

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

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING

3712 Jackson Avenue, Building 6  
3rd Floor, Room 323  
Austin, Texas

Tuesday  
November 26, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN AUSTIN:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT BY TELEPHONE:

- Rob Stephens

TxDOT STAFF:

- Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
- Bobby Killebrew, Deputy Division Director, PTN
- Kris Dudley, Section 5310 Program Manager, PTN

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

INDEX

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order	3
Approval of Minutes from September 24, 2013 meeting	5
Item 5 - Presentation and discussion of Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning	6
Public comments by:	
Ms. Weedon	34
Dave Marsh	43
Mr. Nelson	51
Item 4 - Presentation and discussion of TxDOT's Texas Transportation Plan 2014.	58
Director's report to the committee	112
Confirm date of next meeting	120
Adjourn	121

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Okay. So call the meeting  
3 to order. First item of business is approval of the minutes  
4 from the September 24th, 2013 meeting. Do I have a motion to  
5 approve the minutes?

6 MR. SALAZAR: I'll make the motion to approve.

7 MS. BLOOMER: All right.

8 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I'll make the motion to  
9 approve.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: Alrighty, and we'll second.

11 MS. BLOOMER: All right. We have a motion and a  
12 second. J.R.?

13 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

14 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye. Brad?

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Motion passes. Minutes are approved.  
17 We're going to go ahead and move around on the  
18 agenda. Eric is not here yet, and I believe we don't have  
19 folks from TPMP here, either. So we'll go ahead and move on  
20 to Item 5 on the agenda, presentation and discussion of the  
21 Texas Regional Coordination Public Transportation Planning,  
22 and I'll turn that over to Bobby.

23 MR. KILLEBREW: Absolutely. And welcome to the few  
24 that braved today, and drove the distance.

25 For this item, we do have Steve White with us, who's

1 going to be walking you through the presentation. There are  
2 items in your packet that he'll be going over briefly. I  
3 don't think he's going over all the items in your packet, but  
4 he certainly is here for, you know, discussion purposes. With  
5 that, I will turn it over to Steve.

6 MR. WHITE: Thank you, Bobby. Well, it's certainly  
7 my pleasure and honor to be here to share some information  
8 with you all. The Regional Coordinated Transportation  
9 Planning effort began in a formal way in Texas in 2006. Of  
10 course, agencies across the state have been cooperating and  
11 collaborating long before that. But in a formal way, that was  
12 started in 2006. Since then, we have -- TxDOT has awarded  
13 just more than \$11-million to eight agencies across the state  
14 to support this effort.

15 In your packet, you have a map of the 24 planning  
16 regions in Texas. As you know, each planning region has a  
17 designated lead agency. And on the back of that map is a  
18 contact sheet with information on a contact person and contact  
19 information for each of the 24 lead agencies.

20 A lot has occurred in these past several years.  
21 Twenty-three of the 24 planning regions currently have an  
22 updated regional plan. The regions have gone through  
23 considerable effort in doing any assessment and transportation  
24 resource inventory and various other activities to complete  
25 those plans. In most of these regions, a huge success is that

1 there is infrastructure in place. There is a process where  
2 stakeholders gather on a regular basis, primarily to identify  
3 transportation problems and identify solutions.

4           There are dozens, or probably hundreds of individual  
5 successes across the state in each of the 24 regions. And the  
6 way that this effort has worked to date is that each region  
7 works under kind of a big umbrella regional plan that's  
8 updated every five years. And then, in those interim years  
9 between big plan updates, regions do one of two things: They  
10 either start implementing that plan, or they do additional,  
11 more in-depth planning; studies, research, what have you to  
12 move them further along to achieving the prior needs that they  
13 set forth in their plan. So that's typically what happens in  
14 the in-between years. And in each of those years, each agency  
15 has an annual work plan, and the successes are, in many ways,  
16 measured region by region, work plan by work plan.

