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MR. GLEASON: We are back on. We've got a good connection. I apologize for the delay. We were having some problems getting into the conference.

So Michelle, I think -- well, is everyone online? Christina is not going to be able to join us.

MS. BLOOMER: I heard Al, J.R., Brad, Rob, Glenn and myself. So I think other than -- if Christina is not going to be on, that's all of us.

MR. GLEASON: Is Rob on?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes. I'm here.

MR. GLEASON: There you are. All right. Yes. That's great. Go ahead, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Then I will officially call the meeting to order at 1:07. The second item on the agenda, the approval of the minutes from June 7 and July 12.

Before asking for a motion, I just have a comment to make, and then I will open it up quickly. But in reviewing the minutes from July 12 -- and, Eric, I don't know if you happen to have those. On Agenda Item 3, it was related to the Legislative Appropriation Request, discussion and the letter.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: The comment there focuses more on
the legislative priorities, and it doesn’t indicate anything along the lines that we discussed sending the LAR letter, and we actually did send it.

So I wasn’t sure if we needed to include that part of the discussion as well in there, just to reflect that we agreed on sending a letter to the Commission regarding the LAR, and that we subsequently did that.

MR. GLEASON: Where are you again, Michelle?

Number three?

MS. BLOOMER: I’m on the --

MR. GLEASON: Number 3?

MS. BLOOMER: For July 12, on Agenda Item 3.

MR. GLEASON: I was in June; That explains it.

MR. GADBOIS: So it should read Legislative Appropriation Request discussion and comment and moved to send the letter.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. That was a good catch, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah. And I think just with that revision, I don’t have any other questions regarding the June 7 or 12th minutes.

Does anybody else -- any Committee members have any questions on the June 7 or July 12 minutes?

MR. GADBOIS: I would like to move to approve, with the amendment you suggested, both minutes.
MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I will second that.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. And just since we're all on the phone, I know it's kind of difficult. I will just run through the list of folks I have, and you can yea or nay. So we have a motion and a second to approve the minutes.

Al?

MR. ABESON: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: Rob?

MR. STEPHENS: Yea.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, yes. Okay. So the minutes are approved with those changes.

Moving on to Item 3 on the agenda is the discussion of the Transportation Development Credit rules, and I think I'm going to turn this over to Bobby.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes. For the record, this is Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Director of the Public Transportation Division at TxDOT. Good afternoon,
everyone.

And as we do comment today, we do have a court reporter in the room here in Austin. Just to let you know, I know you all folks are on the phone. Eric is here as well.

And we have --

MS. FISHER: Nancy Fisher.

MR. KILLEBREW: Nancy here as well, from the general public. At the moment, that is the only public we have other than the court reporter. To let you know who's in Austin at the official site of the public meeting today.

In your packet, members, there is a copy -- it looks very like a legal document: Subchapter H, Transportation Development Credit Program. These are the rules that are going to the Commission at the Commission meeting in September. These rules are the same that the committee saw and provided comments on earlier this year, so they remain unchanged.

In the process of receiving public comments on this rule, the Department received only one public comment, and that was from Carole Warlick of the Hill Country Transit District. And a copy of her comment was also included in your packets.

Today=s item for the committee -- I know we
don't do rulemaking very often, so if you bear with me to just go through that real quickly, today's action for the committee -- the committee can do one of a couple of things.

Today the committee can provide comments regarding this final rule packet that would go to the Commission. Or the committee can waive comment and not provide any comment whatsoever.

And with that, Michelle, I guess I will turn it back over to you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Bob. A quick question. On the provide comment, isn't it sort of -- refresh my memory, because basically what was our action last time?

MR. GADBOIS: We developed a letter commenting on the first draft. And since this hasn't changed, if we are going to communicate anything at all, it ought to be we simply stand by our initial letter and comment.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. This is Michelle. I guess what I am asking is, usually there's three: We can waive comment, we can provide comment, or we can forward to the Commission and recommend their approval.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes. This is Bobby. There's two opportunities for the Committee to provide comment during a rulemaking process. The first opportunity, which happened earlier this year, you had three things that you
could possibly do at that point in time.

This is the second opportunity. And in the second opportunity, believe it or not, you only get two things you can do. One is waive comment; the other is you can provide comment to the Commission.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. KILLEBREW: And provide comment could mean we don’t provide any additional comments. Our comment is no comment. Or our comment is XYZ.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think our --

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and we can also have the comment that we affirm our initial letter.

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. Absolutely.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And I was just -- it's has been a while since we sent the letter. And I was just getting back to Glenn=s point.

We, I believe and the letter just communicated that we were in support of the draft rules as presented prior to them going out to public comment.

I don’t know that we -- I think our comment should be something just along the lines like Glenn said, is that we continue to support the rules as written, and recommend Commission approval.

MR. GADBOIS: Indeed, I would like to make that motion, if our Chair wasn=t making it herself.
MR. GLEASON: Hey, Glenn, this is Eric. Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Yes.

MR. GLEASON: Are you on a cell phone or something? We're having trouble hearing you.

MR. GADBOIS: I am indeed on a cell phone.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah. You seem to be breaking up from our standpoint. I don't know if that's true for the others on the call.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Well, to try to repeat it as clearly as I can, I would like to -- this is Glenn. I would like to make the motion that we communicate a comment to the Commission that indicates our support for the rules as written.

MR. ABESON: I'd offer a second on that. This is Al.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion by the committee?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Hearing none, Bobby, we are good then to proceed with taking a vote. You have what you need to communicate to the Commission?

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. Yes, I do.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then I will call for a vote.

Al?
MR. ABESON: I'm in favor.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Rob?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, yes. So Glenn made the motion. Al seconded. It all passed. All right.

Thank you all for your work on that, in getting that through.

We will move on to -- we are actually going to go ahead and skip down to Agenda Item 5, just due to time. And then we'll go back to 5 before moving on to 6.

