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PROCEDINGS

MS. BLOOMER: Since we have four of us either in Austin or on the phone, I'd like to go ahead and call the meeting to order.

The second item on the agenda is the safety briefing. I will turn that over to Josh.

MR. RIBAKOVE: I'm going to turn that over to Bobby Killebrew who has done the safety briefing for this room so many times that he could do it while he sleeps.

MR. KILLEBREW: Absolutely. For the record -- I wasn't going to speak -- but for the record, Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Director of the Public Transportation Division at TxDOT.

Welcome all, including our visitors; it's good to have you here. I think you've probably all been here before and know how to exit this building, but in case of an emergency, if we have to evacuate, you'll see the exit signs in both sides of this room and we will go to the clearest, safest exit.

There are three exits on this floor: there's one by the elevators which you came up; there's one, as I'm pointing -- for the people on the phone -- there's one this direction, which is towards the east; and there's one also kind of a southwesterly direction from this room. And we'll head outside and congregate outside and wait for further
instructions.

I don't think we're going to have any kind of weather today. I think it's warming up nicely outside. I hear it's a pretty day, but should something happen, if we need to shelter in place, this is our shelter-in-place room; it's the safe room on this floor and here's where we'll be.

If you have need of medical necessities, raise your hand. I'm first-aid certified and we'll get you the necessary medical conditions, and anybody can dial 9-1-1 including myself, so we'll do that. We have an AD down on the first floor if we need that for whatever reasons, and with that, we'll have a safe meeting and I'll turn it back over to Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, all right. Thank you, Bobby.

Moving on to Item 3 on the agenda, approval of minutes from July 24th, 2014, meeting. Were there any questions regarding the minutes from members?

MR. GLEASON: This is Glenn. I move to approve.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I have a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Before we take action, can I just ask a quick question: Josh, between Agenda Item 3 and Agenda Item 4, it says Agenda Item 3 is a motion passed unanimously at 8:51 a.m. and then under Agenda Item 4 it
says that we had a discussion at 8:43.

Did we take those items out of order?

MR. RIBAKOVE: I believe we took them out of order. I'm not -- yeah, I think we did. I think we were just -- we were just waiting for somebody to arrive and took care of the minutes first -- we took care of the other, first.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If there are no other questions, I'll call the vote, and given half of us are here and half of us are in our office, I'll go ahead and just call off the names.

So, Michelle?

Yes.

Rob?

MR. STEPHENS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. The minutes pass.

Moving on to Item 4 on the agenda is TxDOT's Public Transportation Division Director's Report to the committee. I will turn it over to Eric.

MR. GLEASON: All right. Thanks, Michelle.

This is Eric Gleason, TxDOT Director of Public
Transportation. I didn't have for you a written report in your packet. I would like to report on three items to the committee today. The first, since you met last in July, was that the Commission did adopt a legislative appropriations request for the 2016/2017 biennium, and of note, for this committee, that request did include in it, as part of the Department's baseline element if you will, flexing into our program, $15 million of highway funding for the biennium for the purposes of a Fleet Replacement Program. And I will have more on that program and how we propose to approach it for you at your next meeting should you like to hear about that, but assuming that that successfully survives the legislative session, then we will be in a position, September 1st of 2015 to be looking at a Fleet Replacement Program.

Now, importantly, this is not -- this is not an exceptional item in the appropriations request; it is included in what I would call, then, the baseline request of the Department.

MR. GADBOIS: Is that State or Federal Highway?

MR. GLEASON: That's Federal Highway Program.

MR. GADBOIS: So you don't have the whole non-constitutionally dedicated issue?

MR. GLEASON: Correct. Correct.

The second item to update you on is actually
something that has been occupying a lot of our time internally and many of subrecipients of our programs, the Department did move to a different financial platform in October and we have spent a lot of time getting folks ready for that during August and September, training over 300 subrecipients on the new program. We are going through what we call a 90-day stabilization phase, which is basically, you know, we're making sure that folks get paid. We're making sure that staff get their paychecks. Subrecipients get reimbursed and working through the normal litany of implementation issues you might anticipate when a department as large as TxDOT, you know, moves away from a financial system that's worked perfectly for 30 years and implements a new one. So, we're making progress. I think that everyone is getting their reimbursements, but it's been a huge focus of attention on our part for the last several months.

The third area I'll mention is in the programs area. Just real quickly, we do have out on the street our next annual coordinated Call for Projects. That went out in early, I guess, early this month, and projects are due in February, February 9th, I believe is the date. And this is the Call for Projects that includes Rural Transportation Assistance Program funding, rural discretionary funding and inner-city bus funding, as well as some 5304 estate planning and research funds. Historically, the call has included
more. Under SAFETEA-LU, it included JARC and New Freedom Program funding, but without those funds being separate anymore, it no longer has that in it. So, we are conducting webinars on that and we'll be looking at proposals around February 9th.

The other one that we have also sent out or have also kicked off this next round of 5310 Program -- of projects, project selection, those proposals are due back to us, as well, on February 9th from around the state. And I know we had a webinar this morning and we have had a number of webinars on changes, key changes in the 5310 Program as a result of some additional federal guidance that we are implementing this year as a part of that.

So with that, I will close and entertain any questions from the committee members.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any questions for Eric from the Committee?

MR. GADBOIS: If I may, Michelle? This is Glenn. So we discussed potential changes to 5310, but that was going to be an initiated conversation about how they would change this year looking towards changing for next cycle, right; am I remembering that correctly?

MR. GLEASON: We talked about that in the context of the Regional Planning Program, which is another item on this agenda.
MR. GADBOIS: Oh, okay.

MR. GLEASON: I'm not sure we exactly talked about that with the 5310 Program.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So what are the changes with 5310?

MR. GLEASON: Well, the Feds came out with some additional guidance around defining of what a traditional recipient is and a non-traditional recipient, and those are the kinds of things that we are working through.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And so are the conversations being well-attended, the discussions?

