS. BLOOMER: I think that's a great comment,  
16 Glenn. And I think we had started -- and this may be part  
17 of the electronic documents I left at COG -- sort of like  
18 an Excel spreadsheet that had the items in it, timelines  
19 and accomplishments as we were going through. I thought  
20 we had created something to that effect. I've slept since  
21 February of 2012.

22 MR. SALAZAR: I know I was on the promote and  
23 coordinate transportation and Al was.

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: I think that was the old  
25 committee.

1 MS. BLOOMER: I think it was you all and Glenn,  
2 and Brad, Rob and I were on the support public  
3 transportation.

4 But why don't we do that, why don't we take,  
5 maybe between now and the next meeting, some time to think  
6 about if these guiding principles still apply. I'll work  
7 with Bobby and we can go back and try to add some of the  
8 accomplishments or milestones that we've made since it was  
9 first drafted. And there was another sheet behind it too,  
10 wasn't there, that Al had created?

11 I have all my old PTAC minutes, binders,  
12 packets, but like I said, I've moved twice since this was  
13 done, so they're in a box in my garage. So we will try to  
14 find that information and we'll bring that back next time  
15 for further discussion.

16 And like you said, I think we've made some  
17 significant progress since February of 2012. I think we  
18 need to document that, and then from that point determine  
19 where we go.

20 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, I'll look to see if  
21 I have some of these documents as well, electronically,  
22 and if so, I'll send them to you, and you can disburse as  
23 you will.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Great. Thank you, Glenn.

25 All right. Any other thoughts on the work

1 plan? We're good? Okay.

2 Item 7 was public involvement in PTAC. I just  
3 wanted to bring this item to the committee. At the last  
4 TxDOT semiannual meeting in July, in talking with some of  
5 the transit providers that were in attendance, there were  
6 some ideas shared about how PTAC could be more open and  
7 enhance our outreach to the industry.

8 Bobby, if you can help me, one of them, I  
9 believe, was they asked if there was a way that the  
10 transit providers could be notified of when the PTAC  
11 meetings were instead of having to go out on to the TxDOT  
12 website, find the date, if it changes, et cetera. And we  
13 had talked about TxDOT traditionally sends out emails to  
14 all the rural or urban providers when we need something,  
15 is there a way we could notify all the providers when that  
16 information is available on the website.

17 I think the second one was a request for  
18 members to be able to call in. A lot of members can't  
19 drive down but they would like to participate or listen.  
20 One of the ideas was, what do you call it?

21 MR. KILLEBREW: A webinar.

22 MS. BLOOMER: A webinar where they could see  
23 us, or maybe just an audio conference that they could call  
24 in.

25 What was the third one?

1           MR. KILLEBREW: There were three items that I  
2 captured, and the first one was notification of the PTAC  
3 meetings. I have updated the portion of TxDOT's website  
4 that features PTAC. It's live now. I'll be emailing you  
5 individually as members. Some of my contact information  
6 that we have on the website is wrong. There are some  
7 members who post information that other members don't, and  
8 I don't know if it's by choice or we just didn't ever ask  
9 for it.

10           For example, some people have their telephone  
11 numbers posted on the website, other members of PTAC do  
12 not. And that certainly is your choice, I'm not  
13 advocating one way or the other. We don't have any of  
14 your email addresses posted on the website. I thought  
15 that was rather strange, but I know that is also a problem  
16 sometimes with people capturing those and doing spam, but  
17 there's ways around that too that we can keep that from  
18 happening.

19           So I'm looking to make that website better. We  
20 have not been posting your future meeting dates out there,  
21 but this committee has decided meeting every other month.

22           Last Tuesday at 1:00 p.m., I think is the time for us to  
23 meet. So we can actually post future dates now with the  
24 rework of the website. We do have all of the minutes, the  
25 agendas, the transcripts posted out there as they become

1 available, so I think we do an even better job there.

2 And going along with that, Michelle, the other  
3 thing I got from the feedback, listening to you and some  
4 of the operators was when you do send out a notice about a  
5 PTAC meeting, can you send us out more information about  
6 what that meeting entails, don't just say PTAC is meeting  
7 at one o'clock on September 24 in Austin, Texas. How do I  
8 know I want to be there or not? Even if I see the agenda,  
9 how do I know I want to be there or not? So is there a  
10 way to tell me more about what's behind that agenda item,  
11 then I might want to make a presence known and perhaps  
12 appear before the committee and make public comment. So  
13 they had asked for that.