Agenda Item 5 is the legislative priorities, discussion and comment.

At our last conference call, on July 17, when we were discussing the LAR letter, I believe we agreed as a committee that we would go ahead and focus the LAR letter solely on our funding request, which will allow us additional time as a committee to talk about what our legislative priorities are and possibly to be a little bit more strategic in how we present those to the Commission,
and to allow greater discussion at the committee level on what the working group was proposing.

So in the meantime, my understanding is that the working group has convened and done some work on their legislative priorities, or at least recommendations for consideration by the committee on some legislative priorities.

So I will go ahead and turn it over to you, Glenn, to sort of bring us up to speed and, Brad and Rob, as to what working group one has been talking about regarding legislative priorities.

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. So my team, Rob and Brad and myself, can jump in and support this for as much conversation as you want to have. I just want to be clear up front, because I have a meeting conflict, in which case, you know, I have maybe 15 to 20, 25 minutes that I can talk about this, and then I'm going to have to get off -- and let the rest of the team carry the rest of the conversation.

MR. UNDERWOOD: In 25 minutes, I'm going to have to get off, too, then.

(General laughter.)

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. Okay. I talked, we talked on this topic, but because I am going to only talk for a couple of minutes here, I want to make sure everybody
understands what -- at least kind of the framework for the 
conversation we had and the direction we are going to seed 
the conversation.

So the three of us talked about legislative 
issues that we would like to communicate to the Commission 
and enlist theirs and the Department=s help in furthering. 
In doing that, there are obviously two legislative 
arenas, and we have different kind of strategies or 
activities we would like to do for each one of those.

Let=s deal with the State first. We asked Eric 
if it was at all possible to have somebody from 
legislative affairs on this call to help advise PTAC as 
they're considering the different options and so kind of 
give some background as to what the legislative session's 
beginning to look like, whether they think these are 
realistic, whether they have any tweaks or better ideas on 
how we can achieve what we want to achieve.

But here are the three-state related things 
that we thought were important to push forward.

The first -- and Eric sent this out in the 
package, and so I'm going to just make sure that they are 
on the table and people hear them directly. The first is 
to ask for a dollar amount, that -- you know, some amount 
of money that could be funded through the Texas Enterprise 
Fund.
The Texas Enterprise Fund has specific legislative criteria for what is available for it. Each biennium it has to be funded, but historically, it's been funded to the tune of around $60 million. And historically, it has gone for everything from bringing in a Toyota plant -- you know, some contribution towards bringing a Toyota manufacturing plant to north San Antonio and really kind of attracting larger businesses and employers to come to the state.

Our argument would be twofold. One is make public transportation eligible for Texas Enterprise Funds, because it is support of a serious employer in this state -- a serious employer and economic development tool.

And for the Legislature this session to earmark some of those monies in a rider or whatever toward public transportation, to take care of some specific, you know, capital needs, or some other needs for the overall public transportation, that's one idea.

The second idea is --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Glenn, can I say something about -- can I say something to that?

MR. GADBOIS: Sure.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, I just want to get in, pretty brief about it.

Eric, you'll recall it was the end of August,
where there was a Transportation Subcommittee hearing. I actually brought that before some of the legislators there, and it was actually pretty well received. They kind of looked at that as something maybe not thought about or they hadn't heard before. And actually, Linda Harper-Brown was pretty encouraged. They kind of shook their head and understood and kind of took some notes.

And they seem to not immediately jerk, the knee jerk with it. It was more like, Hmm, we've not really thought about that. And that could be a very real possibility.

So they kind of gave some positive feedback on that particular idea, so I just wanted to add that to the conversation.

MR. GADBOIS: Good, thanks. Well, you're going to get to add to the second one as well. So the next issue is Medicaid transportation. And for those who haven't had history in dealing with the Medicaid transportation, Medicaid actually, by court decree, is required to provide some level of transportation, particularly for children. But the Court decree has gotten them in business of providing transportation service for all or most Medicaid-eligible folks.

And the ownership or leadership of Medicaid had bounced back and forth. It was over at the Department of
Health, when there was a Department of Health.

Then for a little while TxDOT had lead for planning how the transportation -- Medicaid transportation program went. And then a few years back, it bounced back to Health and Human Services Commission.

Well, as I am hearing, the sample reports about it is that the way it is being done right now is seriously problematic. And so all we're asking for is to include the Department, and particularly PTN, in the planning and program development or program implementation decision making process, such that we have an opportunity to make it a little bit wholly inside HHS and give an avenue to maybe problem-solve some of those difficulties that are happening out at the real world as this is being delivered. And you'll hear of this I think from Brad=s testimony.

The Legislature doesn't understand anything about this, and most people don't understand anything about it. It is a real kind of insider baseball game, but it's hugely important. It is, you know, something on the order of $100 million in transportation investment every biennium.

Brad, do you want to jump in on your experience when you talked about Medicaid transportation?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah. You know, at the
committee meeting there again, was -- you know, it was very much misunderstood. I think a lot of our legislators have no clue how this program works, how it really even benefits public transportation, how that we should be an intricate part of it.

And for instance, Linda Harper-Brown, as well as Yvonne Davis both asked several questions. Well, what does this mean? How does that work? How does it benefit you? What are we currently doing? Had really no clue what Rider 55 was even about. They didn't know whose rider it was.

And so we kind of had to even go a little bit into the explanation of what, you know, creating brokers around the state is actually doing; you know, some of the issues there. So, no, I think there is a complete lack of understanding and really attention being drawn to it, except people in these little pilot areas, Dallas, Beaumont, Houston.

Now, those areas seem like they are getting quite a bit of attention currently, because of the service and the lack thereof in those locations and some of the issues they are having. I know that the Tarrant County County Judge is working on some things for Tarrant County right now with Medicaid transportation.

