



TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - TELECONFERENCE  
MEETING

3712 Jackson Ave.  
Bldg. 6, Room 324, Austin

Tuesday  
September 29, 2015  
1:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John McBeth, Vice Chair  
J.R. Salazar, Transportation Provider Representative

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIA TELECONFERENCE:

Rob Stephens, Chair  
Michelle Bloomer, General Public Representative

TxDOT PARTICIPANTS:

Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)  
(Presenter)  
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN (Presenter)  
Kari Banta, Program 5210 Manager (Presenter)  
Kelly Kirkland, Planning Manager, Public Transportation  
Division (PTN) (Presenter)

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY:

VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Call to Order	Page 3
2. Safety Briefing	Page 3
3. Approval of Minutes	Page 4
4. Division Director's report	Page 4
5. Discussion of potential changes to the Section 5310 Formula Grant for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program activities for FY2016	Page 7
6. Presentation by Linda Cherrington (Texas A&M Transportation Institute) on the effects of Urbanization on transit	Page 20
7. Report on research about energy sector impacts on transit	Page 46
8. Briefing on the Open Meetings Act with respect to options for public comments public Comment	Page 48
9. Discussion and development of PTAC Work Plan	Page 51
10. Public Comment	Page 52
11. Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting	Page 61
12. Adjourn	Page 63

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. McBETH: It's five after one. We have a quorum. Between J.R. and I and Michelle and Rob, we've got four people here. So I'll call the meeting to order, the PTAC for Tuesday, September the 29th of 2015 at -- starting at 1:05. The first order of business is a safety briefing and Josh is going to give that.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Hi, folks. I'm Josh Ribakove for the record from TxDOT. Should we need to evacuate, we'll leave out this door to my right with the exit sign above it. Turn left when you get out there. You'll see a stairwell and two elevators on the right side, use the stairwell, not the elevators. Should we need to evacuate, it's just that we're only on the third floor, just walk down to the lobby, and out through the lobby and out to the street. If we need to shelter in place, and we're not expecting any terrible weather today but should we need to, that same stairwell is a great place to do that. And -- and right there by the elevators, you'll also find the men's and women's rooms and there is a little breakroom with some vending machines for drinks and snacks right across the hall.

MR. McBETH: Thank you. A little housekeeping before we start, since we have two folks on by conference call, as well as some general public people I'm sure will join us. So that we all know who's speaking, when you have

1 a comment or have a question, please state your name so we  
2 can have it for the record and who you're with.

3 And with that, I will accept a - oh, also if you would,  
4 if you're on the call, please -- please mute your side until  
5 you have a comment or -- or need to speak so that we don't  
6 get any feedback.

7 Third Item on the agenda is approval of minutes from  
8 July 23rd, 2015 meeting. I'll entertain a motion to adopt.

9 MR. SALAZAR: This J.R. I move to approve the  
10 minutes.

11 MR. McBETH: We have a motion from J.R. Do we  
12 have a second?

13 MR. STEPHENS: This is Rob. I second.

14 MR. McBETH: We have a motion from J.R., a second  
15 by Rob. Do we have anyone opposed?

16 (No audible response)

17 MR. McBETH: Hearing no opposition, I'll call the  
18 question. All those in favor, s -- signify by saying aye.

19 (Chorus of ayes)

20 MR. McBETH: All opposed --

21 MS. BLOOMER: Aye.

22 MR. McBETH: All opposed by signifying and saying  
23 nay. We had four ayes and no nays so that is passed and the  
24 minutes can be signed.

25 Next Item, number 4, is TxDOT's Public Transportation

1 Division Director Report to the Committee regarding public  
2 transportation matters. Eric.

3 MR. GLEASON: All right. Thank you, John. My  
4 name is Eric Gleason. I'm the director for public  
5 transportation at TxDOT. I'll keep my report fairly short  
6 today. We've got a lot of substantive items on the agenda.

7 At the July Commission Meeting, Commission did ask out  
8 -- take action on remaining balances and awards for FY15  
9 federal program funding -- combination of discretionary and  
10 formula funding. Since that time, we have worked  
11 aggressively in the federal grant system to get all of those  
12 grants and the funds associated with those grants executed  
13 prior to team shutdown, which happened on the 25th. So we  
14 were successful in doing that.

15 And the significance of that -- well, that's a  
16 significant action every year. This year it's particularly  
17 significant because when the federal grant system open up  
18 again in October, it's going to be a brand new system. And  
19 if your grant was not actually fully executed before  
20 shutdown, you would need to do that all over again under the  
21 new system.

22 So we are positioned to move ahead with -- with those  
23 grants that were approved at the July meeting with the  
24 Commission. And we're in a -- various stages of getting  
25 project grant agreements signed to get those funds out

1 there. The -- so we're not -- we are anticipating the new  
2 grant system coming up in mid-October -- late October and  
3 we'll be getting our refresher courses on that.

4 And honestly beyond that, much of my time as Division  
5 Director has actually been spent over in the Transportation  
6 Alternatives Program which is a federal highway program that  
7 the Division manages for the Department that looks at the  
8 construction of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

9 I will report that in -- the Commission approved 17  
10 projects for that program at its September meeting. And a  
11 number them, a small number, but nevertheless significant,  
12 actually were improvements that leveraged existing transit  
13 improvements in communities. So we're -- we're kind of  
14 making that connection across programs to leverage the  
15 benefit of -- of those individual investments.

16 I want to recognize someone in the crowd here today.  
17 Bobby Killibrew is retiring from TxDOT.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yay.

19 MR. GLEASON: In case any of --

20 (Laughter)

21 MR. GLEASON: -- you didn't know. In case any of  
22 you didn't know, Bobby's last day at the Department will be  
23 tomorrow, although rumors are that he'll be in for a couple  
24 days in October. But for all intents and purposes, Bobby,  
25 thank you for your service. I've been here 10 years and

1 I've enjoyed working with you tremendously so --

2 (Applause)

3 MR. GLEASON: And with that, Mr. Chair, that  
4 concludes my report.

5 MR. McBETH: Thank you. Item number 5 is  
6 discussion of potential changes to the Section 5310 Formula  
7 Grants for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals  
8 with Disabilities program activities for Fiscal Year 2016.  
9 And it's an action item.

10 MR. GLEASON: So I'll introduce and then Kari  
11 Banta, our program manager 5310, will please join me up here  
12 and give a brief presentation. We've had a number of  
13 conversations with the Committee over the last several  
14 meetings about the 5310 program. Today, what we want to  
15 focus on is a change in how we approach the program from a  
16 -- from a timing standpoint in the state. And we want to  
17 talk to you about an idea of moving to an every-other-year  
18 format for the program. Kari will kind of walk you through  
19 how we'll get there. And we're interested in any feedback  
20 we might get from you.

21 It's listed as an action item. We're not asking for  
22 your approval of this. But if the Committee does choose to  
23 want to take action in some capacity on this, you're  
24 certainly free to do so. We got Kari.

25 MS. BANTA: For the record, my name is Kari Banta.

1 There is a handout associated with this. And I need to make  
2 a couple of corrections for clarity's sake and for the  
3 benefit of those listening on the phone. On the fourth line  
4 of the table, it says, 5310 application period FY18-19.  
5 That's winter 16 slash 17. And then on the -- the last row,  
6 that's winter 18 slash 19 so we understand what -- what  
7 timeframe we're talking about.

8 MR. GLEASON: Winter starts December 21st --

9 MS. BANTA: Yes.

10 MR. GLEASON: -- of every term.

11 MS. BANTA: So -- most of it's in the next year.  
12 I guess, to put this in perspective, when the 5310 program  
13 solicited input from our staff at PTN and our stakeholders,  
14 providers, there were a number of issues raised regarding  
15 the -- the burden of the 5310 application and its timing in  
16 the process. In particular, last year we ran the process  
17 with the deadlines at the same time. That -- we'd -- we'd  
18 hoped that it would make it easier to have the information  
19 together at the same time. But unfortunately, it didn't  
20 work out that way. So one of the first moves we're making  
21 would be to have the 5310 application due a month later than  
22 the coordinated call.

23 Going into next year, we're looking at that being the  
24 last year for a singu -- single-year cycle. Part of what  
25 we're doing is alternating -- looking to begin alternating

1 years between 5310 and 5311 coordinated call. So the  
2 agencies that apply for both aren't jammed together. Also,  
3 we're hoping that the two-year cycle will give some more  
4 stability in terms of developing budgets and looking ahead  
5 at projects.

6 Because 5310 is so closely tied to the regional  
7 coordinated transportation plans, we're also shifting the  
8 deadlines at certain points so that the plan is completed.  
9 And there is a month after that so the plan -- I believe the  
10 plan is due in March. That year the -- the 5310 application  
11 wouldn't be due until April.

12 So looking at the table, the line that's highlighted in  
13 pink would be the first year of the -- of the two-year  
14 cycle. And actually - -- for those of you who are familiar  
15 with the 5310 contract periods, we -- we don't run a 12-  
16 month cycle. We run a couple months ov -- over so even  
17 switching to this cycle, there would still be an overlap in  
18 the contracts. In case something happens like we had with  
19 the -- the FTA this year. With the situation they're  
20 delaying when we could get the -- the contracts out. So if  
21 you all have any questions or would like clarification --

22 MR. McBETH: So it -- so it appears that you're  
23 proposing that we go to a -- an application process once  
24 every two years.