MR. GLEASON: As far as I know they are, and actually, again, as a potential other item on your next meeting -- is that in January more or less, Josh, the next committee meeting -- in the January/February time frame?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Yeah, the last Tuesday in January, unless we decide otherwise.

MR. GLEASON: So, again, that will be toward the close of the project proposal date and we can provide the committee with a more substantive update on the program, if you wanted to.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I would recommend that we do that.

And getting back to Glenn's point, I think a lot of the providers, in talking to Carol, too, there's a lot of
interest in the 5310 Program and a lot of the changes that are taking place. And how are we going to be able to prove that we are actually doing services, opposed to saying we've done that in the past and people knowing that we have; now we're going to have to prove that and, you know, that's going to be an issue with providers and we're looking forward for guidance from PTN on how we're going to do that. Maybe not necessarily how we're going to do that, but guidance on some of those things that we need to line up.

MR. GLEASON: Any other questions?

MR. GADBOIS: So, LAR, we can talk about developing a letter for communications with the Commission --

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: -- either an exceptional request or, you know, some sort of rider. What I understand from what you've told me is the Department just decided to include a substantial request into their base budget?

MR. GLEASON: I focused on the base budget. I neglected to mention that the Department also included, as an exceptional item, a request for an additional $18 million a year to support Public Transportation Grant Programs.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: But it did -- it was listed as an exceptional item --
MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- so I apologize for not mentioning that earlier.

MR. SALAZAR: And this is J.R. Do we -- did we have copies of that or do we have ...

MR. GLEASON: I assume they all got copies of the letter we sent or the letter that Michelle signed to send to the Commission?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Not from -- not from me, no. I can get those out to you.

MR. SALAZAR: Can we get those, please?

MR. GLEASON: That's an oversight on our part. We will get those in to you, yes.

MR. SALAZAR: Fair enough.

MR. GADBOIS: But we would have gotten the link to the Commission action?

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: And so we would have that on our e-mail, and that's actually more important than the letter.

MR. RIBAKOVE: I will see that you guys all get the letter in your e-mail in the next couple of days.

MR. GLEASON: That's an oversight and I apologize for that.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle.
Glenn, you were asking for a copy of the letter or were you asking for a copy of the exception in the LAR?

MR. GADBOIS: I was looking back to make sure that we understood the full dispensement [sic] of our interests and Eric’s already answered that. Now I just need to remember to go look at Commission action to see the detail.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then, Josh, I just got a text from Brian Baker saying that the call-in number is not working.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Gee, it was working.

MS. BLOOMER: Is there a call-in number I can give him that’s not the call-in number that the committee use?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Yes. That's a different number, but the dial-in number is the same number, the 866 number.

MR. GLEASON: We will send him that -- we will send him that number, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. You're going to send it to him?

MR. GLEASON: Yes, we are.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: Michelle, this is Rob. I could hear Eric clarifying an exception. The LAR letter was for 18 million?

MR. GLEASON: Eighteen million per year, yes, sir.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then -- I'm sorry -- what was
the 15 million?

MR. GADBOIS: That's a base budget for capital replacement.

MR. GLEASON: In the Department's base budget -- in other words, it's not as an exceptional item, but as a part of the Department's baseline proposal -- there was $15 million flexed in from the Highway Program into Transit for the purposes of fleet.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: That's a two-year number.

MS. BLOOMER: So the 18 million is on top of that?

MR. GLEASON: As an exceptional item, yes. So the exceptional item will take specific action to add into the Department's budget, if it happens.

MS. BLOOMER: And is that 18 million, is that also for fleet?

MR. GLEASON: That is for general purposes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. STEPHENS: When do you -- when do you think -- Eric, this is Rob -- when do you think the Commission will be addressing that issue or when would it be appropriate, I guess, for us to --

MR. GADBOIS: Legislature.

MR. GLEASON: Well, the Commission has adopted the appropriations request; they did that in August, Rob.
MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And now it moves into the session --

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- and, you know, it has to make its way all the way through appropriations, and so we're talking late May, early June.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GADBOIS: By May 31st.

MR. GLEASON: Unless they got hung up on other items.

MR. STEPHENS: I gotcha. Thank you so much.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Are there any other questions or clarifications on the director's report?

(No audible response.)

Hearing none, we'll go ahead and close Item 4 and move on to item 5, the presentation and discussion of Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning. And I'm assuming that we'll be turning that over to Steve?

MR. GLEASON: Yes, Steve is here now.

MR. WRIGHT: Hi, Michelle. I'm here.

So, it's good to see you all. Thank you for having us again. We wanted to follow up on the conversation that we had at the last Public Transportation Advisory Committee meeting back in the summer. As requested by the
Advisory Committee at your last meeting, the Public Transportation Division invited lead agencies in Texas to share success stories.

MR. GADBOIS: Steve, can you hang on a second?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Go ahead, thanks.

MR. WRIGHT: As I was saying, to follow up on the request by PTAC at your last meeting, the Public Transportation Division invited lead agencies to share success stories that have stemmed from the Regional Planning Effort. This was not mandatory of the lead agencies; it was completely at their discretion as to do this. They had two or three weeks to respond. Twelve agencies responded with 24 stories.

Attached in your packet is a synopsis of the stories that were submitted to us. Each of those has a more detailed description that was submitted by the lead agency. If you would like that, we would be happy to provide those to you. We simply didn't include them in your packet because each of the stories is two or three pages each and it would have been a bit overwhelming, but if you would like to see more detail, we can provide that to you. I won't go over all of these examples, but, again, they are in your packet. I would just mention as a part of a very quick overview, 100 percent of the projects cited the Regional
Planning Effort as the catalyst for the project that they cited that either the regional planning process provided the mechanism or the environment for the problem or the issue to be identified and/or resolved. And you can see a variety of projects that are represented, so hopefully this will give you a sampling of some of the projects that lead agencies shared with us.