But, yeah, I mean, they're clueless. They
really have no idea that this is even taking place or what's going on.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and then jumping to the last item, just to lay them all out on the table, right now -- this is an idea that Brad and the transit folks kind of came up with, and I think it's a genius idea and since have heard that the large metros are getting behind this idea. And it's basically this:

Right now, the transit agencies, when they buy fuel, pay the fuel tax to the state. Then the state turns around and allocates back out the fuel tax to the transportation providers.

What we are asking for is don't -- you know, is exempt the transit agencies from having to pay the state fuel tax, which ends up being a huge benefit-cost savings for transit agencies and therefore kind of makes the money go further.

But it also keeps that portion of the money out of this loop of going -- you know, getting connected through the Comptroller and then getting distributed through the Comptroller, distribution to the agency and then from the agency out, you know, to whomever, in which case it keeps more money where it needs to be on the implementation of transit.

So that's the core argument there. The one
thing that I needed to point out is the Feds already provide this exemption, and the State has a way to provide this exemption.

It simply is that public transportation agencies aren’t designated as exempt now. So those are the three things we would like to send to the Commission and enlist their help on at the state legislature.

The federal side stuff is more -- is easier to talk about and more complicated at the same time. We just had a new federal bill pass called MAP-21. There has been some good analysis of how MAP-21 is reorienting programs and the impact it will have on the urban areas and probably even on the smaller areas.

But what hasn’t happened to date, that we know of, is a good analysis of how the reprogramming that is happening under MAP-21 will impact rural transit providers.

So we have asked Eric to enlist the help of TTI to do the -- or whatever resources they need to do the analysis; do that analysis early enough to where there is conversation about how this might work -- conversation and education on how this might work before we ever get to the point of sending out letters with, these are the dollar amounts you are going to receive, because what we are pretty confident of is already given that much more of
this is programmed and less competitive, it looks like a number of systems -- you know, their money's going to change. And a lot of systems don't now have good forward planning procedures in place for how they will spend the money. If you get additional money just dropped on them, then we are pretty confident that won't be spent for the best and highest purposes. That might happen if you give them more time to think about it.

Now in addition to that, we were pretty straightforward, where we would like to go with this in the long run is to start implementing an approach that the large metros and the small urbans already do with -- but includes a rural in there -- and that's basically development of a three-year financial plan.

Because we're pretty confident that right now there is not much thinking about the long-term needs, but -- by both the systems and by the State, that there's not much long-term thinking of the direction we are going, needs we might have and planning those out for any additional requests or, you know, any pockets we might have for allocation, and particularly, in processes for kind of evaluation, are you actually spending the way you said you needed to spend or are you just sitting on money that could be used elsewhere?

And we would like to get to a place where we're
more strategic and we're more efficient. And we think that using that MAP-21 as a springboard to help us start some new processes that will help us do both.

Did I miss anything, guys?

MR. STEPHENS: No. I think you covered it pretty well. This is Rob.

I think you covered it really well, Glenn. In your letter, you know, we have talked about before there are -- you know, the operators we have listed here, let's not forget the non-traditional members of that group that consist of private non-profit and private entities. There's been a large investment there, in capital investment there. I mean, what next for that group of people as we've got realignment of funding streams and consolidated funding programs.

And you know, they could -- you know, the rural area could probably use a lot of help in trying to figure out how to move forward long term, and so I support that. But I don't want to forget that huge investment TxDOT -- Texas has made to the non-traditional operator.

MR. GADBOIS: And by non-traditional, you have a cab company that's doing some service and getting some real money in your area. But I assume that would also be,

to make it personal to Michelle, Catholic charities, or --

MS. BLOOMER: Sure.
MR. GADBOIS: — you know, or anybody else that is not a public transportation provider but, you know, is helping to provide public transportation and getting some public money to do it.

MR. STEPHENS: Sure. Some of these have been direct recipients. So you've just got a large investment there. And I don't want us to forget or overlook — you know, that could sneak up and be a problem down the way for somebody, maybe for everyone.

But, you know, as we look at operators get large chunks of money dropped in their laps — you know, some areas, MAP-21 has made those changes — you're going to have large monies taken away from others.

You know, there is some implications that go beyond maybe just the — just what we were thinking of when we began this discussion, so I support it. I just would like some thought to be given about what we do about that large investment we made elsewhere.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And Rob, this is Michelle. Further thinking along those lines, are you also including sort of the folks that — the non-traditional providers who may have been eligible under the Job Access/Reverse Commute and new Freedom Fund who may or may not, depending on how everything sort of settles out from that, be eligible for those funds under the new
program, or the consolidated program.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, exactly.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. And, Michelle, that is exactly the point, is we need to start having some education and discussion about how we're going to deal with that, so that, you know, the people that are getting JARC and New Freedom, whatever now, or frankly, 5310, that aren't public transportation providers, then they are not all of a sudden looking at MAP-21 going, Ahh, all my money is going away. But, you know, instead we are having a real conversation about what needs to be the process in place to make sure that we continue those investments.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. Glenn, this is Michelle, and I agree. I think part of the concern or the question that I have is without really -- we all know what MAP sort of has done or sort of laid the vision. It's now waiting to see how that will actually be implemented.

And so it's -- without having a lot of clear information or guidance from FTA at this point, it's hard to really know what those impacts are.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah. Of course, it is, Michelle. But as we begin to understand that, I mean, maybe in parallel, we can begin to kind of figure out what we are going to do, and how we are --
MR. GADBOIS: Well, and I actually wanted to push back slightly on that point, Michelle. Without a doubt, FTA is going to provide more guidance and TxDOT ought to be, you know, starting to develop what their guidance and response will be.

But we've been able to have good analysis of the impact at a higher level. But it needs good analysis for the urban and small urban that we simply don't even have as a discussion point for the rural at this point.