25 MS. BANTA: Yes.

1           MR. McBETH: You would get two years' worth of the  
2 funds, basically the same way that we sign a contract now  
3 for the state funds for the 5311 program. Is that -- is it  
4 like that --

5           MR. GLEASON: Well, we can only put under contract  
6 --

7           MR. McBETH: Right.

8           MR. GLEASON: --each year what we had.

9           MR. McBETH: Each year what you had. Yes but --

10          MR. GLEASON: But you would have a -- this is Eric  
11 Gleason by the way. You would have a decision process --

12          MR. McBETH: Yeah.

13          MR. GLEASON: -- that would be for two years'  
14 worth of projects. Now I think we probably anticipate in  
15 the intervening year some minor adjustments as -- after  
16 apportionment amounts come out --

17          MR. McBETH: Come out.

18          MR. GLEASON: -- as contract expenditures get  
19 known, minor adjustments. But we don't believe that those  
20 adjustments would rise to the level of triggering any sort  
21 of stakeholder or steering committee process. Now it could  
22 very well be that during the year an event occurs, that  
23 might trigger us either locally or state wide to have to go  
24 back in. But we don't think that's going to be the norm.  
25 And we're hoping that this response to the -- the over

1 burden concerns that people have about doing this every year  
2 along with coordinated call every year that, you know, the  
3 certainty of knowing two years' worth of funding as opposed  
4 to one.

5 Now having said that, I think it -- it also possibly --  
6 there's a tradeoff however with flexibility. You know,  
7 where, you know, you might experience something locally and  
8 within that two-year timeframe that really says, Oh, we  
9 don't really want to spend this money this way. We want to  
10 spend it that way. And the -- this process may not allow us  
11 to go back and make that kind of adjustment. And that --  
12 that's the tradeoff. We think it's worth it. At least it's  
13 worth a try.

14 MR. McBETH: I agree.

15 MR. GLEASON: And then -- and then what -- what  
16 would also be happening in this transition timeframe is we'd  
17 be moving to an every-other-year cycle with the coordinated  
18 call. And there's just -- there's -- there's a -- it's  
19 going to take us 18 months to get there, get everything  
20 sorted out and everything on track that way. So I just  
21 can't flip a switch and switch to it. We have to get there  
22 in a deliberate fashion. That -- that's our objective.

23 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I just have one  
24 question. Is the application process going to be the same  
25 or -- or -- or -- I know we're still a ways off. But do you

1 know if that process is going to be the same?

2 MS. BANTA: There are going to be some changes.  
3 Most significantly we're moving to the eGrants system which  
4 will be an online system that will be able to save  
5 information and save different documentation that we  
6 require. So you won't be resubmitting. That'll reduce the  
7 redundancy significantly. The application process for this  
8 year will be roughly the same. We're looking to make  
9 changes to streamline the application and see what we can do  
10 to recr -- to decrease redundancy. We had a new application  
11 last year and got some significant feedback on that, that  
12 we're going to address.

13 MR. GLEASON: So Mr. Chair, this is for all  
14 intents and purposes a discussion item opportunity for the  
15 Committee. And, you know, there's no action required so  
16 just let us know when you're ready to move on and -- or we  
17 can stay on this as long as we need to.

18 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle.

19 MR. McBETH: Hi, Michelle.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Hi. I'd just like to make a couple  
21 comments. First, I appreciate TxDOT taking the initiative  
22 to address concerns regarding the timing of the 5310 Call  
23 for Projects. My concern remains, I don't think we've  
24 addressed the more substantial issues related to the 5310  
25 program. And I heard mention that, you know, the 5310

1 program is so closely tied to the regional coordination  
2 plan. But, yet -- and maybe it's just my personal view, but  
3 I actually see it on the complete opposite end of the  
4 coordination plan.

5       When I first starting working in the region, we were  
6 funding a bunch of small mom and pop senior citizen centers,  
7 independent living centers, et cetera. And two to three  
8 years into that, TxDOT -- or at the federal level realized  
9 this isn't working. We need to coordinate better since the  
10 miles weren't being put on those vehicles. They weren't  
11 being used. We spent the last 10 plus years working on  
12 regional coordination. And it seems like we've come full  
13 circle again with the new 5310 program of providing funds to  
14 small entities and piecemealing the service, not  
15 coordinating it through the existing providers for that  
16 given area. So that's my first concern.

17       My second concern is the evaluation criteria. So, I  
18 guess, do all the entities that are applying for funds know  
19 what the evaluation criteria is? Who's on the evaluation  
20 committee? In previous go-arounds with the 5310 -- 10  
21 program, the entities submitting the proposals reviewed the  
22 proposals, which I don't necessarily agree that's the way to  
23 go. But I think we need to know who is on the evaluation  
24 committee or at least who is -- who's being represented on  
25 the transportation committee. You know, we don't need to

1 say it's Jane Smith and, you know, here's her home phone  
2 number, please feel free to call her. But we could say  
3 there's a transportation provider. There's an independent  
4 living center rep -- rep. There's an X, Y, and Z.

5 Also, what are the evaluation criteria that may or may  
6 be included in the RFP -- or sorry, the Call for Project.  
7 But then, if folks are submitting it and they don't know  
8 what they're being evaluated against, that makes it hard for  
9 them to improve their application for the next go-around.  
10 Also, if they don't know how they scored, that makes it  
11 difficult for them to know, okay, what do I need to do next  
12 time to make my project rank higher or score better so that  
13 I can receive funding?

14 And I don't think those issues have been addressed.  
15 But at least, I mean, I'm glad to see we're thinking about  
16 how -- how to streamline it. So we aren't over burdening  
17 the providers with multiple Calls for Projects. But, again,  
18 I think we're -- we're missing the bigger picture here on  
19 this program. That's all.

20 MR. GLEASON: So Michelle -- Michelle, this is  
21 Eric. Couple -- couple things -- so the -- it seems to me  
22 that it was -- it was the shift in the federal guidance that  
23 -- with regard to your first concern, it was the shift of  
24 the -- the recent shift in federal guidance that brought  
25 back to the forefront the -- the -- sort of the -- the

1 smaller non-profit agencies as traditional recipients of  
2 this funding.

3         So there may yet be a way through this new guidance  
4 that results in -- where you, in your description of, you  
5 know, more going to the providers. But I think that we had  
6 to adjust to the new guidance and that direction certainly  
7 did not seem to be toward a further consolidation of  
8 subrecipients of the program. Is that a fair statement, or  
9 are you thinking there's something that we did at our level,  
10 or can do at our level to address that?

11                 MS. BLOOMER: I guess that's what I'm trying to  
12 figure out.

13                 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

14                 MS. BLOOMER: And I -- I've heard and I don't know  
15 if this is accurate or not, but I've heard FTA's position  
16 is, is that's not how the program is designed; that that is  
17 at TxDOT's discretion. So I think what I'd like to get at,  
18 is TxDOT thinking it's at the federal level and the federal  
19 level's saying, no, it's at the state level. So who --  
20 who's really putting that research in on how the program is  
21 now designed? Is that the feds and do they agree, or is it  
22 TxDOT?

23                 MR. GLEASON: So, I think that's a fair question.  
24 What I can tell you is that we've gotten very, very positive  
25 feedback from the federal level that we are doing it in the

1 way they intended it to be done. So obviously, we've got  
2 some different opinions out there. But we can continue to  
3 try -- because I have an interest in this -- in this topic  
4 as well. So we will continue to try and push that. But  
5 there seems to be a diversity of opinion out there on who  
6 can do what about that issue.

7 The -- certainly with respect to the evaluation  
8 criteria, we can go back in and look at the application and  
9 make sure that it's clear in the application what the  
10 criteria to be used will be and are. And that if you were  
11 to then look at the subsequent scoring, you will see a clear  
12 roadmap between those criteria in the application and what  
13 is being used in the scoring. With respect to the  
14 evaluation committee, are you suggesting that there be a  
15 standard membership list to the committee in each area? Is  
16 that what you're suggesting?

17 MS. BLOOMER: No. I'm not suggesting that because  
18 I don't -- you know, VFW isn't like south -- south Texas --

19 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- or east Texas or west Texas.  
21 What -- what I'm simply requesting is that whatever east  
22 Texas decides to have -- and I'm not saying they need to  
23 say, okay, Michelle Bloomer serves on the committee. She's  
24 a public transportation representative. Here's her cell  
25 phone number and her home address.

1 MR. GLEASON: Well, no --

2 MS. BLOOMER: It doesn't need to be the -- that  
3 list of --

4 MR. GLEASON: -- I -- no, I -- yeah. No. I  
5 understand that completely.

6 MS. BLOOMER: But --

7 MR. GLEASON: But it had more to do with the  
8 committee makeup. Whether you were suggesting we should put  
9 out there that we need this kind of a makeup or not that,  
10 but this is who is on it and this is the general interest  
11 that they represent. Is that what you're saying?

12 MS. BLOOMER: No and yes. So yes to this is the  
13 general makeup of the committee. But no to saying this is  
14 who has to be on it.

15 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

16 MS. BLOOMER: So I think it would be good for  
17 TxDOT to give some --

18 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

19 MS. BLOOMER: -- the regions or the PTCs guidance  
20 on who -- who they might want to consider to have on the  
21 committee.