A brief recap as far as future direction, generally, of the Regional Planning Effort in Texas: You might recall we have discussed previously that TxDOT convened two statewide stakeholder working groups over the course of the past year to provide input and to make recommendations for future direction of this effort in Texas. These groups represented diverse interests and geographic areas impacted by the Regional Planning Effort. These groups presented TxDOT with a comprehensive set of recommendations covering a wide array of matters such as: roles and expectations of lead agencies, funding priorities, content of regional plans, inclusion of priority population groups, improved quality and accountability, and the need to establish performance measures. All recommendations of both working groups were previously presented to and discussed with PTAC which offered additional input and guidance.

In response to all of these activities, TxDOT has determined a new direction to be initiated in 2015 with the
start of the next five-year plan update. You might recall that the regional plans are updated every five years, as called for through FTA guidelines. Additionally, TxDOT has developed a guide book for lead agencies and will present this guide book and share other information on this new direction with lead agencies in early 2015 during a series of regional workshops.

We will also provide the FY 2016 funding application at these regional workshops which will take place probably in February, at the very latest, the first of March. We'll share these with the lead agencies' staff. Just for your information, timeline-wise, the funding applications for 2016 will be May -- they'll be due May, 2015, and contracts will be executed September, 2015. So that will initiate the start of this cycle for the next big plan update. And these updated plans will then be due by December 30th, 2016. So when we start the new contract in September 1st, 2015, there will be almost a year and a half for the different regions to update their plans. The regional workshops that I referred to will also include sharing of best practices from different agencies around the state and will also provide guidance for conducting this five-year update.

The guide book -- I won't go into detail on that -- but it focuses on clarifying the roles for lead
agencies and for TxDOT. You have a draft table of contents in your packet. Again, this will be presented at these regional workshops in February. It also includes information on performance measures, as we've discussed before. Just, again, not to go into great detail on that, but just to mention, this emphasizes project measures, as had been suggested by PTAC. There will be a very strong emphasis on the need for local performance measures per project, per local plan, and that will be in addition to the new handful of statewide measures that we had talked about before and that had been recommended before by the workgroups.

And to follow up on earlier discussions concerning the looking beyond the next big plan update, as I mentioned, the updates will be completed end of December, 2016, and they will not be updated again until 2021. So those interim years between the next two, five-year updates, those interim years, we will seem notable and significant changes in how we will operate this effort. After the 2016 funding cycle for these interim years, TxDOT will fund the bulk for pilot projects, so this will be a change from the past. The emphasis will be on pilot projects to really try to focus on working the plans and implementing what has been called for in this upcoming five-year update. The pilot projects will need to address priorities in the regional plan. So
whatever is funded is going to need to tie directly to the regional plan so that it is a strategic funding decision.

A preference will be given to proposed projects with measurable outcomes; letters of support from the respective lead agency; local match, which is something new -- that's something that heretofore, we have not called for with the regional planning funding; and the demonstration that this proposed pilot project would be relevant to other parts of the state and could have a high likelihood of being replicated in other parts of the state. So those will -- that will be the emphasis for our interim year funding -- what we've been referring to as "interim year funding."

Another change with this interim year funding is that these awards will be made competitively as part of TxDOT's annual coordinated Call for Projects. This is different. As you might recall, the regional planning funding and Call for Projects has, for the past several years, operated on a separate funding cycle, separate and apart from what we refer to as the "coordinated call." So we think that there will be any number of advantages and efficiencies gained by combining that with the coordinated call.

The other significant change is that any eligible applicant will be able to apply for these interim year funds
to conduct these pilot projects. It will not necessarily be limited to the designated lead agencies. Again, to date, any of the regional planning funds has always been limited specifically to designated lead agencies, so this will be a change. Just to clarify, every five years, when we have the big plan update, which includes the comprehensive needs assessment and the big resource inventory and those steps, that funding will still be limited to the designated lead agencies because that's very unique and specific to their role as lead agency. But the interim year funding for the pilot projects will be open to, you know, any entity in a given region that might want to apply for a project, again, that is strategic in nature; it's going to support a priority identified in that respective regional plan, they would be considered for funding.

Yes?

MR. GADBOIS: So by aligning these, Steve, are you seeing the possibility for parading the different funding opportunities to create pilots?

MR. WRIGHT: We are very much hoping that that will be the case. And I'm glad that you mentioned that, too, Glenn, because I meant to mention, related to your comment, I meant to mention when I talked about the success stories that were submitted earlier, more than half of the stories that were submitted to us, which again is just a
sampling, but based on these stories that were submitted, more than half of those leveraged other funds to complete that project, which is really what this was designed to do from the beginning. Because, you know, we've always stated that the regional planning funds alone couldn't accomplish that. So what has naturally been occurring in a lot of the regions with these projects is that they are leveraging other funds and I think that speaks to the question that you were just asking.

So that will be the bulk of the funds awarded in these interim years. Some funding in these interim years will still be awarded to the designated lead agencies to cover the costs associated with data collection and reporting for the new performance indicators. So it's only reasonable that if we are going to be asking the lead agencies to report in on some of this data, that they be compensated for that cost, but we anticipate that that cost will be minimal. So, clearly, the bulk of the funding during those years will be for pilot projects.

So that's just a quick overview and follow-up to some of the items that we talked about at your summer meeting, and a report of what has transpired since then. I'll be happy to respond to any other questions that you might have.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R., I just have one
question. First, thank you for providing that, because I think that I'm the one who asked for a summary of success stories and thank you for that. But when you're talking about local match from other people, talk me into -- talk me through who some of those people are. I'm just trying to get a grasp on who we're going to get a local match from.

MR. GLEASON: Calvin State University.

MR. SALAZAR: Well, that's different.