14 They did talk about being able to participate  
15 from off site. This committee does have to abide by the  
16 Open Meetings Act. Doing a webinar or a video  
17 teleconference is problematic under that act. There are  
18 certain guidelines and restrictions. We have to post  
19 every meeting location if it's a two-way conversation. If  
20 it's like the commission where it's just broadcast, that's  
21 another issue. We just have to get beyond having a camera  
22 in here and being able to broadcast it. If it's a two-way  
23 conversation, that becomes problematic.

24 So what I had suggested to one of the operators  
25 was how do you feel about just listening in, where you

1 can't actually speak but listening in, and we could  
2 actually open up another conference line. I'd hate to  
3 open up a conference line not only to the members, like  
4 Rob calling in today, as well as the public in case  
5 something happens. By opening two conference lines where  
6 one is available to the general public for just dialing in  
7 and listening, and the other is available to this  
8 committee for any members who can't make it here in person  
9 but want to actually participate by telephone. So we can  
10 do two conference lines on the telephone, and that might  
11 help with people who want to listen in.

12 MR. GADBOIS: I mean, the other option, Bobby,  
13 is simply videotape it and stack that on the website.  
14 Then people get to view it. If they can't participate, it  
15 doesn't really matter whether it's live or they're  
16 watching it at two o'clock in the morning at their  
17 convenience. Right?

18 MR. KILLEBREW: We can either record the audio  
19 part of the conversation. You know, we typically don't  
20 put up a power point presentation or something, it's your  
21 committee packets in front of you, so they'd be looking at  
22 you at the table. But yes, we can check with TxDOT people  
23 to see if that's possible for them to have someone  
24 available for us to record these meetings in that format  
25 and post that, as well, to the website.

1           So those are some options, but those was the  
2 feedback that I think that folks were saying.

3           You know, if we open up the phone line, we can  
4 count the number of people who call in. That's kind of a  
5 nice thing, you can actually get a record of that. If we  
6 do some other things, we can ask them to count the number  
7 of people who visit the website and click on things as  
8 well, but I don't think this is a true picture of people  
9 checking out the committee's web page and so forth. But  
10 I'm open to suggestions.

11           MR. GADBOIS: Maybe I've gotten skewed. Nobody  
12 is asking for a happy hour? I'm shocked. The people I  
13 work with these days, happy hours are all the rage.

14           MR. KILLEBREW: Well, we don't have your phone  
15 number on the web page. As Judy told me, she said, I'm  
16 trying to find Glenn's phone number. And I said, Well, I  
17 can't really give that out because I'm not sure that he  
18 would want us to publicize that phone number. She found  
19 you, I know.

20           MS. BLOOMER: Yes. People have a way of  
21 finding us. So I think one of the things is we're going  
22 to go ahead and post the dates, since we have set dates,  
23 to the website for the upcoming PTAC meetings. We'd also,  
24 I think, talked about an RSS update. I don't know how to  
25 use it but apparently some people do. Like if the date

1 were to change, it would automatically notify folks that  
2 have enabled that on their computer. But I think the  
3 specific comment I got was that's great putting it on the  
4 website, but then I've got to go out and make sure to have  
5 those dates if you change it, et cetera. Is there a way  
6 that we can email, like you do with the commission agenda,  
7 when there is a PTAC meeting, the agenda to all the  
8 providers based on your groups, like the metros, small  
9 urban.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: The lead agencies, the rural  
11 operators, the urban operators.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: Our 5310 list. We can  
14 certainly broadcast those emails.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then I do think if we  
16 can -- I mean, I don't have preference one way or the  
17 other, but I think the one-way communication so they can  
18 listen. If they can't participate in person, they can at  
19 least listen and go back to the discussion and maybe try  
20 to understand some of the discussion on how it got to a  
21 particular place. If that's real-time, that's fine. I  
22 think maybe if we can record it, if they can call in and  
23 listen to it real-time, if it's not too much more  
24 difficult to record it and post it so if there's those  
25 folks who can't sleep at two o'clock in the morning and