MS. BLOOMER: So, Glenn, are you requesting at our next PTAC meeting, that we have more of an in-depth presentation or update on the potential impacts of MAP-21 to the rural program?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, since we don't have it for this meeting, which was our initial hope, yes. That would be the request, is that we as a body have some time to discuss this, if we agree it's important for us to get involved, you know, in helping TxDOT and the community better understand the impact and the direction we need to go as a state because of MAP-21.

Then next -- then we need to have a more detailed analysis at our next meeting, and we need to be ready for a discussion with some, you know, work we can do.

MR. ABESON: This is Al. As one of the members
of the team two, if you will, the working group that was focusing on coordination, as all of you may not know, once MAP-21 was enacted, we suspended our work because of the potential impact, of course, which we, as you just said, Glenn, have no certainty as to what's going to happen.

With that kind of a presentation, it might be sufficient to enable that working group to regain the momentum that was lost and start moving forward. So I think it would be very helpful.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay. And this is J.R. The only thing that I would like to add too, Eric, is that I think you know, coming from a rural perspective, is that I agree that I think PTAC needs a more detailed plan of what MAP-21 is going to do.

But coming from the rural providers, I think that we really do, Eric, because you know, talking to my neighbors everywhere, you know, throughout the state, you know, we are all mentioning MAP-21.

And we all have our own thoughts of what's going to happen, but we really don't know until you guys kind of help us out on that. And so I agree 100 percent with that, with what you said, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: And, J.R., let me ask you a particular question, because one of the things that we started with and that I'd like this group to give feedback
on is there are some outcomes we want to try to get to.

And one of those is to get longer-range financial planning in place for the rurals. Do you have any particular heartburn about that, or do you see, you know, good reason for having it?

MR. SALAZAR: I don't really have a big heartburn about it. You know, it's really hard for us to project five years down the road, but I think most of us are doing that anyway, and so I think it's fine. I don't think that anybody would really oppose that.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And, well -- and the problem -- because I am a firm believer that there has got to be a problem to be solved before you do something. The problem -- and I just want to be direct about this -- is we think that there are some people that go after money and then sit on it until it's the last minute, and they can't spend it because they don't have local match or whatever. And then you know, finally, in a pinch, it may come back to TxDOT to get it redistributed.

What longer range planning allows us to do is better monitoring, support, and/or if need be, reallocation.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, this is Michelle.

MR. ABESON: One of the dilemmas, isn't it, Glenn -- take MAP-21, for example; it's a two-year piece
of legislation.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

MR. ABESON: So -- and the state redoes this every session. So how does one carefully -- carefully is a better word than thoughtfully; thoughtfully is easier -- lay out an anticipated revenue for planning purposes when they really don't have any basis in doing so?

MR. GADBOIS: And, Al, revenue can get more tenuous, you know, two years out. I completely agree with that. But it does put everybody and still the small urban and the rurals and private businesses and cities and everybody else does long-range financial planning.

I think -- and frankly, as J.R. says, some of the rurals do it anyway; it's just not formalized. I think for us to have serious public investment and serious organizations and institutions that we have built off of public investment and not have them committing to at least a three-year financial plan is irresponsible on our part.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, this is Michelle. I think this item probably needs more significant discussion and probably needs more discussion in person, because I think like you said, before we start finding a solution, we have to get down to what the root problem is.

And I think there are multiple issues that need
to be looked at, in addition to maybe better financial planning. But I think there is multiple other ones that feed into that. And what I wanted to get back to is, Eric, Glenn, in the beginning, you mentioned there were two legislative priorities you were looking at: the state and the federal.

My question, Eric, would be, how can we and how would we have impact at the federal level? And should we maybe break those two up and focus right now on getting our state legislative priorities in front of the Commission?

And if that's the case, do -- are we as a committee comfortable with the three that the working group has laid out as is, or do we believe we need additional discussion on what some of those -- three items, the state fuel tax, Medicaid, and the Texas Enterprise Fund?

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. If I can -- just in response to your -- part of your questions, I think the best way for the committee to communicate to the Commission its interests is in the form of a letter. And I think just from a clarity standpoint, it probably makes sense to send one letter with respect to state legislative priorities and a second with respect to federal, just so that they don’t somehow get confused or
one doesn’t get lost with the other.

I don’t mean to be making more work for the committee or ourselves, but I just think it would be clearer if there were to be two communications from the committee to the Commission. Does that make sense?

MR. GADBOIS: It does. And this is Glenn. I'm going to have to get off in just a second. My team can carry all the weight, and I'm happy to do whatever work they commit us to doing.

And just in feedback, I think we anticipated two letters: one state and then additional work needed on the federal side.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: What I'm hoping that this Committee agrees to is next meeting we have -- next meeting, Eric, you agree to have the analysis at least done or presentable. And we focus in on the federal stuff for the next meeting.

At this meeting we end up -- you'll agree to what we ought to put in the letter. And then we, team one, are happy to draft that letter with feedback and specific information that we need from PTN staff.

And with that, I am going to let my team carry the rest of the ball, and I need to go to my Parks meeting.
MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Glenn.

MR. GLEASON: Thanks, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: Thanks, folks. Goodbye.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So back to Eric. One letter for the state, one letter for the federal. And as Glenn mentioned, additional work still needed to sort of come to consensus on the federal level.

I guess my question is, then, for the rest of the Committee members. Do we think -- do we all agree with the three state legislative priorities that have been presented, and do we think there are any others? Or are these the only three, the top three? Anybody have any thoughts?

MR. ABESON: Yes. This is Al. Can I ask a couple of questions?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. Please, Al.

MR. ABESON: Okay. I'm not familiar with the Texas Enterprise Fund and all of its workings. I've read about some of the alleged use of that fund by the Governor, but I'm not familiar with it at all.