(Laughter)

MR. WRIGHT: It will need to be worked out and we need to have conversation about that. In our internal conversations, the first thing that we've done is recognize that people are already pulled, you know, in all different directions for local match, so we realize that that will be a challenge. That's why we have specifically not indicated that that will be a requirement, but that preference will be given to those areas. So all things considered, if there are projects that have been submitted competitively, and if one of those is able to provide some local match to help cover the costs of these very limited dollars, then we would look at that with preference, but we're not talking at all that that would be a requirement. And -- I mean we could have a very lengthy conversation about local match, but we do recognize that that is sometimes easier said than done.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.
MR. GADBOIS: So let's talk performance measures for a couple moments.

MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: All too often in the public sector, performance measures end up being a way to bludgeon to death innovation, and, you know, focus you on just, you know, hitting your measures, whatever they might be, right?

And part of the reason we had our conversation last time about performance measures is of course we need that, and I think that it's real helpful to track and evaluate and look for ways to do improvement, but at the same time I'm hoping for some balancing, some acceptance of failure, because that's a necessary fact of experimentation, you know, but where a region wants to experiment or innovate or look for new ways to do that, we don't want performance measures being so narrowly defined that they're thwarting that interest, right?

Have you had any conversation with folks about those kinds of issues on performance measures and/or, you know, thoughts on how you do that?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, my recollection is that in these groups that, you know, spend a lot of time thinking these through, that that sort of thing did come up and there was very specific discussions, to my recollection, that the performance measures would be -- but there's a need for them
to be realistic and to provide value in demonstrating some reasonable broad areas of success, but they should not be designed or used in any way to be punitive or to penalize, and to honor innovation.

And I think that that's part of the idea behind to having kind of a two-pronged performance measure process, one, that would both honor local, customized metrics for individual projects or for individual plans that's tailored for that area, and then this handful of projects that we could look to from the statewide perspective so that when we're asked in the future for such metrics, we can have something to point to. But these statewide metrics are really focusing more on looking to see that there's progress in a broad sort of way. So, for instance, some of those -- a couple of those measures are looking at the number of projects that move from a planning phase to an implementation phase, whatever that might be. It just shows that there's progress and that all of this effort going into planning isn't resulting in the proverbial "dusty plans on the shelf that aren't being used"; it's a way to show that it's moving forward.

MR. GADBOIS: So along those lines, let me just pitch to you my new favorite intuit bottle. It's not about how many move from planning to implementation; it's about how early they move there. If you can do small experiments
and run those to failure early on, you invest a lot less in it and can move that money on, then, to something more productive.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: So think about looking for that kind of thing, rather than, you know, simply, did you spend all the money out on planning and move it to implementation, when sometimes it's way too late and overinvested.

MR. WRIGHT: That's a good point. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any other questions or comments for Steve?

(No audible response.)

I know this item is an action item, but I don't know that you need to the action from the Committee.

MR. GLEASON: It's up to you, Michelle. We just wanted to give you the option, if you desired, but we are not necessarily looking for anything today.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Is there anything else?

MR. GADBOIS: What would the action be? A good job resolution?

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: A "good job so far" resolution?

(Laughter)

MR. GLEASON: Well, let me -- this is Eric -- I
think -- I hope we've captured the general intent of the comments we've heard from the committee on this. And so the message is that, you know, following the next major plan update, there's going to be a significant shift in the program which is, I think where the committee ended up in recognizing how do we transition from where we are now to this new area, so I hope we followed through on that.

And we will be more than willing at subsequent meetings, if other thoughts come up, to accommodate those. But I certainly appreciate the feedback from the committee on this.

MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, this is Bobby. If I may?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. KILLEBREW: We do have a speaker signed up for this item, so I don't know if the committee would like to take that speaker comment at this point in time or if you'd like to wait?

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If it's specific to this item, let's go ahead and take the comment now.

Thanks, Bobby.

MR. KILLEBREW: All right.

MR. GADBOIS: In front of a microphone.

MR. SALAZAR: Michelle, and for the other members on the phone, it's Ms. Carol Warlick, and she's on her way
up to the front, now.

MS. WARLICK: Hi, Michelle, and other members of
the committee. I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you
today and my comments will be pretty brief and pretty
straightforward.

MR. GLEASON: Carol, before you start, can you
identify yourself first.

MS. WARLICK: Yes, I'm Carol Warlick. I'm general
manager of Hill Country Transit District, the HOP, and I do
appreciate the opportunity to comment. I have some concerns
about regional planning in 5310 that I wanted to bring
before you today.

J.R. mentioned earlier that some of the transit
providers have some concerns, and, of course, we all talk
and the main concern is it seems with regional planning and
5310 that it's becoming more about the process than it is
about transportation and providing transportation to those
who are in need of it. Very cumbersome, 5310 has become so
cumbersome that it's like we don't even quite know what to
do anymore. The public transportation coordinators seem a
bit baffled as to how best to deal with it. The providers
are baffled as to how best to deal with it. What I mean by
that is there's a very small amount of money, obviously, for
the 5310 Program, a minimal amount of money. In the past we
felt like we made very good use of that money by generally
buying vehicles, or at least that's what we did in our case -- I know in many cases it was purchase of service -- but for us we were always able to buy one to maybe three, top three vehicles to provide transportation, additional services, at least to our elderly and disabled population. That's still the primary need. That's still what regional coordination is about, is about providing transportation to people served by our HHSC agencies. The best way to do that is to have more resources to do it with: vehicles.

Now we're kind of getting away from that, it seems. And I've not sat in on the webinar yet. I intend to be in on the December 3rd webinar, so I'm a little bit in the dark about the new process. I'm not familiar yet with what the requirements are going to be, but I'm not looking forward to them. I have a feeling they're going to be not something we're real pleased with.

In addition to that, those who are in larger urban areas, as we now are in Killeen, have a new set of rules to deal with regarding 5310 and I don't know how exactly we're going to deal with that yet. It's obviously something I'll need some guidance on. But what I've seen, at least in the Hill Country Transit District region, is a lot of confusion created by 5310. It seems to bring with it an expectation from the HHSC agencies that there's more money. That we have the ability to do more when, in fact, we really don't;
it's such a small amount of money it doesn't give us much opportunity to be innovative or to do anything additional. And so when they come to those meetings, the HHSC people come to the meetings, they end up being disappointed and sometimes even almost angry that they have been led to believe this program is going to offer more than it does. So that's primarily my comment about 5310.