17           The types of projects vary considerably. Many of  
18 those are related to increasing access to services, serving  
19 areas or vulnerable populations that heretofore lacked access.  
20 Some of the activities focused on addressing inefficiencies in  
21 services. There has been a considerable emphasis heretofore  
22 on serving specific, priority, vulnerable populations that  
23 have been identified by federal statute; and that, in  
24 particular, has been an emphasis on individuals with  
25 disabilities, senior citizens, and persons with low income, as

1 well as there's been a considerable emphasis on employment-  
2 related transportation, which the JARC Program has been a  
3 major player in that.

4           Each of the regions has -- the way that this has  
5 operated to date is that each of the 24 regions have  
6 established their own set of performance measures and metrics,  
7 depending on their unique plan and their unique annual work  
8 plan. We expect, during the coming year, to specifically  
9 address performance measures in a bigger way, looking at  
10 metrics, not only for local areas, but also statewide, as  
11 well. And this stems from a pending recommendation of the  
12 Statewide Working Group that recently convened to make  
13 recommendations to TxDOT -- TxDOT on the direction of regional  
14 planning in Texas. And Brad sits on that working group.

15           Lessons learned, kind of essential elements to date.  
16 This could be an extensive presentation unto itself, and so I  
17 just wanted to give a few highlights, kind of very high-level  
18 observations about what we have learned seems to work.

19           One, that this be a locally driven process. The  
20 decision was made at the very beginning that in Texas that  
21 would be our approach, and that seems to work very well.  
22 Rather than a top-down approach, we have very much been a  
23 bottom-up, grassroots approach.

24           Obviously, state-level agency collaboration is  
25 essential, as well. We have learned that those areas that

1 seem to really be succeeding most are those that have a truly  
2 interdisciplinary and interagency team that meets and  
3 functions regularly.

4           Critical to the success of this effort is the issue  
5 of capacity. I can't understate that. Those areas that have  
6 the capacity, that have the resources, both financially and  
7 staff-wise, find that to be an -- a necessary piece of this  
8 effort; in addition to creativity, flexibility, and  
9 communication. Those all play into major lessons learned.

10           One key strategy that has to be mentioned, that we  
11 have learned over these past few years, is the essential link  
12 between mobility management and case management, especially  
13 with the emphasis that we've had on human service  
14 transportation needs. In example after example we can point  
15 to, there are very -- there's a very definite correlation  
16 between connecting the case management operations of human  
17 service agencies and organizations with the mobility  
18 management operations of transportation organizations, so that  
19 it becomes systemic. What the case managers do and what the  
20 mobility managers do becomes part of their day-to-day routine  
21 and process.

22           Current activities. We are into the state's Fiscal  
23 Year 2014. We -- almost \$420,000 was awarded for regional  
24 planning activities. For FY '14, one of your attachments  
25 includes -- it's a front and back, and it includes selected

1 activities requested for funding in 2014. This is not a  
2 comprehensive list. It is a selective list, but I tried to  
3 list out a variety of different types of projects that are  
4 being funded this year. So at your leisure, you might want to  
5 look through those and get a sense of the type of activities  
6 that TxDOT is funding for regional coordination this year.

7 Another significant note for current activities is  
8 there is increased attention to veterans' transportation  
9 needs, and that is happening at the state level. We are  
10 interacting much more with the Texas Veterans Commission and  
11 at the regional level. Any number of these local regional  
12 contracts that we have in place for this year include  
13 veterans' transportational related projects in the regions.

14 And then, finally, again, the -- another significant  
15 activity that is ongoing is the working group that I mentioned  
16 a couple of minutes ago, that has spent a considerable amount  
17 of time and effort in discussing the future direction of this  
18 project. And two other handouts give you a sense of what this  
19 group is considering.

20 There are two handouts. One says -- one says  
21 consensus, recommendations, October 10th, 2013. These, the  
22 group has already reached consensus on, so these are sure  
23 things.

24 There's another handout that says final  
25 recommendations, November 13th, 2013. This is a pending list.

1 And this week is actually the deadline. The group is supposed  
2 to finalize which of these there will actually be consensus on  
3 by the end of this week, so we will be able to report on that  
4 in December.