If there were a rider that were attached that would enable public transportation to get those funds, how do those funds get distributed? Do they come into PTN and PTN allocates? How would that work?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Al, this is Brad. And I don't
want to speak for Eric, but I think we would treat them
just as we treat our -- whether it be revenue miles
funding or formula funding. I don't know that you would
want to have them go to each specific agency for some sort
of project.

But that's just my initial reaction, unless we
got a lump sum and had a competitive call for those funds,
if that's what you are thinking. I think you could do it
either way.

Am I correct in saying that, Eric?

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think it is a strategic
decision on your part or the industry's part about which
approach you think will be most successful with the
Enterprise Fund.

You know, historically it's a project-based
award, if you will. The notion of an industry-wide award
from it is probably different than perhaps contemplated,
and so I think it's a strategic decision. I think if it
were sort of an industry-wide thing, then probably part of
the proposal would in fact be a distribution methodology.
And if the Department were to be involved, it would just
be in whatever follow-through were necessary to do that.

MR. ABESON: So that could become a competitive
process once again. Is that right?

MR. GLEASON: I guess it would just depend on
the strategy, again. I mean, I don’t know, you know. Does it make sense to go to the Enterprise Fund with a general description of funding that would be part of a competitive program within the industry?

Or is it better to go with, hey, we got an idea we want to use this money for, and here are the benefits. I mean, it just depends on where folks think the most likely successful strategy is.

MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I think, Al, your questions, as well as sort of the questions that I am having in my head -- I think what the rest of the committee really needs is I think from a concept standpoint, I’m not -- how do you say it?

I’m not against the Texas Enterprise Fund, but I don’t know enough about what it is, how it historically works, what -- like Eric mentioned, I guess historically they funded projects.

I think what we really need the working group to bring back to the committee is sort of a basic white paper on what is the Texas Enterprise Fund, how has it been used; how do we think we could leverage that resource for the benefit of public transportation, and answers to some of those questions.

And I don’t know if the committee would be willing to sort of take -- putting something together, or
asking other -- like, Al, if you have other questions about the Texas Enterprise Fund, how that would work?

I'd be interested, on the Medicaid, in learning more about what the real issues are and some of the ideas of how we think having PTN involved in that process could enhance that process.

And then the State Fuel Tax, Glenn mentioned that the state has a way to designate. Maybe some information on how the state currently does that so we as members can understand that, so when I sign the letter, I have a thorough understanding of what we are asking for and how easy or not it is to occur.

But I think if we could tap that in advance of our next meeting and then just the committee members can ask any questions that aren't answered, or we can submit them in advance after receiving the white paper, and then we can take action at the next meeting and have a letter sent to the Commission.

And then in addition to doing that, we can continue to have our discussions on the federal priorities as to whether or not those are areas that we want to pursue, as far as the financial planning, et cetera.

MR. ABESON: This is Al. I concur with what you've just said, Michelle, but I would add one thing to it.
I would be interested in, as part of the white paper, who and what interests might be in opposition to all three of these proposals, because obviously, somebody's benefitting now who may not benefit as much or at all, depending on what changes occur.

So if there could be some anticipation of opponents, I would be interested in knowing that as we get into the process.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I think that's a great point, Al. So anticipation of opponents.

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. Could I ask a question?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, please.

MR. GLEASON: Brad and Rob and J.R., to what extent do these three proposals mirror what the association might also have on its agenda? And to the extent to which they may be the same, some of this work that the committee is looking for might be done elsewhere?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Eric, these actually mirror the TTA legislative agenda as well. Medicaid is going to be a very big priority for us going into session. There is going to be lots of talk about how to reform that whole program, and so that is being worked on.

The fuel tax is another one that is being proposed by the Association. In fact, it is very nice of
Glenn, to say, hey, Brad thought of this. Brad did not think of this at all. This was actually vetted a long time go with some other TTA Association members. I just brought it up to Glenn.

MR. GLEASON: I think, if I could -- now, one possible option for the Committee -- and I'll just throw this out there for consideration -- would be at a next meeting the committee could have on its agenda a discussion with the association, if you will, on their legislative agenda, just for the Committee=s education. And that could be an opportunity or an avenue to talk through some of these things.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I think that's a great idea.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes. I do too. But, yes, I don=t think we're -- the things we're talking about here are not outside the TTA legislative agenda at all. This is very similar to what they're speaking about.

MR. GLEASON: And this is Eric. Brad, you're on the steering committee for that. Right? Is that the right word?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes, sir.

MR. GLEASON: Is that something you can carry back, then?

MR. UNDERWOOD: I can. Absolutely.
MR. GLEASON: All right.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I can get with Scott.

Charlotte's the chair of that committee, and so I am sure that she would not be opposed to filling us in.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: Brad, this is J.R. Are you going to be there next week, TTA?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes, sir. I will be there.

Yes, sir.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay. Good.

MS. BLOOMER: And Brad, this is Michelle. Has TTA already prepared some sort of background information that they could share in advance with the committee for the next meeting?

MR. UNDERWOOD: They could. In fact, Scott Gilmore -- I spoke to him yesterday, and he is finalizing that right now. I believe that could be --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I think for the things I'm looking for, the who, what, where, when, why, how and how much, if we're talking the fuel tax, how much are we talking about, and how much would that leverage?

MR. UNDERWOOD: He does have those numbers already.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm 99 percent sure that he
does have that.

MR. SALAZAR: Michelle, this is J.R. I hate to keep going back, but I have a question for Eric.

When we talk about the state fuels tax, that it's taken in and redistributed, how is that done? I mean, I probably should know this, but --

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think, J.R. -- this is Eric. I think it's one of these things where, you know, you pay the tax, and it contributes to one account in the State=s coffers. And then you all submit a reimbursement request to us for those expenses, part of which is you're reimbursed with state funding from our program with.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: So, you know, then you have got to add, that that fuel tax also goes to the State Highway Fund. So you know, it's -- this money --

MR. SALAZAR: It is part of a bigger pool.