Regarding regional planning, I think the concept behind it is good and I think it varies by regions in the state as to how effective it is and the degree of need for it, so I don't mean to totally take away from regional planning efforts at all. The main thing it's done in our area is make other people aware of what we do that maybe didn't really know for sure what we did. It's brought that forward and clarified that. I still think the process itself is still very cumbersome and that's why we chose to step away from being a lead agency. I think the time involved in meetings, reporting, performance measures -- and I'm not against performance measures, but I think there's always a better way to do that -- I just think the time involved is not -- is not in good relation to the outcomes that are supposed to -- that we want to see. I don't know how else to say that.

So our job is to provide transportation. That's our goal in life is to provide transportation to those who
need it and more and more -- I've been doing this 31 years
now and I still love it, I'm still glad to be in this
industry -- but more and more, I see our time being taken
away from managing our transit systems and talking with our
staff and talking about how we can improve daily services to
being spent on data collection, reporting, meetings -- and I
know those things have to occur; I'm not against those
things -- but let's not let them become the driving force
behind everything. Let's not let that take over our primary
purpose of providing transportation. So that's -- those are
my comments for the day.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you, Carol.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Carol.

MS. WARLICK: Thank you.

MR. GADBOIS: You might have --

MS. BLOOMER: Does anybody have questions or
follow-up for Carol?

MR. GADBOIS: Of course I do, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, Glenn. It's yours.

MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

MS. WARLICK: I don't mind.

MR. GADBOIS: Do you mind making this a little bit
of dialogue?

MS. WARLICK: I don't mind at all.

MR. GADBOIS: So let's start with the 5310
comments, and I'll start with the last one first, the HHS folks coming to the table with an expect- -- with an unreasonable expectation and/or getting frustrated.

MS. WARLICK: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: Why do you think that happens? That seems like a communication problem where somehow they're getting a built-up expectation that then sets them up for frustration once they come to the table?

MS. WARLICK: Well, I think it happens because a notice goes out that there's going to be a 5310 meeting, a meeting regarding the Section 5310 Program. The availability of these federal funds to provide transportation services to elderly and disabled, okay. That all entities are invited to come and state their needs. So they come with the expectation that they're going to maybe get some funding out of this and sometimes they may get a very small portion, and they come with the expectation that we're going to be able to expand services, maybe expand hours, maybe expand routes, really make big differences in the type of service were already providing. And then we when tell them that's there's only $80,000 or $130,000 or whatever the case may be, then we can buy one vehicle and you can purchase a few trips, then they're like, Why we were told that there was going to be this big meeting and there's all this opportunity to do something? That's what I mean by
MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And then on the 5310 use for capital, traditionally, at least one of the big ways that it's been used --

MS. WARLICK: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: -- do you understand the LAR request and/or budget well enough to be able to tell me whether you think that 15 million can be -- is that -- that's for capital replacement, right?

MR. GLEASON: It's for fleet replacement.

MR. GADBOIS: Fleet replacement. So that's only things in your inventory that needs to be replaced because they're out of date, not new vehicles, correct?

MR. GLEASON: Not expansion vehicles.

MR. GADBOIS: Not expansion vehicles?

MR. GLEASON: Correct.

MR. GADBOIS: So what I'm looking at is that 15 million in the LAR is not going to address the issues you raised around 5310, correct?

MS. WARLICK: Well, it may help somewhat. It will help somewhat.

MR. GADBOIS: So there's never enough money, right?

MS. WARLICK: There's never enough money for fleet replacement.
MR. GADBOIS: But it can address some of those needs that 5310 had been dealing with; that's a question, not a statement.

MS. WARLICK: It doesn't replace the importance of having those 5310 funds, that additional money, to buy a vehicle or two with.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. WARLICK: That money, historically, has been hugely important to us, Glenn, to purchase one or two more vehicles for the rural fleet, is generally what it was -- one or two vehicles for the urban fleet.

MR. GADBOIS: To expand the fleet?

MS. WARLICK: No.

MR. GADBOIS: No?

MS. WARLICK: To replace aging vehicles.

MR. GADBOIS: To replace, okay.

MS. WARLICK: They've always been used to replace aging vehicles.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. WARLICK: But that allowed us to at least keep the same level of service that we were at. We've never had to cut services, but being able to just kind of piece by piece, replace the fleet, then we would have been able to continue those services to those elderly and disabled folks.

MR. GADBOIS: And so, Carol, I understand you're
taking a bunch of federal -- a number of federal programs
and looking at how can I do my business --

MS. WARLICK: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: -- and that means at times piecing
together some 5310 to do vehicle replacement --

MS. WARLICK: Exactly.

MR. GADBOIS: -- and looking for other ways to do
vehicle replacement, et cetera. I understand that as a

process.

Eric, have we ever gotten a good handle on the
actual numbers needed over time for vehicle replacement? I
mean do we have a state schedule for that?

MR. GLEASON: What we have is we have a database
of every fleet that there are grant funds in throughout the
entire state, and in most cases, we hope simply the entire
fleet that a rural transit district has or an urban transit
district has. So we have a database by fleet member tells
us how old the fleet is and each year there's a mileage
update associated with that member of the fleet so we can
track at the fleet level, at the vehicle level, where we're
at. And so we can drop the line -- we can draw the line
anywhere we want in terms of useful life. What I can tell
you is that as a rule, the agencies in this state can easily
exceed industry standards for useful life, and they do.