1 want to listen to it, they have that option, versus the  
2 only time they can hear it is the last Tuesday of the  
3 month at one o'clock when we actually have the meeting.  
4 Sort of like the commission, you can go back and you can  
5 listen to it, if that's possible. But I would agree, I  
6 don't want to use the same phone number, that needs to be  
7 separate. That would make it really difficult to manage.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: The phone numbers will allow  
9 lots of users to call in, but the quality of the phone  
10 call decreases when you get somewhere above 150.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Well, then you have no idea if  
12 they're going to be working, background noise.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: That's true. And using two  
14 phone numbers, we can make the second phone number muted  
15 at all times so you don't have that background noise.  
16 It's an automatic mute when they dial in. And then  
17 allowing the PTAC members to have a separate phone line  
18 will allow those to be unmuted; otherwise it becomes a  
19 maintenance headache for the person at the computer back  
20 at the office muting and unmuting certain people.

21 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm agnostic to what it turns  
22 out like. I would just start with the easiest possible,  
23 if that's recording and getting it on the web, it's that.

24 Just start with that and let's see how it goes from  
25 there.

1 MS. BLOOMER: And then back to the information  
2 that's on the website, Brad just pulled it up. Apparently  
3 mine still says North Central Texas Council of  
4 Governments. And then do we need to talk about  
5 consistency? I don't have a problem putting my work email  
6 or my work phone number out there, but I can understand  
7 where maybe Al and Glenn don't.

8 MR. GADBOIS: Al is not here anymore.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Right. Probably don't want his  
10 home phone number on there.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Yes, because what I use is my  
12 cell phone so I'd just as soon not, but I'm happy to give  
13 you my work email and have that on there, and I think it's  
14 completely legitimate for somebody to want to be able to  
15 talk to any one of the members.

16 MS. BLOOMER: So if everybody can just check  
17 their own information out there and make sure it's as  
18 accurate as it needs to be, and then as much information  
19 as your comfortable putting out to the general public.

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: My other thought was if you sit  
21 on a committee that is subject to the Open Meetings Act,  
22 are the members of that committee also not subject to it,  
23 meaning that you're required to give out a working  
24 telephone number and a working email address and address?

25 MR. KILLEBREW: I do not know the answer that a

1 member has to provide that.

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm not really sure we have  
3 that option is what I'm trying to say. It's part of the  
4 whole being accessible to the public if you're going to  
5 make decisions. I'm not certain.

6 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm not either. Right now we  
7 wouldn't be in compliance as the only thing on here is an  
8 old company address and an old address for me. So I'm  
9 happy to update this, Bobby, and I'll send you an email  
10 with new address, telephone number and email. You decide  
11 what we need on there for compliance.

12 MR. GLEASON: We can check on that. We'll  
13 research that for sure.

14 MR. KILLEBREW: The other option is, and I've  
15 seen this done with some of the committees, and maybe a  
16 way to get around it is that the email address for the  
17 committee may be a TxDOT email address. So there is that  
18 opportunity. I don't need another mailbox to check, I  
19 already have two or three myself that I have to check.  
20 But yes, that's maybe another option. Some people  
21 actually want to reach out to individual members, they  
22 don't want to email TxDOT and have TxDOT forward their  
23 correspondence to the committee, they may want to tug on  
24 your shirttail and an individual member and not to go  
25 through TxDOT.

1           MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, that comes into mind is  
2 like when we used to do appointments to like EDCs and  
3 community boards and that kind of stuff, they all had to  
4 be under the same regulation the council was under, with  
5 name, address, phone number kind of thing. It's all open  
6 meetings, I don't think there's different levels of open  
7 meetings, I think it's all across the board.

8           MR. GADBOIS: Bobby is right. I mean, my  
9 experience is you can manage access even via email so you  
10 can give a switchboard number, a one point of contact  
11 phone number or email, you just need to be able to access.

12           MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes, I think so.

13           MS. BLOOMER: Well, if you could just let us  
14 know, Bobby, so we make sure we're in compliance, and then  
15 we'll each update our information. If you could just send  
16 out a reminder tomorrow.

17           MR. KILLEBREW: I will. Maybe I'll send you  
18 out a template that you can just fill in so it will be  
19 very easy, and you can just stick it in a letter or send  
20 it through an email, either way, I'll take it.