22 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

23 MS. BLOOMER: But not to be as stringent as saying  
24 these are the five people that have to be -- or the five  
25 representatives that have to be because each region's

1 different. But you may have a list of like 10 -- these are  
2 people you may want to consider given your regional makeup.

3 MR. GLEASON: And then so -- and then taking that  
4 and then once we have the decision on who is on the  
5 committee that a, you know, name and area of -- of interest  
6 or expertise that they bring to the committee -- making sure  
7 everyone knows that?

8 MS. BLOOMER: Right. Yes.

9 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Okay. The final point was on  
10 feedback to improve the quality of submittal. You know, I  
11 think realistically we can look at webinars and formats like  
12 that at the beginning of an application process that would  
13 describe to participants, you know, what makes a good  
14 application and what makes a not so good one.

15 It's a little daunting to think we would be able to get  
16 back -- although I do appreciate the -- the idea very much  
17 and agree with it. It's a little daunting to think we might  
18 be able to get back with everyone who applied to give them  
19 feedback. There's just so many people. I'm not sure we  
20 could sustain that. But I do -- what -- what -- what I  
21 think we can do --

22 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

23 MR. GLEASON: -- is -- what -- what I think we can  
24 do is look for ways early to get out to people opportunities  
25 to learn how to do a good application. And --

1 MS. BLOOMER: I think that -- This is Michelle.  
2 Eric, I think that's a great idea on the frontend. But on  
3 the backend -- and I'm not asking for TxDOT to call every  
4 single individual and let them know how they did.

5 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

6 MS. BLOOMER: But at the PTC level, here's every  
7 -- you know, just for transparency's sake. Here's everybody  
8 that submitted an application. Here's what they requested.  
9 25 points for, you know, topic one, 25 for two, three, and  
10 four -- for a total of 100 points. Submitter one, under  
11 section one, 25 possible -- got 20 -- et cetera, all the way  
12 through. So they can see how they ranked. Now if they have  
13 questions, then that would be on them to follow up with --  
14 okay, you know, where was I lacking and I only got 20 out of  
15 25. But I -- I --

16 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

17 MS. BLOOMER: I think it's more just to give them  
18 an idea of where they rank with everybody else. And if  
19 there's X amount of money available, here's how it was  
20 distributed and some sort of basis for how that was done.

21 MR. GLEASON: Okay. I understand what you're  
22 saying. Thank you. That's a -- that's a -- that's a great  
23 suggestion.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you. That was it.

25 MR. McBETH: Thank you, Michelle. Any other

1 comments?

2 (No audible response)

3 MR. McBETH: Hearing none, we will move on to Item  
4 number 6 --

5 MR. GLEASON: Sorry.

6 MR. McBETH: -- presentation by Linda Cherrington  
7 of the Texas A&M Transportation Institute on the effects of  
8 urbanization on transit, a report that I've been anxiously  
9 awaiting for months. And with that --

10 MS. CHERRINGTON: And with that -- so thank you.  
11 What I'd like to do is to walk through some information that  
12 was delivered in your agenda packet. It's -- it's heavy on  
13 information and data. And so if I might with the permission  
14 of the Committee, I'll j -- just go through each page and  
15 just kind of highlight what it presents. It's really  
16 intended to be background information for your continued  
17 discussions about the effects of urbanization, particularly  
18 on the transit -- Texas Transit Funding Formula.

19 So I want to talk today about four topics. The first  
20 is the impact of large urbanized areas that grow into rural  
21 -- their adjacent rural transit districts. I've referred to  
22 this as rapidly urbanizing rural areas. The second is to  
23 talk about gaps -- urban gaps when metropolitan areas grow  
24 and there is not a corresponding ability to serve transit in  
25 the areas that -- as they grow. The third is the change in

1 MAP-21 funding that effects the limited eligibility  
2 providers in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington urbanized area.  
3 And the fifth is the growing number of urbanized areas and  
4 how they are handled in the Texas Transit Funding Formula  
5 for state funds.

6 So if I go to page one -- page two -- pardon me -- the  
7 first topic is the rapidly urbanizing rural areas. I want  
8 to talk about the access for rural transit districts that  
9 see large urbanized areas growing into their district and  
10 how those funds are accessed, the ability to use 5307 funds  
11 for operating assistance, and the limited sources of revenue  
12 for local share.

13 I'd like to use as my example on this topic the Fort  
14 Bend transit -- Fort Bend Public Transportation Department  
15 and Paulette Shelton is -- is here today, if you all have  
16 some additional questions. It is a good example and a very  
17 -- it's a good example for illustration and practicality of  
18 the problems in this area.

19 So on page three, you'll see in the top graphic, this  
20 is Harris County. And the colors are showing how the  
21 urbanized area has grown in the last three decades; the  
22 yellow is the 1990 urbanized area, the kind of burnt orange  
23 is the 2000, and the dark orange is 2010. And you'll see  
24 how the urbanized area is growing into the adjacent  
25 counties, particularly into Fort Bend County. And -- and

1 each of those counties surrounding Harris has a rural  
2 transit district. And so we're going to talk more  
3 particularly about Fort Bend.

4 So if you look at the bottom of the page, you see a  
5 blowup of Fort Bend County. And you see how m -- much of  
6 that area is now urbanized, largely as effect of the 2000  
7 and the two -- and the 2010 census. So now there's a large  
8 area and a large population in Fort Bend County that is  
9 urbanized. So we'll talk about what that impact is on the  
10 access to funding to help provide transit to that extended  
11 urbanized area.

12 On page four, I provided just for your background and  
13 reference, the 5307 Urban Area Formula Grant apportionment  
14 criteria. So this -- again, this is just background.  
15 Sometimes we forget the factors that go into the allocation  
16 of 5307. And the top part of page four is the formula  
17 funding for small urban areas and the bottom is for large  
18 urbanized areas. And you'll see that there's really five  
19 elements, two are related to bus service and two are related  
20 to fixed guideway. And Houston Metro does operate fixed  
21 guideways, so that's a significant set of the funding  
22 apportionment to -- to the urbanized area. And then there's  
23 a small allocation to low-income. Information in case we  
24 need to refer to it.

25 Page five take -- talks a li -- a little bit about the

1 background of -- if you are -- if you're Fort Bend County  
2 and you see this growth in the urbanized area, how do you  
3 get access to funds that may be used to provide transit in  
4 that urbanized area? Well, first you must go to the  
5 designated recipient and work through the metropolitan  
6 planning process, so the NPO.

7       The designated recipient is a significant player in the  
8 allocation of 5307 in large urbanized areas. And this -- in  
9 small urbanized areas, the designated recipient is TxDOT.  
10 It's -- it's -- it's actually the governor who delegates it  
11 to the Commission who delegates it to the -- TxDOT. And  
12 then each of the small urbanized areas is -- is a direct  
13 recipient.

14       But in a large urbanized area, if -- if you're Fort  
15 Bend County, you go to the NPO and to the designated  
16 recipient, which is Houston Metro, and you -- you go through  
17 the process that is local to ask for funding. And every  
18 large urbanized area has its own process. Its -- its own --  
19 sometimes it's a formula. Sometimes it's negotiated. And  
20 in the case of the -- the Houston Metro, Houston-Galveston  
21 area, it's a negotiated process.

22       The designated recipient may elect to designate a  
23 direct recipient and allocate funds that are then approved  
24 by the NPO process or they may elect to -- to act as a  
25 subrecipient and give a grant to the rural transit district.

1 In the case of Houston Metro, they do designate Fort Bend  
2 County as a direct recipient.

3 On the bottom of page five and page six, I provided  
4 illustrations just to give an idea of the role and  
5 responsibilities of each of the players in this process.  
6 FTA apportions the funds, the NPO has the process, the  
7 designated recipient is accountable to the FTA for the use  
8 of the funds, and it allocates funds in cooperation with the  
9 NPO, and then the designated recipient may elect to -- to  
10 name a des -- direct recipient or a subrecipient.

11 And the reason I take the time to bring this out now is  
12 because different urbanized areas -- large urban areas in  
13 Texas do it differently; some name a direct recipient, some  
14 have a subrecipient. So if we refer back to that later, I  
15 -- this gives you some background.

16 I'll go to page seven. Seven brings up the real issue  
17 of a small transit provider that's asking for funds and  
18 needing to use the funds to provide operating assistance in  
19 a large urbanized area. So in MAP-21, there was provided  
20 what is called the Operating Assistance Special Rule. It's  
21 also sometimes referred to as the hundred bus rule. And if  
22 I may step you through on page seven, the four steps in the  
23 process because it's -- it is complex.

24 First of all, if you are a small operator and you've  
25 asked for 5307 funds in a large urbanized area, you are

1 eligible to use those funds for operating only in the  
2 following cases: First of all, does the small operator  
3 report fixed route to the National Transit Database? If no,  
4 then you cannot use 5307 funds for operating. So if you  
5 provide only demand response services, you have no access to  
6 -- to large urbanized area 5307 for operating. If yes, you  
7 might be eligible.

8       The next step is, does the small operator report 100  
9 busses or fewer in fixed route service during peak-hour  
10 service? If the answer is, no, I operate more than 100,  
11 then you have no opportunity to use Section 5307 large  
12 urbanized area funds for operating. If the answer is, yes,  
13 my agency operates 100 busses or fewer, then you need to  
14 identify whether you operate equal to or less than 75 busses  
15 or between 76 and 100. And I'll come back to that later.  
16 So now, yes, I operate 100 or less and now I'm calculating  
17 whether I'm 75 or under or over 75.