MR. GADBOIS: Sure. We do that with a roadside as
MR. GLEASON: Yeah, and so it's, you know -- and
so we are able to develop a replacement schedule, if you
will -- we don't have a replacement schedule, per se, that
says, you know, this year, this year, that's it. We will be
able to do that with this LAR funding so we're not so
totally dependent on what I call a "food drive," an
unscheduled food drive from the back of the federal plane
with some discretionary funding source that we didn't know
was going to be there when the year started.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: So the whole idea behind this
program, as small as it is, and it's not big enough, but we
thought it was a reasonable first step in this direction --

MR. GADBOIS: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- was to commit the Department on
more than an on-going basis to bringing additional funding
in that can then be paired with federal formula funding that
everyone gets. On the rural side we hope to produce a ten
million dollar a year replacement effort. The actual need
is probably closer to 15.

MR. GADBOIS: Number, one, I wanted to understand
that the LAR, in relation to Carol's comments on 5310.
Number two, we haven't gotten into this conversation, but
it's usually generous to the roadside guys who are at 30 to
40 percent backlog on their maintenance and operations, to
give up some money, to do that at all. I mean I actually
think that is generous of them. They're not saying go find
new money, which is usually the answer that we get on our
side, so thank you.

So last question --

MS. WARLICK: Uh-huh?

MR. GADBOIS: -- general manager, is that you?

MS. WARLICK: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So what's the difference in
your mind between a general manager and a CEO?

(Laughter)

MS. WARLICK: I don't know. What's the difference
in your mind?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, the reason I asked that,
Carol, is because the transit industry for a long time has
been saying, Let me just keep my head down and run my
business, and the problem with that model is that nobody
then understands your business and nobody wants to invest in
it, right?

MS. WARLICK: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: And so one of the differences in a
CEO is they accept responsibility for selling their services
to shareholders, to potential investors, et cetera.

MS. WARLICK: Uh-huh.
MR. GADBOIS: And in one of your comments about regional planning just made me think about this and so I wanted to ask you: It seems to me part of the transit business ought to be using this regional planning as a way to sell your services to new investors and partners.

MS. WARLICK: Uh-huh.

MR. GADBOIS: But it doesn't sound like that's an opportunity being realized very well.

MS. WARLICK: No, I think I said that. I think I said that one of the things that has come out of regional planning is there's been a renewed awareness or an awareness among some people who were not aware of exactly what we did. I think that has come out of it --

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. WARLICK: -- and I think that is a good use of it.

A lot of the rest of it, I'm not so sure about. I think we generate a lot of reports and we do a lot of paperwork -- we don't, us, specifically, anymore. We have a lot of meetings and we raise a lot of expectations that, again, that maybe cannot always be met. But, Glenn, I do believe that regional planning is very different in every region of the state, the way that it's conducted and the results. And in our area, it's quite different than I'm sure the way it is in the Houston area or East Texas or...
somewhere like that.

For us, the people who meet in your Regional Transit Advisory Group, the name of our group, are people who have worked together for the 30 years that I've been doing this. We all know each other. We have been coordinating since I started this job. We have brought some new people in and that's been a good thing. We brought a few new people to the table, but we could have done that anyway.

MR. GADBOIS: Without all the paperwork.

MS. WARLICK: Yeah. I think that would have happened anyway. As far as being able to generate any new services, we've not been able to do that. It takes the funding to do that. We're having the same conversations now that we had 25 years ago. We need to expand hours. We need to expand routes. We need more vehicles. We need to market our system a little bit more. It's been good as far as sitting down and having a type of conversation that you and I are having -- or this group is having today, but beyond that, there are limitations.

MR. GADBOIS: I just want to ask one -- I swear, Michelle -- just one last question because you just made me think about it. That you have no new service coming out of it, is that a matter of people not -- you know, the people that you talk with not having any money for services or is
that people that have money saying no?

    MS. WARLICK: It's a matter of us not being able
to expand beyond what we're doing with the resources that we
have.

    MR. GADBOIS: But that wasn't quite a question.
Is that because ya'll haven't found any new money or is that
because people who have new money to invest in this are
saying no?

    MS. WARLICK: It's because we're part of a formula
program and we get X amount of funds.

    MR. GADBOIS: Well, ya'll are, but other people in
the area --

    MS. WARLICK: The people that I'm dealing with,
they don't have vehicles. They don't have resources. They
don't --

    MR. SALAZAR: We're in the same boat that Carol
is, is that we don't promote more service simply because we
cannot do it in the vehicles that we have in place now. So
we don't go out and promote that because we can't meet the
demand as it is now, and so it's hard to do that.

    MS. WARLICK: Right.

    MR. SALAZAR: And I think to Carol's point is, you
know, I think her title is general manager, but I think she
holds the CEO title as well, where those things are kind of
combined.
But I do understand Carol's point, with regards to 5310 where now I think there is some issues with people that have big areas, such as Carol, such as Kerr, Brazos, such as mine where we had the issue of multiple applications and I believe that's been addressed and I think that's been taken care of. But now in the application there is a scoring formula for participation from elected officials, commissioner's court, and that kind of thing.

So now, I am thinking, are we really going to have to spend time to go out to every commissioner's court that we have in our area and ask for a letter of support from them. And that's fine if we have to do that, but if they come back and said, Sure, we'll give you a letter of support, but we want some information from you. We want you to go back. We want you to give us ridership. We want you to -- you know, it's just creating this great big huge workload for us and we're busy enough as it is, and to Carol's point, are we here to do that? Are we here to speak in front of the commissioner's court or are we here to provide service? And I think that's what I think is that we're here to provide service.

MS. WARLICK: And we do relay it to our commissioner's courts and our elected officials. Now, obviously we all do that.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, I would think so because you
want money from them, right?

        MS. WARLICK:  Well, we want their support. We
want their --

        MR. GADBOIS:  I mean among other things.

        MS. WARLICK:  -- we want their interaction with
our system and we get that, but the main thing the transit
people are feeling is that we are becoming more and more
machines that generate -- that collect data and generate
reports.

        MR. GADBOIS:  Uh-huh.