21           MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we'll post the dates to  
22 the website and we'll send out an email reminder to the  
23 providers letting them know probably about a week in  
24 advance of the meeting, with the agenda. I think if we  
25 have our updated information on the website, they can feel

1 free to contact us to get further detail about what a  
2 particular item might be to help them determine if they  
3 want to attend or not, and then posting the updated  
4 information and recording the meetings and posting it to  
5 the website. And so we'll go back to, I guess, the  
6 January semiannual meeting and let them know that we've  
7 done that based on their comments and see if anybody has  
8 participated between now and January, if we have any  
9 meetings.

10 MR. KILLEBREW: And I'll report back on the  
11 progress of me getting all this done before January. And  
12 I think, Michelle, what you just said you made in the form  
13 of a motion for the committee to have their weigh-in on  
14 this?

15 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. Do I have a second?

16 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Second.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Rob, did we get you back?

18 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Do you have your vote, Rob?

20 MR. STEPHENS: Yes. Aye.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Brad?

22 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye.

24 J.R.?

25 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

2 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

3 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Motion passes.

4 MR. KILLEBREW: Thank you. If I may, Michelle?

5 I had hoped to have a new individual at this meeting for  
6 you all to meet as in support of the committee. Ginnie  
7 supported this committee for many, many years, and we all  
8 miss her. I really miss her. I did hire a communications  
9 individual, I had him for three and a half days and I lost  
10 him. He was hired away by another TxDOT division, so it  
11 hurt for a little while, it's still hurting a little bit.

12 So while I'm working diligently on this one, be  
13 patient. If you find that I need to do something, you  
14 need my attention, you may have to actually just wake me  
15 up real quickly by shaking me and saying: Wake up, I  
16 really need your attention on something. It's not that  
17 I'm ignoring any of the committee members. Call Eric,  
18 he'll get on my case. It's a lot right now on my desk,  
19 and so I will do the best I can. And I do have the  
20 communications position which posted again yesterday, so  
21 it will be up for two weeks and we're getting applications  
22 in, so hopefully we'll have someone soon. So thanks for  
23 your patience.

24 And the web page has been updated, if you want  
25 to go out there and see. It looks pretty much the same

1 but has kind of a different feel to it. So we've got a  
2 lot more PTAC stuff on the page, as far as your meetings,  
3 and so I've had to organize that in a better fashion.

4 MS. BLOOMER: And then Bobby, just a point of  
5 clarification, because I'm sure we all do miss Ginnie, but  
6 I would like to say I really appreciate all your efforts  
7 with PTAC over the last year or so. That won't be  
8 transitioning. Correct? You've done an excellent job.

9 MR. GLEASON: This individual will work for  
10 Bobby.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Will work for Bobby, and you will  
12 jointly handle PTAC in support of PTAC.

13 MR. KILLEBREW: I'm not going anywhere.

14 (General talking and laughter.)

15 MS. BLOOMER: Are there any public comments?

16 (No response.)

17 MS. BLOOMER: Seeing no public comments, the  
18 next meeting date is?

19 MR. KILLEBREW: It would be at the end of  
20 November, and that is one of the meeting dates we had  
21 talked about may be shifted. We get into the holiday time  
22 frame, the November-December time frame, so November would  
23 be the next every other month, January would follow that.

24 MS. BLOOMER: So I think if it's the last  
25 Tuesday of the month, that would be the week of

1 Thanksgiving. Right?

2 MR. GADBOIS: Could we look at don't one kind  
3 of early December-ish or something instead? Because  
4 otherwise, November and December are both going to hit the  
5 same problem.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Well, we don't have December; our  
7 next one would be January, because we do every other. So  
8 the idea is if we stop for this year and take a breath and  
9 come back in January, or if we try and take up the work  
10 plan between now and the end of the year. So we can think  
11 about that. But we currently have a meeting on the agenda  
12 for Tuesday, November 26, according to Brad's calendar.

13 Do I have a motion to adjourn?

14 MR. UNDERWOOD: So moved.

15 MR. SALAZAR: Second.

16 MS. BLOOMER: All those in favor?

17 (A chorus of ayes.)

18 MS. BLOOMER: Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

19 (Whereupon, at 2:52 p.m., the meeting was  
20 concluded.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: Public Transportation Advisory Board

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: September 24, 2013

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 70, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Transportation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Transcriber) 10/02/2013  
(Date)

On the Record Reporting  
3636 Executive Ctr Dr., G-22  
Austin, Texas 78731