18       Then you go to step two. So now I -- I'm 100 busses or  
19 less. I oper -- I report fixed route to N -- to NTD. Now  
20 what? Number two -- a percent of the apportionment is  
21 attributable to the operator based on vehicle revenue hours.  
22 So now we -- we've changed from busses and now we change to  
23 vehicle revenue hours. This is the source of the data  
24 that's reported to NTD for all operators in the U -- in the  
25 UZA.

1           And if you're a small operator, you take your number of  
2 vehicle revenue hours and divide by the entire large  
3 urbanized area, and that percentage is the percentage that  
4 is apportioned to you as an operator. And that may be a --  
5 a one percent or less than one percent. It may be 10  
6 percent or it may be one percent. It's -- it's your small  
7 operator revenue hours divided by everybody else. Then you  
8 go to -- to -- and that -- that's the percentage of the  
9 total apportionment to the region that you might be able to  
10 use for operating. We haven't got to the end yet. You  
11 might be able to use this.

12           Then you go to number three. Then -- so I've figured  
13 out my percentage of the total apportionment to the region.  
14 And it's some tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now  
15 I can use up to 75 percent of that if I operate 75 busses or  
16 less. I can use 50 percent if I operate between 76 and 100  
17 busses. So I can't use all the apportionment. I can only  
18 use part of it.

19           And then you go to number four. And then you go back  
20 to the number of revenue hours reported, and you multiple  
21 that times the apportionment, times the number of dollars to  
22 the UZA, times 75 percent or 50 percent. And now you've got  
23 the maximum amount that you can use for 5307. S -- so we've  
24 gone through this whole process and that may mean that you  
25 have a few thousand or a few hundred thousand.

1           So if you go to the next page, I've used as an example,  
2 again, carrying three -- through Fort Bend County. So this  
3 is the table that is issued from FTA under the  
4 apportionments. And this is the FY2015. And actually it's  
5 for Texas. I -- pardon me. It's for -- this is all of  
6 Texas. And you see for each of the large urbanized areas,  
7 you see the number of vehicles operated in fixed route  
8 service. So if there's any other operators in those -- in  
9 those areas, they aren't -- they aren't eligible.

10           And then you see the apportionment for the entire  
11 urbanized area times that percent of apportionment, times  
12 the eligible percent, and in this case it's all 75 percent.  
13 And that's how much money you can use up to 50 percent of  
14 your operating deficit. And -- and you see in some cases,  
15 we're talking now -- we've been through this whole process.  
16 And we're talking -- I need to turn my lights on. In the  
17 case of Public Transit Services, PTS, it's \$29,000 through  
18 this whole process. Probably spent 29,000 doing the math.

19           (Laughter)

20           MS. CHERRINGTON: And then if you look down in the  
21 next section, this is Houston. Houston has three small  
22 urbanized areas. And you go through this whole process.  
23 And in the case of Fort Bend County, they were eligible to  
24 use up to \$889,107 as local operating assistance. And I've  
25 provided all of the other large urbanized areas. Why aren't

1 Austin, San Antonio, and El Paso on this list? Because they  
2 have no fixed route operators that report to the NTD so they  
3 have no small operators that can be eligible.

4 Now the last point I want to make in this topic is on  
5 the far right. So now you have to provide a local match for  
6 those urbanized dollars. You're a small operator. Most of  
7 these are rural transit districts. Where do you get your  
8 local match? Well, you may be eligible for a local sa --  
9 tax dedicated to transit. And that's the case of Denton  
10 County Transit Transportation Authority, Corpus Christi, and  
11 Laredo. Or you may be eligible for the State Urban Funds.  
12 And you see those that are eligible for State Urban Funds,  
13 which we'll talk about more later.

14 The rest of those boxes, including the rural transit  
15 districts, don't have access to a source of funding to match  
16 those large urbanized dollars. They have to find it another  
17 way. It's not through a sales tax and it's not through  
18 state funds. That's the end of topic one. Questions before  
19 we go on?

20 MR. McBETH: This is John. This is really a good  
21 chart.

22 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah.

23 MR. McBETH: This really a good chart.

24 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah.

25 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

1 MS. CHERRINGTON: It really does illustrate --

2 MR. McBETH: Yes, it does.

3 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- the dilemma.

4 MR. McBETH: It -- it -- it -- it outlines the  
5 dilemma I figured was there. Yeah.

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: So I'll go on and cover -- the  
7 other things won't be quite as extensive. I'll cover the  
8 other topics to benefit your conversation.

9 So the next area that I wanted to talk about was urban  
10 gaps. And our definition -- this is a -- kind of term that  
11 we developed over the last 10 years. It's urbanized areas  
12 that are outside the -- the regional or municipal transit  
13 authority that -- that have access to funds apportioned to  
14 the UZA. But they're not operating -- they're not eligible  
15 for the -- the service. And this -- and it's also urbanized  
16 areas not included in urban transit districts or municipal  
17 transit service areas so that may be small urban areas.

18 So to illustrate the urban gap in 10 -- page 10, this  
19 is a -- the bar chart shows the size of the urban gap. It  
20 shows what it was in 2000. Remember these are areas that  
21 are outside the -- the transit agency service area. But in  
22 the urbanized area, and not -- basically they don't have a  
23 sponsor for transit services. And you see that the most of  
24 it is around the metro urbanized areas. It's a small  
25 percentage but a growing percentage that is around the small

1 urban met -- municipal areas.

2 And the bottom of page 10 just gives you the -- the  
3 actual populations so that you can -- the bar charts kind of  
4 puts it in perspective. The actual dollar -- the actual  
5 population numbers are at the bottom. And you see that the  
6 growth in the urbanized areas in the urban gap was -- around  
7 the metros was 65 percent from 2000 and 2010. And it more  
8 than doubled in the smaller munici -- the small urban areas.

9 Going to page 11, I provided several illustrations to  
10 -- to give you an idea of who's affected and the size. So  
11 page 11 is the western part of the Dallas-Fort Worth-  
12 Arlington urbanized area. It shows you the surrounding  
13 rural transit districts and the growth of the urbanized area  
14 into those transit districts. The color scheme is the same;  
15 yellow is 1990, burnt orange is 2000, and the dark orange is  
16 2010.

17 Page 12 shows you the eastern side of the Dallas-Fort  
18 Worth-Arlington area, same set up, the rural transit  
19 districts. I might mention to you that McKinney UZA and I  
20 -- and I labeled it -- isn't -- is the adjacent UZA. This  
21 is looking at the large urbanized area, Dallas-Fort Worth-  
22 Arlington.

23 Page 13 shows you the San Antonia urbanized area. And  
24 you'll notice that the VIA Metropolitan Transit service area  
25 includes most of Bexar County. But the urbanized area

1 growth is added to the adjacent counties, into Comal and  
2 Guadalupe and a little bit into Kendall County. So y -- and  
3 you'll see that most of that was in 2010. So it really  
4 significantly changed the picture in the San Antonio area.

5 Page 14 illustrates for you the Austin area.

6 MR. McBETH: Wow.

7 MS. CHERRINGTON: The color scheme is a little bit  
8 different. It shows you the -- the orange is actually the  
9 2010 UZA service area and the green is the area in the urban  
10 gap. So the orange is within the Capital Metro service  
11 area. And the green, you see Cedar Park, Round Rock,  
12 Pflugerville, Georgetown, Buda, and Kyle on the south.  
13 They're in the urban gap. They are not a part of the -- the  
14 CARTS rural service area. They're urbanized.

15 And then if you go to the next page, it shows you El  
16 Paso. The interesting point about El Paso is, El Paso is a  
17 municipal transit department with a half-cent sales tax.  
18 But it's limited to the city of El Paso. So they can enter  
19 in to inter-local agreements. But there is no sales tax to  
20 support it in adjacent cities. And if you look at that  
21 green area to the south, that is some of the -- the -- the  
22 areas with the highest transit needs -- Socorro, Ysleta in  
23 the south side of El Paso. But they're outside the city of  
24 El Paso. So they are not provided service. And they are  
25 not -- they're in an urban gap.

1           And then on page 16, I wanted to -- to give you one  
2 example. It's a very good illustration of a small urban  
3 area and where the urban gap is growing. I think it's --  
4 this is Port Arthur in the orange and the green. But  
5 Beaumont's also shown here. And you'll see Port Arthur is  
6 orange; Beaumont is red. Look at the growth of the  
7 urbanized area. I -- it's -- it's larger than Port Arthur.  
8 And they're very distinct from the mugi -- municipal transit  
9 services in those two areas.

10           So you see that the growth of the urbanized area in --  
11 in this particular example is beyond the mutici -- municipal  
12 -- beyond the city limits. And so it's an urban gap. And  
13 it's no longer a part of the rural transit district. Now  
14 it's -- it's basically an -- it's an urban gap. It -- it  
15 has no sponsor. And this is not unusual about other small  
16 urban areas across the state. Any questions about that  
17 material?

18           Then I'll go to the third topic. I just wanted to make  
19 you aware that there has been a change under MAP-21 in the  
20 limited eligibility providers in the Dallas-Fort Worth  
21 urbanized area. If you look on page 18, under TEA-21, there  
22 was specific legislation that was written in that provided  
23 up to 1.4 million that could be used out of the 5307  
24 allocation to the Dallas-Fort Worth area. That could be  
25 used for operating assistance for limited eligibility

1 providers that had 20 or for -- fewer vehicles and served  
2 only seniors and people with disability.