5 And our plan is, once we have the consensus  
6 recommendations from the working group, those will be accepted  
7 by TxDOT; and then we will, in turn, share those  
8 recommendations with all of the lead agencies and other  
9 stakeholders for additional input. I would say that, on the  
10 working group itself, there are 30 or 31 members. There's a  
11 very diverse representation, including seven lead agency  
12 representatives. And there's a host of other representatives.  
13 It's very well rounded, and we feel quite representative of  
14 this effort in Texas.

15 So those are the plans. And the recommendations of  
16 -- there's -- time doesn't allow us to go into these, but they  
17 cover a variety of issues from membership and engagement of  
18 local stakeholders to the role and expectation of lead  
19 agencies, to outreach, to what should the content and  
20 components be of the big umbrella regional plans, and then  
21 again metrics.

22 And I anticipate, although I don't know, but based  
23 on the discussions that were had, I anticipate that we will be  
24 considering pulling together another working group to  
25 specifically address the matter of metrics and performance

1 measures.

2           As far as challenges, metrics, of course, will be  
3 one of them. Capacity, which I mentioned earlier, is an  
4 ongoing challenge. Leveraging resources, a lot of the regions  
5 have become really skilled at figuring out how to leverage  
6 other resources because there's never been enough funding for  
7 the dollars that have been earmarked for regional planning;  
8 there's never been enough to actually sustain this for a new  
9 region. So it calls -- it necessitates leveraging of the  
10 resources.

11           And then, finally, I mentioned case management and  
12 mobility management. It's an ongoing challenge to develop  
13 ongoing mechanisms in each region for informing the clients.  
14 Quite often, there is kind of an institutional memory problem  
15 when there's turnover, staff turnover at the local level,  
16 because you know, we offer training and workshops from time to  
17 time, and provide guidance. But then, when the local staff  
18 changes, and someone new comes in, it's often, you know,  
19 foreign. So that is a challenge. So the more that these  
20 processes can be institutionalized for lack of a better word,  
21 at the local level, the least likely that things will slip  
22 through the crack when there's a, you know, staff turnover and  
23 change.

24           So I hope that gives you a very brief, high-level  
25 overview of where that effort is right now in Texas, and I

1 would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Steve. Did you want to --

3 MR. SALAZAR: I had a question, maybe more towards  
4 Bobby, on the determination of funding level. How is that  
5 done?

6 MR. KILLEBREW: And this is Bobby. You know, we've  
7 handled that a variety of different ways over the years. As  
8 you'll see in the early years, when this effort was first  
9 kicking off, we invested quite a large amount of funds into  
10 this process. Things were new. People had to gear up towards  
11 this.

12 We are entering a more cyclical type of environment  
13 now, where we call it "spikes and valleys." There are years  
14 in which individual plans need to be updated, and we'll call  
15 that the "spike years," where we think that there needs to be  
16 more resources, financial resources, dedicated to the lead  
17 entities and the systems doing this. And the years in which a  
18 plan doesn't need to be updated, we think those are more the  
19 valley years, where perhaps the funding levels are -- should  
20 be more appropriately at a maintenance-type level.

21 Each year, as we go into the process -- and Steve  
22 will correct me if I say this wrong -- we do collect the plans  
23 from the lead entities, lead agencies out there, and we do  
24 review those, and we go over those together with those lead  
25 agencies. And through that back-and-forth discussion, we

1 determine amount of funding level that is appropriate for that  
2 plan, for that area, and for that particular year. So there's  
3 not a preconceived amount of money that we know we're going to  
4 put towards that. We do recognize there are scarce resources  
5 at the state level. And it's one of those things, if you put  
6 more funding towards this effort, it has to come from  
7 somewhere else and some other programs that we're working on,  
8 as well.

9           We do look at the overall picture of what we're  
10 funding completely in the State of Texas; and again, we try to  
11 evaluate individual plans on those spikes and valley years, to  
12 make sure we do cover the needed basis. And we know we have  
13 some federal programs that are still tied to the plan. We  
14 know we still have a state requirement in the state statutes  
15 here in Texas to do this. We don't want to back off of that  
16 effort. We want to make sure we can provide enough resources  
17 where it's applicable. Did that answer your question close  
18 enough there?