        MS. WARLICK:  And, yes, we all are sophisticated
enough that we know that's part of the game, that to some
degree that we must do that; that there's accountability;
that there's numbers that need to be collected; that there's
information that needs to be collected. That's not an
issue, but it's becoming really the tail wagging the dog.
It's becoming overwhelming, the amount of detail in
collection and reporting that's required. And like J.R.
said, every time you talk to someone, that leads to, Well,
would you just give us -- you know, like that's the only
thing that we have to do -- would you just give us this
little report.

        MR. GADBOIS:  Well, Carol, I wouldn't think that
you would be complaining if that were leading to money for
buses, right?
MS. WARLICK: Possibly so, but it doesn't lead to any more funding; it just leads to more work.

MR. GADBOIS: But what you're saying is we're having to do all of this reporting and all of this work and it's not having a net-positive impact on our ability to do business?

MR. SALAZAR: Well, I think, Glenn -- and I don't mean to speak for Carol -- is that we have a long working history in the state of Texas and that has never been the case where we work with community and they provide funds, or at least they haven't for my area, and so I think that's where we come from, that we know, yes, we're going to deal with them and, yes, we have commissioners on our board, and, yes, we talk to them, but when it comes down to them providing funds for us to provide service or purchase a vehicle, that historically hasn't happened.

MR. GADBOIS: Really? Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: Or, at least that's in my area. I don't --

MS. WARLICK: Yeah.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. WARLICK: So, like I said, this is not a complaint against having to generate a reasonable amount of paperwork; that's part of our job, we understand that. But it's just becoming more complex and more cumbersome every
year, and I see the staff -- I'm not talking about me. It doesn't affect me nearly as much as it does my financial director, my human resource person, my rural and urban ops people; they're the ones that I see stressing more and more and getting loaded up more and more to where it's literally difficult for me and Terry, my financial director, to find time and sit down and talk about daily operations and things we need to do because she and the staff are so busy generating.

And, you know, it's partly because we have many different grants. It takes many different grants, that patchwork of funding to do what we do. So I'm not putting -- this is not a blame game; I'm just saying it's the nature of the beast. It's becoming very, very cumbersome and there's really nothing else for me to say about it.

MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you, Carol. Are there any other public comments, Bobby?

MR. KILLEBREW: I don't believe so, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think one thing we had talked about moving onto -- I think that closes out Agenda Item 5, if everybody is okay with that, as well as Agenda Item 6.
That puts us on agenda Item 7, which is propose and discuss agenda items for the next meeting. And based on Carol's comments and the comments earlier from Eric, I think one of the items that we wanted to talk about at the next meeting was the 5310 Program, the additional federal guidance, and then based off of Carol's comments, maybe looking at the reporting requirements associated with the 5310 Program. So I would agree, in the end, we're all here to provide service, which is the end-product, not necessarily the process.

Are there any other items that the committee members wanted to place on the agenda for next time?

MR. GADBOIS: So given this conversation, the other one I'd like to get, Eric, and to him thinking about is what I just heard, capital equipment, buses are a cap for the ability to do services. They are a ceiling on their ability to provide services; is that a fair summary of what you said, J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Sure.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So what I would love to be able to understand is what we think LAR's request might do for capital replacement and any -- what do we have that might start helping us understand what new capital investment might be needed. Does that make sense?

MR. GLEASON: If I can explore a little further,
the notion of fleet as a cap on certain -- it almost sounds as though if you had more fleet, that you could expand service.

MR. GADBOIS: That's what I heard.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. So you got money for service, not for fleet?

MS. WARLICK: We do to a limited degree.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I heard that right; that it's limiting expansion.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, that's what I heard. That's what I want to explore.

MS. WARLICK: I think we have -- I think we have some local entities who would step up to the plate a little bit more if we had the resources.

MR. GADBOIS: For purchasing services if you had the resources.

MS. WARLICK: I think so.

MR. GLEASON: If you could accommodate the fleet need.

MS. WARLICK: To some degree. I'm not talking about huge expansion. I want to be careful about that, but to some degree, yes.

MR. SALAZAR: I agree with Carol.

MR. GADBOIS: So, I'd like to explore that a little bit.
MR. GLEASON: And what is it that you want to explore about that?

MR. GADBOIS: Well, my first question about that is: What do we have already -- what do you have already that would help us get a handle on what those dollar amounts are?

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: And, then, obviously, what are the caps so that we can come to a dollar amount?

MR. GLEASON: So you're asking about fleet expansion?

MR. GADBOIS: That's what I heard was a cap to providing more services.

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle.

I think if we can look at replacement and then expansion, so --

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: -- I know you've already done some sort of an analysis as part of the LAR, but what's the current status of the fleet? And if we say it's at 120 percent past it's useful life it's going to cost this much; if we replace at 150, it's going to cost this much, how much does the, you know, would the 15 and the 18 million assist in that, and then we can look at expansion as well, as part of that.
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MR. GLEASON: Okay. I understand -- I understand what --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Because I would say we have the --

MR. GLEASON: -- you're looking for.

MS. BLOOMER: Sorry.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah?

MS. BLOOMER: I was going to say I would say we had the same issue when I was in Tarrant County, is that we had -- we had local entities coming to the table with money requesting to purchase service, but we didn't have the fleet to do it.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and --

MS. BLOOMER: Not -- like Carol said -- not a huge amount, but we did have some service requests that we weren't able to meet because we did not have the vehicles to provide the service.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, and Michelle -- I'm right -- that's the way a lot of HHS's are going to want to purchase, right -- or participate, is purchase of service; they won't help straight up on the capital replacement?

MS. BLOOMER: Right. Right. They just want to purchase a trip.

MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And so --
MR. GLEASON: Wait. Wait. Wait. Wait. Wait. And when they purchase a trip, they're purchasing -- they're covering the full expense of that trip with that purchase?

MR. GLEASON: No. No.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. It depends, depending on the program. In some cases it should be the fully allocated cost of the trip and it's either covered a hundred percent by the local entity or, you know, it's matched with another grant like JARC and New Freedom.