3         So those eligible cities were Arlington, Grand Prairie,  
4 Mesquite, and Grapevine, which was the -- the federal  
5 recipient for the NETS -- the North East Transportation  
6 Services -- group of cities. Under SAFETEA-LU, SAFETEA-LU  
7 did not include the exact same language. But FTA extended  
8 that consideration to those same cities. And they  
9 established 7 criteria. Those four limited eligibility  
10 providers were eligible under those 7 criteria. And they  
11 continue to be eligible for 5307 funding. And I've -- I  
12 pasted in a cat -- an illustration of what funding was allow  
13 -- allowable for them. So that was SAFETEA-LU.

14         Now under MAP-21, this limit -- this consideration has  
15 not been extended. And because they don't provide fixed  
16 route service, they're not eligible for the operating  
17 assistance under the -- the hundred bus rule, or the special  
18 operating rule that we went through before. They are  
19 eligible under the Texas Transit Funding Formula for an  
20 allocation under the urban funds. So they continue to be  
21 eligible for state funds, but they cannot use federal funds  
22 for operating. And up until now, that's been okay because  
23 the money had carried over year after year. But they've hit  
24 the wall now. They can no longer use federal funds for  
25 operating.

1           The last topic I wanted to present to you, on page 20,  
2 was the growing number of urbanized areas that are ac --  
3 accessing the State Urban Fund. So if I go to page 21, this  
4 gives you the data. So these are the number of state funded  
5 urban transit districts. The 2010 population is on the  
6 left, the 2000 in the middle, and the 1990 population on the  
7 far right.

8           And so it gives you -- if you look right in the middle,  
9 the total number of transit districts has not changed a lot  
10 but the population has. And under the -- the funding  
11 formula, if a city's gone over 200,000 -- under the needs  
12 portion of the funding formula, the population is capped at  
13 199,999. And so that's why there are two columns in -- and  
14 what I've total -- totaled for you is the population that  
15 has access to the funding formula with the capped  
16 population. And you see that change. It increased 13  
17 percent from '90 to 2000 and 18 percent additional to 2010.

18           Now to illustrate what that means to the funding  
19 formula, if you go to page 22, it's a pie chart. And it  
20 shows 1990. In 1990, there were 25 urbanized areas that  
21 were eligible for state funding under the urban formula --  
22 25 small urban and then remember the four limited  
23 eligibility; for a total of 29.

24           Only McAllen was over 200,000 at the time, and their  
25 allocation capped at 19 -- and this is -- by the way, this

1 is population. This isn't money. This is population on  
2 these pie charts. So because they were capped at 199,999,  
3 they had 10 percent of the population. And population is  
4 the factor in the needs portion of the funding formula so  
5 that's why it's -- it's indicative of 50 percent of the  
6 funding; does that make sense?

7 MR. McBETH: Mm-hmm.

8 MS. CHERRINGTON: Okay. If you go to page 23,  
9 this is the 2000 census. And this was the f -- this w --  
10 this was the population used from 2004 forward when the  
11 funding formula came into play. And now you see that the  
12 limited eligibility cities had a piece of the pie. And the  
13 urbanized areas over 200,000 had 18 percent. And that now  
14 includes McAllen, Lubbock, and Midland. Again, they were  
15 capped at -- at 19 -- 199 and Midland-Odessa was actually  
16 not a large urbanized area. They're two small urbanized  
17 areas, but under the Texas Funding Formula, it -- it's  
18 together at 200,000.

19 And then the last illustration is on page 24. And  
20 that's the same approach and now it's 2010 funding. So you  
21 see now the -- there are now six -- seven -- sorry -- seven  
22 urbanized areas over 200,000. And they have 36 percent of  
23 the pie.

24 And the last page, and I'll conclude, the information  
25 is on page 25. What do we think might happen in 20 twin --

1 2020? Sorry. In 2020, we're -- we're monitoring the  
2 possibility of four small-urbanized areas going over 200,000  
3 and the possibility of five areas that may go over 50,000;  
4 although, one of those could be combined in an existing  
5 adjacent urbanized area.

6 MR. McBETH: This -- this is John. Just a  
7 question, Linda.

8 MS. CHERRINGTON: Uh-huh. (Affirmative).

9 MR. McBETH: On the -- the last page.

10 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yes.

11 MR. McBETH: Those four possible new urbanized  
12 areas --

13 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yes. Over 200,000.

14 MR. McBETH: Over 200,000, yeah. Can you give us  
15 a chart like your next-to-the-last one -- this one here,  
16 urban transit funding formula need, that would include your  
17 projected populations? Because it looks to me like with  
18 these four -- you have right now seven that are using 36  
19 percent of the resources. But if you put these four in  
20 there, it looks like 11 systems are going to use about 50  
21 percent of all the resource.

22 MS. CHERRINGTON: That's probably --

23 MR. McBETH: That about correct?

24 MS. CHERRINGTON: That's probably close. Yeah.

25 MR. McBETH: Yeah. Which is what I've been

1 thinking.

2 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah.

3 MR. McBETH: So that leaves 50 percent of all the  
4 resources for 20 other grantees. It'd be nice to see a  
5 chart like that just because it would scare everybody.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. McBETH: Scares me.

8 MS. BLOOMER: And this is -- this is Michelle. I  
9 just -- I think John, the other -- the other thing too is  
10 for those four, I think the biggest issue for them is  
11 they're going to go from under 2,000, where you can use  
12 operating assistance to over 2,000 where you can't.

13 MR. McBETH: Yeah, exact -- exactly. That --  
14 that's -- you use a -- you can use a portion of it based  
15 upon --

16 MS. CHERRINGTON: Right.

17 MR. McBETH: -- going through that long exercise.  
18 And we're real -- Brazos is real familiar with that long  
19 exercise because when The Woodlands-Conroe became over  
20 200,000, we had to go through that mathematical minefield.

21 MS. CHERRINGTON: Well --

22 MR. McBETH: And it gets real political real  
23 quick.

24 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah. In fact, if you go back  
25 to page eight, page eight does show for the urbanized areas

1 that are over 200,000 in which -- so you see at the bottom  
2 of that page: Killeen, Brownsville, Lubbock, Laredo, Conroe-  
3 The Woodlands -- you'll see that they do have a fairly  
4 significant share of their funds that can be used for  
5 operating under the hundred bus rule.

6 MR. McBETH: Yeah. Yeah, I think --

7 MS. BLOOMER: But I think that the amount to all  
8 those folks that if you're on that list of four and you  
9 aren't currently providing a significant amount of service  
10 in fixed route mode, you need to start doing it now. So you  
11 can submit your ridership report to NTD in time to have that  
12 reflected when the census happens.

13 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah. And --

14 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

15 MS. CHERRINGTON: And if your bus -- if your  
16 number of busses is beginning to approach 100, then that's  
17 where the -- that's where the new watermark is. And that,  
18 of course, is a concern particularly to -- to Cor -- Corpus  
19 Christi I -- I -- I think. Actually right now, it shows  
20 Brazos-Conroe, John. But I think that that's going to  
21 subdivide when the -- the -- when The Woodlands and Conroe  
22 are su -- are s -- reporting separately.

23 MR. McBETH: That's correct.

24 MS. CHERRINGTON: So neither of them will be  
25 approaching 100.

1           MR. McBETH: Yeah, neither of them. No, no, they  
2 will not.

3           MS. CHERRINGTON: Okay.

4           MR. McBETH: But the thing that really complicates  
5 this whole thing -- and this is John again -- is you not  
6 only have four new systems going over 200,000 that will  
7 still be eligible -- grandfathered in eligible for our state  
8 share because they're currently receiving it. But at the  
9 same time, you have the possibility of five currently rural  
10 areas moving into the small urban pot with Eagle Pass, Rio  
11 Grande, Lufkin, Galveston, and Del Rio. Those -- those five  
12 moving in. So, you're putting five more grantees into a  
13 piece of pie that's already very small. So it's a double  
14 whammy.

15           So it -- it does point out the need that, we really  
16 have to start thinking now about what the legislative  
17 solution to this problem's going to be because it has to be  
18 a legislative solution. It has to be more money or -- or  
19 something because it's going to break the system. There  
20 won't be enough money for anybody else to do anything,  
21 really, if we stay at the current funding level so that --  
22 that's certainly a concern to me.

23           But even of more concern, Linda, is your -- your piece  
24 in here, which I had not thought about, the -- the urban  
25 gaps. That's -- those are -- these are big gaps. They're

1 -- these are -- these are huge. I mean just looking at  
2 Austin; wow. There's a lot of -- there's a lot people  
3 living in those green areas that are probably transit riders  
4 that need the service. And then you look over here at El  
5 Paso; wow. It goes all the way up into New Mexico.

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: Mm-hmm.

7 MR. McBETH: This -- I mean, that's -- that's a  
8 need that -- I think this Committee needs to start thinking  
9 about this need. I mean, this is a -- it's a lot of people.  
10 There's a lot of people here that don't have transit or have  
11 access to it.

12 MS. CHERRINGTON: A -- and to be fair, depending  
13 on the urbanized area, there are efforts going --

14 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

15 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- on to try to share funds.  
16 For example, Fort Bend does --

17 MR. McBETH: Yeah, exactly.

18 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- receive funds from Houston  
19 Metro. But we talked about the -- but there's not local  
20 money to match it.