19           MR. SALAZAR: It did.

20           MR. KILLEBREW: It is very much a collaborative  
21 effort, J.R. I've not sat in on very many of those  
22 conversations. A lot of those Steve has with individuals.  
23 And I would say, for the most part, it's been working pretty  
24 good with the agencies being very honest about what they  
25 intend to do with the funding, where they're spending it. You

1 know, it's not just about plan updates, but some of these  
2 people, you know, may be paying salaries with it, may be  
3 paying other types of expenses, so we recognize that. And it  
4 is a cost of doing business. And we don't want to put anybody  
5 in a position where they have to make a difficult choice out  
6 there; do I pay the light and water bill this month, or do I  
7 update my plan. So we do -- we are cognizant of that fact.

8 MS. BLOOMER: And Bobby, this is Michelle. What's  
9 the source of the funding?

10 MR. KILLEBREW: That, too, has -- Michelle, that's  
11 also kind of evolved over the years. In the early years, we  
12 used a lot of program funds from JARC, from our administrative  
13 piece of JARC. In the most recent times, we've used some  
14 hundred percent state funds we've had, and a lot has come from  
15 the planning program. So that's why --

16 UNIDENTIFIED: And we --

17 MR. KILLEBREW: -- I was talking about those scarce  
18 resources. As we take from those different programs, or as  
19 those program funding, like JARC, have previously gone away,  
20 as those sources are not available, you know, we have to look  
21 at the overall picture and where we're getting the funds from.

22 MS. BLOOMER: And so in the last nine years, we  
23 spent 11 million on regional coordination. Have we seen  
24 significant improvement in the number of trips provided, the  
25 trip -- any of the metrics? Nine years; \$11-million. What

1 has that bought?

2 MR. KILLEBREW: And I think that's -- well, you  
3 know, if Eric was here, he would be -- I know Brad, you were  
4 -- I don't remember if you were at that workshop or not --  
5 they had a workshop here very recently -- in fact, in the  
6 spring wasn't it?

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: And Eric stood right up here at the  
9 front, and that was one of the things that he wanted to  
10 demonstrate. He said, we need to start seeing some results.  
11 You know, it's one thing to do a plan; it's another thing to  
12 come together and talk about it, but here's the results. Am I  
13 seeing any increase in trips? And if we look at the stats  
14 over the year, you don't necessarily see those increase in  
15 trips.

16 Now does that mean that we'd still have the decrease  
17 whether we put the plan with it or not? Perhaps the plan  
18 number is addressing other things, other than just trip count.  
19 Maybe it is making those meaningful connections. Perhaps  
20 there's other parameters out there that causes trips to  
21 increase and decrease over a period of time.

22 Steve, you were in those workshops more than I was,  
23 so I know y'all probably delved in to that because Eric kind  
24 of gave that as a charge at the beginning of the meeting. He  
25 said, I want you to talk about this as a group. Is this

1 planning effort actually resulting in more trips, are we  
2 making those meaningful connections, are we able to fill those  
3 gaps in service that's been identified in each individual area  
4 of the plan?

5 MR. WHITE: Well, and that did -- as Brad shared,  
6 that did prompt a robust discussion about metrics and  
7 performance measures, and that is what clearly brought to our  
8 attention the need to address this in a bigger way. But one  
9 of the questions that -- or one of the observations that  
10 became obvious with the group is that there isn't one way that  
11 folks are using to measure success. Some --

12 MR. GADBOIS: Well, again, it seems to me dissecting  
13 out increase in trips is really tough to do because the trips  
14 will go up and down. You know, it could be carried by this  
15 program, it could be carried by somebody else.

16 One of the things I find as interesting, if not more  
17 interesting, is are -- is this program resulting in increased  
18 partnerships that gives either more money or more human  
19 resources involved in helping connect people to transit.