MR. GLEASON: Okay. I've got enough to start. I've got enough to go on. I think what I'm reacting to is hearing -- and maybe I just haven't been listening -- I've always understood the issue to be a level of frustration associated when we are successful in bringing in more and new people to the table; that they come for the first time expecting, A-Ha, well, I'm here to talk about more, and what they hear is -- and so, part of the new federal direction is to do a better job of getting more people to the table. And so part of our, quote, new 5310 process, is bringing new people to the table. So we're being successful, but they're bringing expectations that, Oh, what do you mean, this money has already been spoken for three times over? I thought I'm coming -- I thought this was new money? It's not.

So with -- we're working through that thing that
we've created. But I've -- in my own mind, I've always thought that the true cap on things was money for service and not so much that fleet was an obstacle, because quite honestly, we have always been in a far before position to support fleet requests for partnerships as they come forward, than we ever have been for service. And so -- okay, I need to understand it as both, then, okay.

MS. WARLICK: It's both. And I think, Glenn, where the focus that came on it just being capital was because I was talking in the context of 5310, which was a program where we had only purchased capital --

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. WARLICK: -- but Eric is exactly right and that should be clarified, that it's got to be both.

MS. BLOOMER: Yeah, Eric, this is Michelle. I think part of it, too, is depending on which partners you're talking about. I think in Tarrant County, I just want to say, when you have new partners coming to the table for the first time they get the 5310 letter, they do come with sort of expectations and then they're disappointed and frustrated. But those partners that you've been working with for awhile that have -- that you've been able to educate as to what you're doing and what your limitations are, given your resources, then they start to realize, okay, if I want service, I'm going to have to pay for it. But you
can't just throw them in at the fully allocated cost and go from zero to $50 a trip, you know, overnight, you'd have to ease them into it. But, usually, one of the things that they're not interested in is helping buy a vehicle.

MR. GLEASON: So here's what we can do. We can identify what we think we need, the amount of money we can identify to sustain a reasonable Fleet Replacement Program. We can compare that amount to the combination of funds that are available in the LAR through the 15 million and the 18 million, and we can -- if there's a net remainder, then we can talk about expansion.

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. And that's my first step, Eric. I understand now more clearly that we need to look at models for more operating costs, as well.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MR. GADBOIS: But one of the ways that you can cover operating costs is how you allocate it out to contracts for service.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: So that becomes a lot more complicated very quickly. I want to start with the capital stuff, which is what we're talking about here. To the 5310, because that's the other thing that's coming up next meeting, we should also have a conversation about guidance or help we can provide regions on how to communicate better.
once we're getting more new people to the table.

Because I can easily see the problem, new people come in, “Yeah, yeah, more money, let's go spend it on new stuff” without any understanding of all the old stuff that's completely still dependent on, and we ought to look at how we can have those conversations more productively, more quickly, and more easily. And what I can guarantee is that people are talking across the table and we ought to look at how we can facilitate those communications, okay?

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any other questions or discussions on Item 7?

(No audible response.)

And, Josh, what was the date of the new meeting, again, it was the last Tuesday of January?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Right, Tuesday, January 27th, but there have been some mention about the fact that we're going to have our semiannual meetings for our division and for our operators in early January.

MR. GLEASON: Well, it's the week before.

MR. RIBAKOVE: And so the question was, just do this meeting -- I want them to do the same thing they did the last time and sort of piggyback their meeting onto that when all of the operators are around or do we still just want to go with the 27th?

MR. GADBOIS: I think we ought to align to.
MR. RIBAKOVE: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: That's my motion, Michelle. This is Glenn.

MS. BLOOMER: What was the motion, I didn't hear that?

MR. GADBOIS: To align our meeting either before or after, whatever -- however it works best -- but since the operators in the crowd are going to be in town anyway, we might as well make that as convenient as possible.

MS. BLOOMER: I would agree, and I think it also -- it also helps to allow folks to attend, rather than just participating on the phone, so if we can align it either before or after the semiannual meeting, that would be great.

MR. SALAZAR: Well, I -- this is J.R. I'm fine with that, the only issue I have is that TTA typically aligns themselves with that time frame, as well, so it's either before or after --

MR. GLEASON: The big party.

MR. SALAZAR: -- but I'm fine with it. We'll just have to figure out what TTA is going to do and maybe act. I don't know if they're going to do anything.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Well, we'll leave that in Josh's court, to coordinate with TTA and ACT and see if we can align the next PTAC meeting with the semiannual and all
those other meetings, since we'll probably all be in Austin anyway that week.

MR. SALAZAR: And what I would recommend is that us just go ahead and align our PTAC meeting and then have TTA --

MR. RIBAKOVE: Okay. And we'll explore the logistics of that and see what we can do to make it convenient.

MR. GLEASON: We will look at the Thursday morning --

MR. RIBAKOVE: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: -- following the semiannual. The semiannual is scheduled for Wednesday, the --

MR. SALAZAR: Twenty-first.

MR. GLEASON: -- 21st, so --

MR. SALAZAR: I think that's perfect because TTA typically does it the night before.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, I know. So we will look.

So you can just put a hold on Thursday the 22nd and we'll shoot for the morning and make it as convenient as we can.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: All righty. If there are no other items for discussion for the next meeting's agenda, do I have a motion to adjourn?
MR. GADBOIS: No, ma'am.

MS. BLOOMER: No?

MR. GADBOIS: No, we have -- no, we have people's -- no? Okay. Myles just sat through all this just to sit through it? Nothing to say?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So moved.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: Second.

MS. BLOOMER: I have a motion, a second.

I'll second it. All those in favor?

Aye.

MR. GADBOIS: No, no. You got a second, but anyway...

MR. GLEASON: Aye.

MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you, all. We'll talk to you again in January.

MR. GLEASON: Thanks, guys. Thank you.

MR. GADBOIS: In record time.

(Proceedings concluded at 2:17 p.m.)
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