21 MR. McBETH: Yeah, that's the problem.

22 MS. CHERRINGTON: And in another area, it may be  
23 that it's -- the -- the provider is going to the rural  
24 transit district to provide continued demand response  
25 service -- not -- not growing the transit services --

1 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

2 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- commensurate with the  
3 urbanized area, so that particularly for example, Georgetown  
4 --

5 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- that's what's happened in  
7 Georgetown. And New Braunfels, that's what's happened  
8 there.

9 MR. McBETH: It's just astounding. Wow. This  
10 whole problem I wasn't looking at.

11 MR. SALAZAR: Linda, this is J.R. And I -- and I  
12 -- I guess I'm just a little curious on these smaller urban  
13 areas. I mean, there's urban gaps in all the urbanized  
14 areas; correct?

15 MS. CHERRINGTON: Almost all. There are some  
16 transit -- municipal transit systems that, their policy is  
17 to provide service to the entire urbanized area or to the co  
18 -- entire county. But I would say that's the exception, not  
19 the rule.

20 MR. McBETH: I would agree with that.

21 MS. CHERRINGTON: Mm-hmm. And then there are  
22 other instances, for example, Concho Valley, in which the  
23 urbanized area has grown, but Concho Valley transit district  
24 is serving across the rural and urban area. So there's no  
25 -- there's not a gap. So that's -- that's one of the ways

1 that areas have filled that gap.

2 MR. McBETH: Well, thank you, Linda. It's a great  
3 report. Any other questions?

4 MS. BLOOMER: This -- this is Michelle. Linda,  
5 can we go back to slide 16 for Port Arthur?

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yes.

7 MS. BLOOMER: And I just want to make sure I'm  
8 understanding this correctly. So in the map we have -- is  
9 it the city of Port Arthur that's that kind of orange  
10 mustard color?

11 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yes.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then Beaumont. And is  
13 the provider the -- is it a municipal provider?

14 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yes, in both the case of Port  
15 Arthur and Beaumont.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. But the green area  
17 encompasses the entire urbanized area.

18 MS. CHERRINGTON: The gr -- yes, the green is the  
19 urbanized area outside the city of Port Arthur. If you see  
20 the --

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

22 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- the -- there's a blue area  
23 that -- that defines the Port Arthur service boundary. And  
24 you'll see that it does not include the -- the majority of  
25 the green area, Nederland, Port Neches, Groves, and North --

1 West Orange and Orange.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Right. And I guess, what I would be  
3 curious is because the formula is based off of population,  
4 population density, and the percentage of elderly and maybe  
5 persons with disabilities -- I can't remember.

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: It's -- it's low-income.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Is how much do the -- low-income.  
8 Thank you. How much those areas in green actually attribute  
9 to the apportionment? And since those folks contribute to  
10 the amount of money coming into the UZA, but yet, they get  
11 no service for it. And I understand there may not be local  
12 match, et cetera. But if Port -- oh, not -- oh, I should've  
13 picked an easier one. Groves, if Groves were to apportion --  
14 approach Port Arthur and say, we're interested in providing  
15 public transportation services, you know, what amount of the  
16 UZA funding does Groves bring in or help bring into the UZA?

17 MS. CHERRINGTON: So --

18 MS. BLOOMER: And since they should be eligible to  
19 receive it, they wanted to secure service or provide the  
20 service themselves or hopefully coordinate with Port Arthur  
21 to extend service out their area.

22 MS. CHERRINGTON: So it would -- it -- that's an  
23 NPO. And it's actually Beaumont-Port Arthur NPO. And so  
24 the NPO and the two direct recipients would then negotiate  
25 and decide what that is. But what's happening is, the

1 cities in these urban gaps are not approaching the -- to  
2 provide service. They're not contributing their general  
3 funds. And so it's -- it's a local situation.

4 And, yes, those funds could be used for transit if the  
5 local entities were willing to contribute the 50 percent  
6 local match and/or, you know, contribute to the capital.  
7 They also could go to the rural transit district and ask for  
8 the NPO to allocate funds and ask the rural transit  
9 district. But, again, it comes back to those local  
10 communities have to have the initiative and want that  
11 service.

12 An -- and typically, as you might imagine, what happens  
13 is these -- these areas have grown so fast, these are not --  
14 these are not areas that have been long time in this  
15 discussion and are sophisticated about what's the funding  
16 available. And so it -- it's a -- it's --it's a dilemma  
17 that's both the -- the planning process and -- and the  
18 funding formula.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Right. This is Michelle again. I  
20 guess my question is how many of those entities know they're  
21 actually eligible for funding? Or is that part of -- you  
22 know, they're just so -- such a new process, they -- they  
23 may not even be aware.

24 MS. CHERRINGTON: They may not be; although,  
25 again, the -- in this case, the South East Texas Regional

1 Planning Commission, which also serves as the NPO -- I think  
2 they're the NPO.

3 MR. McBETH: Mm-hmm.

4 MS. CHERRINGTON: They staff the NPO --

5 MR. McBETH: They are the NPO.

6 MS. CHERRINGTON: -- for the -- but they are  
7 aware.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

9 MR. McBETH: Any other questions?

10 (No audible response)

11 MR. McBETH: Thank you, Linda.

12 MS. CHERRINGTON: Okay. Sorry it took so much  
13 time.

14 MR. McBETH: Great report. Super.

15 MR. RIBAKOVE: John, can I do a little bit more  
16 housekeeping before we go to --

17 MR. McBETH: Sure.

18 MR. RIBAKOVE: -- the next item? Just wanted to  
19 say that we do have a sign-in sheet at the table by the  
20 door. If you're here, even if you are a TxDOT person,  
21 please do sign in so that we can count you. And also if you  
22 would like to comment at this meeting, we have speaker  
23 comment sheets. And they're also on the table by the door.  
24 And just pass it up to me and we'll get you some time to  
25 talk. That's it.

1 MR. McBETH: Yep. This -- this item shows that it  
2 was an action item but --

3 MR. RIBAKOVE: I think it was really just -- just  
4 like the last one.

5 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

6 MR. RIBAKOVE: We -- we made it an action item in  
7 case there was an action the Committee decided to take any  
8 action on.

9 MR. McBETH: I don't think right now -- I think  
10 right now, everybody's trying to absorb it. I don't think  
11 we can take any action it. But it's a -- it's a great  
12 report. And it shows actually more than I thought you were  
13 going to show, Linda. This is pretty -- this -- this should  
14 wake some people up.

15 Item number 7, report on research about energy sector  
16 impacts on transit.

17 MR. KIRKLAND: Good afternoon, members. My name  
18 is Kelly Kirkland. And I have the role of being the  
19 planning manager for TxDOT's Public Transportation Division.  
20 Today, I'm going to speak to you a bit about the research on  
21 the energy sector impacts. A little bit of background on  
22 this. For the past couple of years, TxDOT and the Committee  
23 has been hearing that rural transit districts and urban  
24 transit districts close to the areas of activity for the  
25 shale plays around the state -- five locations that are

1 heavy with drilling and fracking activities -- are having  
2 trouble keeping experienced drivers, particularly when they  
3 get their commercial driver's license or CDL and experienced  
4 mechanics as well, because there's high demand for those  
5 skills in the oil industry.

6 In addition to that, we understand that there is  
7 significant damage done to the roadways from this activity  
8 both doing the fracking and the in the production of the  
9 wells. This causes damage to vehicles as well as causes a  
10 slowdown in service, therefore decreasing productivity. So  
11 PTAC asked Public Transportation Division to look into this  
12 and do some research about it and see what might be done  
13 about it.

14 Accordingly, we contacted the TxDOT's RTI Office which  
15 is our Research and Technology Transfer Office and asked  
16 them to put out a call to the public universities in Texas  
17 and see who might be interested in doing some research about  
18 that. They received one proposal from a university. That  
19 proposal was reviewed by staff, myself, and Eric Gleason.  
20 And we had some comments and suggestions that we sent back  
21 to the university, and asked them to take another stab at  
22 it. They did so and we feel that their response was still  
23 not quite what we were looking for. But particularly there  
24 was a lot of emphasis on road damage and what that might do  
25 to vehicles and relatively little emphasis on drivers and

1 mechanics. In addition to that, there was still a strong  
2 emphasis in their proposal on rural areas. And -- and  
3 nothing on the small urbanized areas.

4 Therefore, Eric and I developed a new draft scope and  
5 asked for more proposals. Our research office is going to  
6 share that among the public universities in Texas. And in  
7 the near future we expect to see some more proposals about  
8 that. That's all I have right now.

9 MR. McBETH: Great. Thank you, Kelly.

10 MR. KIRKLAND: Sure. You all have any questions?

11 MR. McBETH: Any questions? Any comments?

12 (No audible response)

13 MR. McBETH: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Kelly.  
14 Moving on to number 8, a briefing on the Open Meetings Act  
15 with respect to options for public comment.

16 MR. RIBAKOVE: All right. That will come from me.  
17 I'm Josh Ribakove with TxDOT. We also have Sarah Parker  
18 here from our Office of General Counsel to respond to any  
19 questions from the Committee. Basically, the Open Meetings  
20 Act in itself does not specifically give the public a right  
21 to speak at meetings that the public is entitled to attend.  
22 But if a government bod -- a governmental body wants to  
23 allow members of the public to speak at its public meetings,  
24 it can adopt reasonable rules that are consistent with the  
25 relevant provisions of the law that allow them to do -- do

1 so. And -- and TxDOT does want public comment to be  
2 available at our public meetings.