20 MR. WHITE: Yes. And that's what some of the  
21 working group members could share, too. It's right on target  
22 with that observation, that there are a number of different  
23 ways we could consider measuring success. One of them would  
24 be process measures. Are there new stakeholders being  
25 engaged? A couple -- or three examples that I have jotted

1 down:

2           For instance, in one part of the state, where  
3 they've got a veterans transportation project going on, one of  
4 their performance measures is the number of veterans who  
5 report using public transportation to access jobs. Another  
6 one is reduced no-shows at the VA hospital in that area for  
7 appointments due to lack of transportation. Very legitimate  
8 metrics for that area and that project. Certainly ridership,  
9 expanded access, percentage of populations with access to  
10 public transportation.

11           And your point about, you know, it's not always easy  
12 to isolate what to contribute ridership increases or decreases  
13 to, because it does take resources and a level of  
14 sophistication. I did pull -- it came to my mind one region  
15 that did a particular project, where they really did some  
16 heavy-duty evaluation. And in that area, in this particular  
17 year, they had a special intervention where they were  
18 specifically having intensive trainings and workshops with the  
19 case managers and mobility managers in their area. It was an  
20 intensive intervention, specifically with that group of folks.

21           They did a multivariate analysis comparing the pre-  
22 intervention data with post-intervention data. And they  
23 looked at ridership, rides provided, and passenger miles  
24 traveled, doing a multivariate analysis where they controlled  
25 for other factors. After that intervention with the intensive

1 training with mobility managers and case managers, their  
2 ridership went up seven and a half percent, their rides  
3 provided went up 12 percent, and the passenger miles traveled  
4 went up 16 percent, which I think is just hugely valuable  
5 information.

6           Now, is each region and each lead agency able to do  
7 that level of evaluation for every single project? It's  
8 probably not realistic. But it gives you an idea of what  
9 could be done. And it certainly opens up a really interesting  
10 discussion about what should the metrics be.

11           Another thing that came out of the focus -- the  
12 working group is that perhaps we should look at local metrics,  
13 in addition to Texas establishing some statewide metrics.  
14 Because we have to recognize that each region's plan will be  
15 tailored for their needs. They'll have a different set of  
16 local metrics. But is there value in Texas, as a state,  
17 having a common set of metrics, so we can answer your question  
18 more precisely, Michelle, what can you show from this \$11-  
19 million, State of Texas.

20           MS. BLOOMER: Well, and I was -- what I was trying  
21 to get at, too, is I'm hearing two different things. I'm  
22 hearing it's a local grassroots process, and the locals should  
23 develop the metrics, and then I'm hearing we should have  
24 statewide metrics. And again, I heard more trips provided and  
25 filling gaps, but then I also heard, well, maybe it's not just

1 about that, it's about more partnerships, it's about  
2 coordination. So before we develop metrics to measure  
3 something, we have to figure out what our ultimate goal is.  
4 Because if it's not actually providing more trips, then what  
5 should we be measuring?

6           And we've had this metrics discussion before, and it  
7 was like no metrics, let us at the local level determine it.  
8 And now, when I heard that we had started a statewide working  
9 group, that was the first I had heard about that. So I'm a  
10 little concerned that we're working to develop a future for  
11 mutual coordination, but yet, this is the first time we've  
12 heard about a statewide working group working to come up with  
13 it. And they've already come up with recommendations and  
14 metrics. And I'm not sure that, you know, other than Brad --  
15 are you on the committee?

16           UNIDENTIFIED: No.

17           MS. BLOOMER: That any of the PTAC members are on  
18 the committee, are aware of what was going on. And my  
19 understanding is that's PTAC's role, is to help PTN sort of  
20 provide the guidance and direction and input of where things  
21 are going. So I was a little surprised when I heard about  
22 that, and wanted to learn more about who's on that committee,  
23 what they're being asked to do, what they're coming up with,  
24 how that fits with sort of the committee's idea as to where we  
25 were wanting to take regional coordination. So that's still

1 what I'm trying to wrap my hands around.

2           And just looking at -- just as a note, we only have  
3 the November 13th draft in our packet. So whatever the,  
4 quote, "finalized recommendations" are, we don't have those.