MR. GLEASON: -- goes around the state between different accounts.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And this issue was arranged with Mr. Wilson just after he arrived. I think he understood it from a commonsense standpoint, that it ought to be looked at.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.
MR. GLEASON: Just generally from the state perspective, all we're doing is moving money around.

MS. BLOOMER: But I think --

MR. UNDERWOOD: J.R., this is Brad. If you look at it, J.R., I don't know what kind of fueling system you use. You may use in-house fueling. But for instance, on ours, on the places that we use a fleet card system, it will say how much money that you have saved -- because you're federally exempt from the state tax at the federal level, it shows how much that is, and then on the state side, it will show you how much taxes that you paid.

If you take that amount, whether it is on a weekly or a monthly basis, you can get an estimation of what your agency would be saving or receiving every year.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: I think Back to Al=s first question is anticipation of opponents. And if it's going -- if the gasoline or the fuel tax is going into the general fund, you know, where -- who is ultimately receiving that funding? If not --

MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, I don't know that it's going into the General Revenue. It is my understanding that all of this is going into Fund 6.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Is that correct, Eric?
MR. GLEASON: I don't know. That's a reasonable assumption. And then for every dollar paid in the tax, half of it gets paid back with perhaps state money. So I think this is an issue. And, Brad, correct me if I'm wrong. The dollars associated with this aren't huge by any stretch of the imagination.

MR. UNDERWOOD: They are not --

MR. GLEASON: It is more a matter of principle and with the thought being that there may be other things like this that, over time, if you keep chipping away at these things, you begin to build up and accumulate something that looks significant. Is that a fair description?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Absolutely. And for instance -- and I will just throw this number out, since we are amongst friends here on the call. Like TAAHP spends on average about almost a million dollars a year in fuel. And that's about what we run through. And I think we figured it was going to be somewhere along 75–, $80,000 a year for us in savings, to kind of put it in perspective.

Not a huge amount of money, but there again, instead of just not charging us the state tax, if that was something that was put back into our -- you know, into the allocations, you know, as far as our state money, you
know, then it becomes match and, you know, we could leverage that with federal, and that $80,000 turns into $160,000 for us, or more.

So I think that's more of the idea, if that makes sense. Is that coming through?

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Yes. I think there's just -- I think we need a little bit clearer of a picture. I think we all are -- well, I'm in support of this general concept; I just need more information to better understand how that would all work, and then what that translates into as far as the $80,000 for one provider, what does that mean statewide?

And then like Al mentioned, would there be anybody in opposition, because then they're thinking, well, that's $80,000 that then won't go to some pot that they would receive funding for.

So I think it would help to better understand, like transit providers pay fuel sales tax. It goes here; it gets put in this pot. It gets spent this way. Or just to show the circuitous route of the dollar or the penny, where it goes from the transit provider to the State Comptroller, to this bucket and this bucket and then it goes back to a transit provider.

MR. ABESON: You could actually picture the flow chart and how amazing that would probably look to
follow a dollar collected and the dollar redistributed and rehandled and rehandled and rehandled. The administrative costs I bet would be significant.

MS. BLOOMER: And that might be a good attachment to a letter to show this is actually what happens. But just a thought.

Okay. Is there any more discussion, then, on legislative priorities?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Based on the discussion, I don't think we're ready as a committee to take action at this time, unless somebody disagrees.

I think perhaps we have work between now and our next meeting to get TTA representatives from the legislative committee to come maybe present their legislative agenda, as well as answering some of the basic questions: who, what, where, when, why, et cetera, about the three that we're proposing, unless TTA can do that for us.

And then from that point -- we'll focus on state legislative priorities first and then focus our attention on federal legislative priorities. Does that sort of sum it up, as everybody else understands it?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, I'm in agreement with you. The only thing that I might recommend, because we
are approaching the session very fast -- I don’t know if
we could wait a couple of months before we have a meeting.

We might need to try to do what we could do to
get the information we need so we can start putting some
things out there. I know the association is also kind of
feeling the speed as well, with the session coming. So
that’s my only comment about it.

MR. ABESON: What is a target date for having
this letter off?

MS. BLOOMER: That is a good question, Al.

Eric, I know last time we asked, there wasn’t
really a time frame set up yet. Do we have a better idea?

MR. GLEASON: Not really, Michelle. This is
Eric. The Commission -- under the new leadership of the
Department and the Commission, the Commission is not going
to be adopting a formal state legislative agenda.

So I think that from the committee’s
standpoint, I would think if you had something in the
Commission’s hands by some point next month, I would think
that would be fine.

You know, I think the sooner the better,
because there’s always a lot of conversations that happen
just prior to the start of the session. But there’s no
timetable for Commission action that the committee needs
to try and target.
MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Next month is October. So by the end of October or mid-October?

MR. GLEASON: I'm going to say I'll leave it up to you all. I think from a practical standpoint -- I don't know when the association might be ready to come have a conversation with the committee.

In thinking about the federal side of things, and the work we need to do to get ready for substantive committee conversation, I wouldn't think we would be ready before the end of October, if not the first week or two in November. I just think it's going to take us that long on the federal side.

So that doesn't sit real well, perhaps, with the schedule, but maybe the end of October would be a good window to look for.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. How does the rest of the committee feel about that?

MR. ABESON: It seems reasonable, and really it sounds like we don't really have a choice.

MR. UNDERWOOD: That's right.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad, do you -- I guess you and J.R. sort of indicated you have a TTA -- is it a board meeting or a steering committee, legislative committee meeting later next week?