3 As far as the Texas Administrative Code goes, there are  
4 no specific to PTAC rules about public comment. We take our  
5 cue from the rules for the Texas Transportation Committee  
6 and their open meetings. Public access to those commission  
7 meetings is -- is governed by the Texas Administrative Code  
8 or the TAC.

9 At those meetings, they -- they have some specific  
10 rules. The open comment period is limited to a maximum of  
11 one hour and three minutes per person is re -- is allowed.  
12 So far in PTAC, we really have not tried to be as stringent  
13 as that. And -- and put a specific limit on the time that a  
14 person can take to make a public comment. And the -- we  
15 really have never approached that length of time in -- in my  
16 experience. What else can I tell you?

17 The -- well, the Transportation Code does require  
18 a comment card. And -- and the comment card needs to -- to  
19 be filled out before someone can comment. I -- I've got one  
20 here. There are also some if anybody wants to see right on  
21 the table by the door. Basically, we ask for the name of  
22 the speaker, the organization they represent if they do;  
23 we'd like to know which agenda item they would like to  
24 comment on.

25 And then there are some specifics that the Texas

1 Transportation Code asks us to -- to find out and so there  
2 are three boxes that can be checked at the bottom of the --  
3 of the comment sheet. One to tell us whether or not the  
4 person commenting is actually employed by TxDOT or does  
5 business with TxDOT or finally, could stand to benefit  
6 monetarily from the project or other item about which they  
7 are commenting. None of these things could disqualify  
8 anyone from making a comment. But it's good to know who's  
9 talking and where they're in -- sort of where they're coming  
10 from.

11 TxDOT does want to make the -- the -- their -- and  
12 especially PTAC wants to make this -- this meeting available  
13 to everyone over the phone. And we open up a listen-in line  
14 which -- which we -- in which anyone can call and listen to  
15 the meeting in its entirety or any section of it that they  
16 want to. They are muted. They're not allowed to comment  
17 over the phone. That has to happen in person. A lot of  
18 that is because of the requirement for the comment card to  
19 be filled out. And -- and also just to make it possible to  
20 really facilitate these meetings. And -- and know who it is  
21 who is -- is talking and where they're really from. It  
22 would be really difficult to -- to do that over the phone.

23 We asked our Office of General Counsel whether, you  
24 know, they might recommend trying to do that over the phone  
25 -- trying to find a way that that could be done. And -- and

1 they -- they don't recommend changing that procedure at this  
2 time.

3       Written comments, on the other hand, are always  
4 accepted by TxDOT. TxDOT and PTAC post contact information  
5 for all the Committee members on PTAC's webpage on txdot.gov  
6 and just go to our main page. And there's a search box and  
7 you can just type PTAC in there, and that'll take you right  
8 to the PTAC page. And you can see who all the members are,  
9 their contact information, e-mail addresses, phone numbers,  
10 all of that.

11       People can also write to TxDOT by regular mail at our  
12 normal mailing address, 125 East 11th Street here in Austin,  
13 78701. They should be addressed to TxDOT attention PTN,  
14 that's the Public Transportation Division, hyphen PTAC.  
15 I'll get those and I'll make sure that they get to the  
16 Committee. The Committee is not -- would not -- would not  
17 have to -- to read those comments aloud at meetings but  
18 could consider them and perhaps bring them up at a future  
19 meeting if there was a topic that the Committee wanted to --  
20 to discuss.

21       And that is basically the rules for the -- for public  
22 comment at our meetings. Again, if anybody has -- has  
23 questions or comments to make, we do have a representative  
24 here from our Office of General Counsel who can probably  
25 apply some expertise to that as well.

1 MR. McBETH: Thank you. Any comments, questions?

2 (No audible response)

3 MR. McBETH: Hearing none, we will move on to Item  
4 number 9, discussion and development of Public  
5 Transportation Advisory Committee Work Plan based on PTAC's  
6 guiding principles and comments made at the January 22nd,  
7 2015 meeting. This is a placeholder on pretty much all of  
8 our agendas for each meeting. It's an opportunity for any  
9 of the PTAC members to address any comments relative to  
10 either expanding our Development Plan or shrinking it. If  
11 -- if -- are there any comments? Does anyone want to  
12 discuss this issue? If not, we will -- we can move on to  
13 the next issue.

14 (No audible response)

15 MR. McBETH: Hearing none --

16 MR. RIBAKOVE: Yeah. Hang on. I think --

17 MR. McBETH: Yeah, I agree with that; let's just  
18 move on. We will move on to public comments. And I think  
19 we just received a public comment.

20 MR. RIBAKOVE: And it will be about the item that  
21 we just discussed.

22 MR. McBETH: Okay. The public comment is by  
23 Paulette Shelton from Fort Bend County. She wants to  
24 discuss Items number 6 and Item number 8. Paulette?

25 MR. RIBAKOVE: Paulette, if would, if you'd take a

1 seat in the -- in the front row here, it'd be great because  
2 we've got some microphones up here. And we'll be able to  
3 transcribe it a little more easily.

4 MS. SHELTON: Item 6 was related to the -- the  
5 effects of urbanization on transit. As you know, I'm at  
6 Fort Bend County. And we've had not only first-hand  
7 experience with this, but several years' experience with  
8 dealing with it. In following up with Linda's report, John  
9 made a comment about addressing the legislative issues.  
10 There's actually two legislative issues going on with this;  
11 one on federal level, the other at the state level.

12 On the federal level, we've undertaken the process to  
13 try to address the situation at the federal level. Two  
14 issues going on there, the first had to do with whether or  
15 not you were operating fixed route, and the second had to  
16 with this formula that we talked about that essentially is  
17 -- is putting the smaller operator in the region against the  
18 -- the large metro in the region.

19 We have confirmation and everybody has seen the new  
20 Senate Bill that's out; that the proposed language that we  
21 have to address these two issues is in there. We have  
22 sources who have said that it's on the House side as well,  
23 although we have not seen that writing yet to be able to  
24 confirm it.

25 I bring that up because those existing stakeholders, as

1 well as the ones that are looking at this in a few years,  
2 are stakeholders in this. And it's important for us to let  
3 our representatives know that a fix is there. I've got a  
4 copy of the proposed language, I can point it to -- point  
5 you to it, where it is in the Senate Bill. I need to check  
6 the House Bill as soon as it's published. But it is there  
7 and will provide some relief. It does relieve the same  
8 threshold in regards to the 100 bus vehicles. But there is  
9 some relief in terms of the operating assistance. And there  
10 is relief for those operators that demand response system  
11 only.

12 Now on the State level, from the perspective of Fort  
13 Bend County, what you've seen is a list of systems that  
14 graduated from the small urban system to a large urban  
15 system and are accessing state funds. In the case of Fort  
16 Bend County, where you have a rural to a large urban, we're  
17 not. So when you talk about gaps, there's another gap there  
18 in that we have some operators that have been affected by  
19 this that are still receiving state re -- support and others  
20 aren't. So I would hope as we go into any type of a state  
21 fix legislative leap to this problem that we consider also  
22 those of us that are out there that are also struggling with  
23 this. And finally on that, there were some questions from,  
24 I believe, it was Michelle regarding some of these areas  
25 that have been identified on the maps as -- as gap areas

1 with no service. And Linda's comments to that, you know,  
2 had to do with whether or not those cities were aware of it,  
3 and possibly that there are issues with local match. I can  
4 tell you from our own experience not only this go-around in  
5 the last 10 years in Fort Bend County, but prior to that in  
6 Galveston and Brazoria Counties, where we kind of saw our  
7 system growing all the way up from rural to small urban to  
8 large urban.

9 One key issue there when we go to the cities is their  
10 ability to provide local match with the sales tax. Many are  
11 already at the state constitutional maximum of eight and a  
12 half percent. And so I would say that a lot of times what  
13 you might find is the city that's willing, but they're at  
14 the cap already. And they're already using that and it's  
15 committed to something else. And the decision has to be  
16 with, can I cut anything for this, and that's often very  
17 difficult for a city. So that was kind of my comments on  
18 Item 6. If I could move on to the public comment Item.

19 MR. STEPHENS: That's a great speaker. Yeah,  
20 amplifies.

21 MS. SHELTON: In regards to the public comment  
22 Item, I know at the last meeting that I had made some  
23 comments that had to do with confusion on how to do it.  
24 There was also another comment that I made in regards to,  
25 when to do it. I understand your process. That was

1 explained very well today by Josh. But I still have some  
2 remaining questions.

3 We have an agenda with action items. But the ability  
4 for the public to comment on those action items is not  
5 provided until after the action is taken. And I think to be  
6 more specific was, would the Committee consider putting the  
7 public comment process at the beginning of the agenda as  
8 opposed to the end of it so at least public comment is heard  
9 about an action item before action is taken on the item.  
10 And that's really kind of my only comment on that.