5           MR. WHITE: So you don't have one titled "Consensus  
6 Recommendations, 10/10/13"?

7           MS. BLOOMER: No.

8           UNIDENTIFIED: No.

9           MR. WHITE: Well, I'll personally make sure that  
10 those are sent to you, as well as a roster of the working  
11 group membership. And they have not come up with recommended  
12 recommendations; they've only come up with a recommendation  
13 that we address the matter of metrics and performance measure.  
14 So those are all to be determined.

15           And like I said, I -- it's premature for me to say  
16 what we will or will not do, but I'm inclined to think that we  
17 will address that in some way. And one option that has come  
18 up is that we can pull together a working group of  
19 stakeholders to specifically answer the questions that you  
20 posed: What are the metrics that we want to look at? Do we  
21 want to look at statewide for real; and if so, what would that  
22 be, or does it stay strictly local and region by region?

23           MR. KILLEBREW: And in all fairness, too, we  
24 actually were bringing this item to PTAC as -- in this plan  
25 for a later PTAC meeting. This one kind of popped up at the

1 last minute on the agenda.

2           We haven't -- we had the assistance of the  
3 University of Texas to help with the work group. They made --  
4 and there was a lot of people in this room. I only stuck my  
5 head in for five minutes. But there was a lot of people in  
6 this room. The idea was coming from the lead entities  
7 themselves, and I think they were all represented. Some of  
8 the lead agencies were represented, and there were other  
9 categories, you know, of local human service provider in the  
10 rural area.

11           UNIDENTIFIED: Rural.

12           MR. KILLEBREW: Yeah, and we started to collect that  
13 information from that working group. We had hoped to have a  
14 more polished version of this at the January PTAC meeting, to  
15 present to you what happened in that working group. And UT  
16 is, you know, helping us polish up that type of presentation,  
17 as well.

18           So it's -- what you see in your packets today is  
19 very preliminary. The Department hasn't settled on anything  
20 from the work group, we've not enforced it, we've not made any  
21 movements out on that to do anything, take any type action on  
22 it right way. But we do -- we agree with you, we do think  
23 this is a PTAC weigh in matter too.

24           MR. GADBOIS: And Bobby, let me interject here for a  
25 second, because you were around when Michelle and Michelle's

1 boss, spent a good bit of time thinking through this, how this  
2 might work and start up initially.

3 MR. KILLEBREW: Uh-huh.

4 MR. GADBOIS: And so I think some of what -- I hope  
5 I'm not putting words in your mouth. But some of what  
6 Michelle's laying on the table is some consistency of  
7 implementation on those original decisions that were made,  
8 which were really made with a focus on let's allow for as much  
9 flexibility locally, to experiment, as we possibly can.

10 There's still an opportunity, as your example just  
11 pointed out, to develop metrics around that and ask for  
12 metrics around what's being -- what's happening locally. But  
13 to the extent you change that, some of those basic  
14 presumptions about how this works, there ought to, number one,  
15 be very full conversation about it; and number two, some good  
16 reasons to be able to say we're ready to evolve and come up  
17 with more, you know, consistent, statewide kind of service,  
18 something along those lines, and so I hope you all think about  
19 that as you're going along. You know, the pointed questions  
20 are: What's the time line and what's the process?

21 MR. WHITE: The process is -- well, first of all, my  
22 impression from -- and Brad can chime in. My impression from  
23 the working group meetings and the preliminary set of  
24 recommendations -- and even once the recommendations are  
25 finalized, they are only recommendations. My sense is that it

1 would still, by and large, remain the same as it is, as far as  
2 being very heavily, locally driven.

3           In the discussion of metrics, it was brought up by  
4 the room full of stakeholders that should we consider, would  
5 there be value, would it be helpful to all parties concerned  
6 if there be local performance measures, in addition to maybe a  
7 common set of state measures, so when we're asked the  
8 question, what can you show as far as your performance  
9 measures for the State of Texas for \$11-million, we can have  
10 an answer.

11           So it just came up as -- it organically came up. We  
12 didn't expect it; it may not go anywhere. But my clear  
13 impression is that it's very much remaining a locally driven  
14 process.