MR. UNDERWOOD: It's on the 19th.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Is it possible that maybe you could just feel out -- I guess I could follow up with Shauna, too, to see if she would be willing to come. But see if the committee thinks they have some sort of white paper on, or their legislative priority document prepared, that they would be willing to share with us in advance of a PTAC meeting towards the end of October?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah. I don't think that would be an issue. I really don't.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I could visit with Shauna and Scott. Of course, I think Nancy's sitting there. So, yeah, I think we could all put our heads around that and try to have something.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I think that is the goal, honestly, of TTA in our legislative agenda, is that we're all kind of on the same page, wanting the same things. Really it's more of a unified, you know, response from the industry that way.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And that's sort of one of my goals going forward, is to do a little bit more collaboration and coordination with TTA and the industry,
to make sure that we are reflecting the thoughts and the 
feedbacks of the industry, as well as we -- as we proceed 
forward. Okay.

So then, Eric, why don't we go ahead and we 
will focus on a end-of-September --

MR. GLEASON: End of October?

MS. BLOOMER: Sorry. End of October. I was 
still hoping that maybe we weren't halfway through 
September yet.

MR. GLEASON: I'm afraid not, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: So the end of October, for our 
next meeting, with the thought that between now and then 
we'd have sort of the MAP -- we'd be prepared at that 
meeting for the MAP-21 overview or impact analysis.

MR. GLEASON: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: And then sort of state 
legislative priorities in coordination with TTA and then a 
more detailed on federal legislative priorities.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. And then Al, maybe 
your group, working group two, after we have the MAP-21 
impact discussion at the next meeting, will feel a little 
bit better able to proceed from that point on, and we'll 
just hold off until that point.

MR. ABESON: It sounds good.
J.R., is that okay with you?

MR. SALAZAR: It sounds good to me. Yes, sir.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think if we are all okay on that, I don't think we need to go back to Item 4, because it's our work plan, and we've pretty much talked about working group one and working group two.

So are there any other items for discussion regarding to the PTAC work plan?

MR. ABESON: I do have one question, and then -- this is Al.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. ABESON: At one of the meetings earlier in the summer, we prepared a letter that we sent or we -- hopefully we sent, regarding the Texas Rural Transportation Plan. I never saw a final draft of that, and I wonder if it got sent, and I wonder if there was any response?

MS. BLOOMER: Eric?

MR. GLEASON: So, Al, this is Eric. We need to close the loop on the Texas Rural Transportation Plan?

MR. ABESON: Yeah. That's basically it, Eric.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. All right.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Al, this is Michelle. I'm pretty sure the letter was sent, because I believe I
signed it. But maybe we can just request, Eric, that a
copy can be sent out to the committee.

    MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

    MR. ABESON: Yeah. That would be fine.

    MS. BLOOMER: Yes. If I could also ask for the
LAR letter -- I apologize in changing -- it's in my old
email, and I was trying to remember what we had sent with
the last LAR letter for this year, and I wasn't able to
put my hands on it. So if we could put those --

    MR. GLEASON: We will put copies of both
letters out to the committee.

    MS. BLOOMER: Thanks.

    MR. ABESON: And if there was any response to
the letter on the Texas Rural plan -- I doubt there was,
but just out of curiosity.

    MS. BLOOMER: All right. I'll make a note.

Any response? I think we got our response. It was no
response. But we'll -- we can put that on -- and, Eric,
maybe just one of the issues in that Rural Transportation
letter, if I recall, was just asking that in the going
forward and developing the next one, that we could be a
little bit more involved in suggesting some enhancements
to the plan. I think as long as we have it on our radar
screen when the next one comes around --

    MR. GLEASON: Okay.
MS. BLOOMER: -- we should be good.

Okay. Any more PTAC work plan related items?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: If not, I will turn it over to you, Eric, for Item 6, Division Director's report.

MR. GLEASON: All right. Well, thank you.

Just briefly, I apologize for not getting something out to the committee ahead of time. We're missing Ginnie; she always used to prompt me to get that done. And so we'll try and do better next time.

But just to go over -- I thought I would focus on Commission activities and then a little bit on that point one, recognizing that our next meeting we'll do a lot more of that.

August was a big month for us in front of the Commission. You know, we managed to award the remaining balances in federal fiscal year 112 funding that we had. Coordinated call awards were made. A relatively small but. I think, significant award to Tarrant County MHMR focusing on trying to simplify access to information for folks with disabilities and others on public transportation options. That looks real promising to us for statewide application.

We also were fairly successful in the discretionary program arena with FTA. We received just
over $14 million of discretionary funding from them, the
vast majority of which was associated with fleet
replacement as a part of a state-of-good-repair proposal
we sent in. So those funds were awarded.

The Commission did adopt the 2014-2015 LAR.
The good news is it continued to carry the additional
census impact funds in the baseline that are part of the
current biennium, so those funds at least are recommended
and proposed in our baseline budget to be carried forward
into the next biennium.

The Commission chose not to add as an
exceptional item the additional funding request from the
committee. The decision, as I understand it, on the
administration's part is to focus on a relatively small
number of priority areas in the LAR.

And the general thinking at the time was that
the likelihood in this upcoming session of securing
additional funding for public transportation or for any
other purpose through the General Revenue fund was very,
very small. So the LAR does not include an exceptional
item for the additional public transportation funding.

In September -- the big thing in September is
the final adoption of the development credit rules that
the committee talked about earlier. The September meeting
is in the Woodlands.
In October the meeting will be back here in Austin. And at the October meeting, we intend to award some of the -- or the remaining balance of the census impact funding that we have for this biennium.

You may recall that about $3.2 million was allocated in this biennium for census impact funding. About just over $900,000 of it, I believe, was distributed through the formula, and the remaining $2.3 million, we sent out a request for proposals.

We received eight proposals, totaling over $4 million worth of requests. Two of the proposals, relatively small ones, were out of scope. And so we are proceeding in looking at the remaining six and hope to be in a position at the October meeting to make a recommendation to the Commission for the award of those funds.