11 MR. McBETH: I -- I think on -- on that comment,  
12 that's something that TxDOT would -- would need to address.  
13 I know in the case of -- of -- of my own agency -- this is  
14 John -- in the case of my own agency, we start the -- after  
15 a call to order, we start off with open public comments, and  
16 the last thing on our agenda is public comments. So the  
17 person gets two bites at the apple. But I don't know what  
18 the legalities are of -- of -- of that. That's something  
19 that TxDOT would have to take up with their General Counsel  
20 relative to -- to -- to items, I'd suppose.

21 MR. GLEASON: If I can, Mr. Chair. This is --  
22 this is Eric Gleason. And I think there's -- I don't think  
23 there's any reason we can't be flexible with respect to that  
24 last piece. I mean, I think rightly or wrongly, even in the  
25 past, I think the Chair has the discretion during the

1 meeting to -- with each individual item if -- if we have say  
2 a sign-in. And if someone identifies a specific item, I  
3 don't -- I don't know if we can, at that point during the  
4 discussion say of Item 6, if we know that someone in the  
5 public wants to comment, the chair has the discretion I  
6 assume to enter -- entertain comment at that time. I -- I  
7 think we can probably fashion something along those lines.

8 MR. SALAZAR: And -- and this is J.R. And we've  
9 done that in the past; right?

10 MR. GLEASON: Well, I know we have. I just am  
11 trying to be --

12 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

13 MR. GLEASON: -- legally correct here.

14 (Laughter)

15 MR. GLEASON: You know, I think --

16 MR. SALAZAR: Sorry, Eric.

17 MR. GLEASON: Thanks, J.R.

18 MR. McBETH: This is John. You know, I know -- I  
19 know in the Legislature, you submit your public co -- if  
20 you're going to make a public comment, you submit it at the  
21 very first of the hearing. And when they get to that item,  
22 they do the public hearing. And then they say which --  
23 which people are in the audience and -- and have sent in  
24 comments cards on that item. And they're allowed the  
25 opportunity to comment at that particular time. But you

1 have to make sure you get your card in at the beginning of  
2 the hearing or register now by computer in -- in the  
3 hallways to -- and you have to be there. We know that. You  
4 have to be there. Or you get -- you get in a fistfight with  
5 the Chairman.

6 MR. GLEASON: So if -- if I can again, this is  
7 Eric. I mean, when -- when people come to the meeting, they  
8 can sign in. They identify the agenda item. And I don't  
9 see why, again, it would be -- Rob, Mr. Chair's -- your  
10 deference. I think we can entertain the idea on particular  
11 items --

12 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.

13 MR. GLEASON: -- of -- of having the comment at  
14 that time, as long as somebody had signed in to do that. I  
15 don't have any problem with that at all.

16 MR. McBETH: Makes -- makes perfect sense. Makes  
17 perfect sense, to address it while it's there in the front  
18 of everybody's mind.

19 MR. GLEASON: Because you're right. I mean, after  
20 the action, what's -- what's the point? I got it.

21 MR. RIBAKOVE: And I think we can -- we can also  
22 -- and -- and I can pick up the slack on this myself -- be a  
23 little more specific about outlining the comment pro -- you  
24 know, the process at the very beginning of the meeting --

25 MR. GLEASON: Perfect.

1 MR. RIBAKOVE: -- maybe at the same as we do our  
2 safety briefing.

3 MR. GLEASON: Good idea.

4 MR. McBETH: Works for you, Paulette?

5 MS. SHELTON: Yes, thank you.

6 MR. McBETH: And, Paulette, addressing your --  
7 your -- your question about Item number 6; you're right.  
8 But the whole -- the -- it's not just pieces of the statute  
9 that need to be addressed, it's the whole statute. The --  
10 every -- everything about it needs to be addressed because  
11 we have based upon Linda's report, we have the perfect  
12 storm. It's already started. It's going to be a tsunami in  
13 -- at -- in -- by 2013 or by -- by -- by -- by 2022, it'll  
14 be a tsunami.

15 You have five rural systems moving into small urban.  
16 You have four small urban systems staying there but still  
17 able to draw state funds. So those are not things that we  
18 even considered when we wrote the statute years and years  
19 and years -- back in the '80s. So the whole statute will  
20 have to be revisited.

21 And I think Linda's report is a good thing to base  
22 going forward on -- the suggestions of what -- what's going  
23 to be broken, what is broken, what's going to be broken, and  
24 how big it -- how big it's going to be broken. So that we  
25 can get new, fresh, clean legislation that sets out a

1 direction for the growth of public transit in Texas. It's  
2 real disturbing that we have this many of those little bitty  
3 green urban gaps, where they're getting service if their RTD  
4 has the money to go out and give it to them. But if they  
5 don't, they're not. That's just kind of tragic because  
6 there's a lot people. That's -- there's a lot people in  
7 that. I'd be interested in knowing what the populations of  
8 all those urban gaps are. It's got to be -- it's got to be  
9 a couple of million people.

10 MS. CHERRINGTON: That's that bar chart.

11 MR. McBETH: Yeah. That's a lot of folks.

12 MR. GLEASON: It is. It's --

13 MR. McBETH: It's a bunch of people.

14 MS. CHERRINGTON: Yeah, it is.

15 MS. SHELTON: Well, I thank you. And I agree with  
16 you, John. I think if I was to reiterate anything, it would  
17 be that this group of stakeholders, it's relevant on the  
18 federal side as well as the state side.

19 MR. McBETH: Yeah.

20 MS. SHELTON: And it's important that we all work  
21 together and we all support the initiative. And then I  
22 think, you know, as my follow up to that is I -- I think  
23 that we need to dig a little bit deeper and understand what  
24 the issue is at the local level because our state  
25 legislators are going to ask that. Well, why -- why is it

1 that these cities aren't doing it? Or why is it that these  
2 counties aren't doing it?

3 And that raises a whole other issue of counties'  
4 ability to leverage sales taxes in -- into the argument of  
5 whether or not they should be using general revenues for it  
6 in the first place. We -- we've been down all of those  
7 roads. And there's limitations on what counties can do that  
8 are not there for cities. And a lot times, this  
9 encroachment is happening into the unincorporated area. We  
10 don't see that on Fort Bend County's map. But if you were  
11 to overlay that on our map, what you would see is that  
12 tsunami you were talking about. We've been going through it  
13 here because it -- it's multiple levels depending on the  
14 area and depending on the issues. And as we move through  
15 this, we need to be able to respond to that to our  
16 legislators.

17 MR. McBETH: Exactly.

18 MS. SHELTON: Thank you.

19 MR. McBETH: Thank you. Item number 11, propose  
20 and discuss agenda items for next meeting and confirm the  
21 date of the meeting. Josh?

22 MR. RIBAKOVE: Well, currently the next meeting is  
23 scheduled for Tuesday, November 24th, the last Tuesday in  
24 November. That is the same week as Thanksgiving.  
25 Thanksgiving is on -- is on the 26th. So the question is

1 leave it; move it?

2 MR. McBETH: I -- I could be here, but I don't  
3 know about anybody else. This is John.

4 MR. RIBAKOVE: If you want to not decide now, I  
5 can poll the Committee and let you know.

6 MR. McBETH: I think that's probably a good idea.  
7 Poll the committee and -- and see what everybody's druthers  
8 are. Probably a lot of people would prefer not to be in  
9 Austin during the week of Thanksgiving. That's my guess.

10 MR. STEPHENS: Oh yeah.

11 (Laughter)

12 MR. McBETH: A reply Rob -- speaks up.

13 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah. Yeah, John -- you guys, this  
14 is Rob. I'm listening in. I -- I've been listening. I've  
15 been quiet because I can't talk too much. But what -- what  
16 -- whatever -- yeah, le -- le -- let's keep us out of out of  
17 there during the w -- during the holidays, man, if we can.

18 MR. McBETH: Got you. Josh will work on it.

19 MR. RIBAKOVE: All right.

20 MR. McBETH: Okay.

21 MR. RIBAKOVE: And ag -- agenda you want to --

22 MR. McBETH: I don't have any agenda items to add.  
23 Anyone else? Rob, Michelle?

24 MR. STEPHENS: No, sir. This Rob. I have nothing  
25 to add. I -- I do appreciate you, John, for running that

1 meeting. I could not have done that. Appreciate all of  
2 you. Thank you so much.

3 MR. McBETH: Thank you, Rob.

4 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Nope, no further  
5 comments.

6 MR. McBETH: Okay. Thanks, Michelle. Okay.

7 Agenda Item number 12 is adjourn. I'll entertain a motion  
8 to adjourn.

9 MR. SALAZAR: I move to adjourn.

10 MR. McBETH: We have a motion. Do we have a  
11 second?

12 MS. BLOOMER: Second.

13 MR. McBETH: Michelle seconds.

14 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle seconds.

15 MR. McBETH: Michelle seconds. J.R.'s made the  
16 motion. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

17 (Chorus of ayes)

18 MR. McBETH: There's only four here so there are  
19 no nays. I guess we'll adjourn. Thank you all.

20 MR. SALAZAR: What a strange meeting we've just  
21 been in here.

22 (Laughter)

23 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you.

24 MR. McBETH: Thank you, Rob and Michelle.

25 (Whereupon, at 2:34 p.m. the meeting was adjourned)

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 63, constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the PTAC meeting, held at 3712 Jackson Avenue, Building 6, Room 324, Austin, Texas, on Tuesday, September 29, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.  
DATED this 8th day of October, 2015.



---

Kimberly C. McCright, CET

3712 Jackson Ave.  
Bldg. 6, Room 324, Austin