And then looking ahead to November and December, the main thing I want to mention there -- and this goes a bit to our earlier conversation on transitioning for MAP-21 and some of the points that Rob was bringing up about the investments that had been made under the former authorization legislation into non-traditional providers, or non-traditional agencies, and then when the consolidation of the JARC program into the 5307 and 5311 funding programs and the New Freedom Program consolidated into the 5310 program.
Previously, New Freedom and JARC were discretionary programs. We awarded relatively large amounts of money for two- and three-year projects with specific agencies; Center for Independent Living, private taxicab operators, non-profit organizations.

And so we had a remaining balance of JARC money that had been unspent from previous years, and so we sent an RFP out looking for proposals to focus specifically on helping us through this transition time frame and encouraged non-traditional recipients to work with their public transportation agencies specifically on a transition plan for the successful services, so that as we transition to the no formula-based funding and individual awards are not as large as they used to be, that there's a game plan locally to at least preserve and secure the most productive of those investments.

So we're looking at creating perhaps a two-year bridge time frame with this remaining balance of JARC money to allow those conversations to take place locally and to hopefully help ensure a smooth transition to the new funding. And the committee was -- talked about that a little bit earlier. So that's the main thing, looking at either the November or the December meeting for that.

It's also possible, if you read the news out of Washington, that there may be relatively quick action on a
six-month budget for the next federal fiscal year. And we always begin sort of watching and waiting for action in the fall so that when we do get apportionments from the federal programs, we're able to move on those as quickly as we can.

With respect to MAP-21 -- I'll save most of this for our next meeting -- we are beginning to prepare sort of program-by-program comparison, looking at previous fiscal year amounts and projected fiscal year authorization amounts, to kind of tease out what we think some of the key issues might be.

You know, on the rural side, the rural program is going up in the overall amount that is associated with it, and it's going up more than just that that could be attributed to historic JARC funding levels here in Texas.

So the good news on the rural side is that it looks like that program will be larger. I think some of our stickier issues are going to come with the 5310 program that -- because one of the things they did is they changed the way in which those funds are going to come down to the state.

And historically, that has been a single statewide program that the department has managed and administered for the entire state, including the large
urban areas. And under MAP-21, the large urbanized areas are going to get an allocation of those funds for that purpose separately.

So we're going to have to work our way through what has been a traditional statewide process the Department has run in each of its districts, including the large urbanized areas -- we're going to have to work our way through to a new future where it's no longer a statewide program from a funding distribution standpoint. So that promises to be really challenging.

Also within the 5310 program, there is the ability now to use those funds for operating purposes, or at least a portion of those funds. And so we think as well that may have an impact on some of the historical uses or the awards we've made to non-traditional agencies, if you will, in the past who have gone out then through a purchase-of-service agreement contracted for a service to be provided by the local transit districts. So a lot of changes there.

We're a little concerned that the state-of-good-repair program, at least for the rural side of things, looks pretty small. And although it would be something we might be able to count on from one year to the next, it's, you know, very small compared to what we think we need. So we're going to have to address that
issue on the rural side.

Then there were other program impacts from safety to the federal motor carrier safety association or agencies. There are asset management and performance based planning and progress requirements. So there is a lot of stuff going on. And we will do our best for the next meeting to brief the committee on what we think the most critical pieces are.

And then, finally, just a bit of organizational change news. Recently the decision was made in TxDOT to bring the bicycle and pedestrian program for the Department, which has historically been in the Transportation Planning and Programming Division -- that program now reports to me, in public transportation.

So we're still trying to figure out what that means. But I think we can look forward to some conversations in the future on how to integrate those elements into what we do.

And that concludes my report.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Eric. Are there any questions for Eric on the Director=s Report?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Eric, I have one question.

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Any news about the 5307 federal, that minute order going to the Commission? Have
I just missed that?

MR. GLEASON: This would be on the Governor's apportionment group?

MR. UNDERWOOD: The Governor's apportionment, yeah.

MR. GLEASON: We don't take that to Commission, Brad. We just certify for FTA the amounts that they have allocated to the individual areas. And to my knowledge, we sent that letter to FTA real recently.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: Well, hang on. Maybe not.

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby, Brad. Are you talking about FY >12 funds or FY >13?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah what?

MR. UNDERWOOD: The remaining apportionment for FY >12.

MR. GLEASON: This would be the remaining balance.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. That was already sent to FTA, so the Governor apportionment system should be able to pull down their full apportionment for FY >12. If you have an issue there, if you'll just call me or email me on that, and I will for sure give it to the
FTA folks.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Terrific. Okay. I will do that. I will yield my time here so you can get on with the meeting. But I'll call you about that, Bobby, what we were told. So, okay.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: I did want to say I appreciate the update on the Commission action. And I think the update on the 2014-2015 LAR might be a good place for us to sort of jump off from regarding our state legislative priorities, sort of to follow up with the Commission and thank them for keeping the 3 million in Census funding there.

And then, you know, we understand they weren't able to provide any additional funding, and here's ways that we could initially leverage our existing funding better and hope in doing so with those three things that they have laid out, the working group has laid out.

But if there aren't any other questions, is there any public comment?

(No response.)

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, this is Bobby. We
don't have any public comment signed up in the room.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. The next item on the agenda is to confirm the date of the next meeting. I think for now we'll just try to keep that last meeting of October as free as possible for those of us that can attend an in-person meeting in Austin.

If there aren't any other questions, I will take a motion to adjourn.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So moved.

MR. ABESON: Second. This is Al.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. I heard a first from Brad, a second from Al. Is anybody opposed?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Hearing none, the meeting is officially adjourned. Thank you all.

MR. GLEASON: Good-bye.

(Whereupon, at 2:16 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
CERTIFICATE

MEETING OF: Public Transportation Advisory Committee
LOCATION: Austin, Texas
DATE: September 13, 2012

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 57, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Leslie Berridge before the Texas Department of Transportation.

09/18/2012
(Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting
3307 Northland, Suite 315
Austin, Texas 78731