15           Now the process, the consensus on which of these  
16 recommendations will actually be finalized is this week, is  
17 the deadline. Following that, as Bobby said, we're contracted  
18 with UT, that is going to compile the -- you know, synthesize  
19 and kind of shape everything up. We will then, in turn, share  
20 that with all the lead agencies across the state, not just the  
21 seven who were on this working group; other stakeholders, and  
22 we will encourage each lead agency to, in turn, share with  
23 their respective stakeholders, for additional input and --  
24 review and input. So even though this working group's life,  
25 their task will have been accomplished and, you know, they'll

1 move on, the project and the opportunity for input is  
2 absolutely still there.

3           So TxDOT will take all of this under advisement,  
4 then we will make decisions as we look at future years and  
5 those cycles that Bobby referred to, and anticipating the next  
6 big plan update, which I believe is due in 2016 now, already.  
7 It seems like we just finished the other one. You know, what  
8 that might look like, process-wise and it's still a very open  
9 process.

10           MR. UNDERWOOD: Here's a couple of things that we  
11 talked about in the work group that stood out to me, and I  
12 hope maybe they'll address some of your concerns, too, Glenn.

13           I've been a part of both what I consider in the last  
14 four years kind of a good side of a good working RTC group. I  
15 take it someone had some issues in the very beginning of this  
16 process. I'm kind of -- I feel like I've been on the other  
17 side of some better working RTC group. I don't think we're  
18 perfect, but I think we get some things done pretty decent up  
19 in our area. We are the lead agency when we're doing it, so I  
20 guess I can say that about myself.

21           But anyway, some of the problems that I have, just  
22 as this process moves forward, is the lack of resources that's  
23 in this program. It's -- we gather together once a month, and  
24 we have different variety of agencies, and that sort of thing,  
25 all around the table and we talk about needs, we talk about

1 gaps in service, and then it used to be we kind of had sort of  
2 a -- you know, we've got kind of a light at the end of the  
3 tunnel. We've got JARC money, we've got new Freedom money.  
4 Let's all go out, let's apply for a project to address this  
5 specific need. You know, let's go out -- oh, you're right,  
6 that is a huge need, we need to fill that, let's write a grant  
7 application to the coordinated call process, let's go out,  
8 let's apply for it, we'll implement it, and we've seen a  
9 couple of those come through. We've been doing this a little  
10 while now where we actually have some projects that have  
11 happened through that.

12           The problem is now those projects are gone because  
13 you've got no JARC money, you've got no new Freedom money.  
14 It's all rolled into the one. Transit hasn't had an increase  
15 in state funding since 2001. So we're trying to keep up with  
16 what we're doing, much less adding on new things.

17           And so it's almost like we all get together, we  
18 identify needs, and then it's like, now what are we going to  
19 do about it. Nothing. Nothing. It's like, well, we've  
20 identified this as a huge need. I agree, we have. But  
21 there's nothing we can do about it to move forward. And so it  
22 almost seems like we're moving people down a path, through  
23 this process, where there is no end in sight. It's just we're  
24 going to walk this path all day long together, and we're  
25 really not getting anywhere, where this actually rubber meets

1 the road.

2 I would -- I spent a little time in Oklahoma just  
3 because of our -- one of our projects up there. And so I  
4 asked them one day, I said, well, how do you guys handle your  
5 regional coordination. Because we actually have two members  
6 from Oklahoma that attend our regional coordination meetings  
7 from the Durant area. And they said, we don't have these in  
8 Oklahoma. I said, well, what do you do? I said, you have to  
9 have a plan, it's a federal mandate, so what do you do. It's  
10 done at the statewide level.

11 And I said, why is done at the statewide level.  
12 They said, well, at the statewide level, our DADS, DARS, HHSC,  
13 all these different individuals, they can talk amongst one  
14 another, they have -- they know what funding they have  
15 available, they know how it can interchange, what federal  
16 won't match with other federal, that sort of thing, they put  
17 it all together, we do a statewide update every five years.  
18 We complete some local surveys at our local level, figure out  
19 what some of our needs and gaps are, and then the state --  
20 it's done at the statewide level once a year.

21 And I said, okay. And they said, but if we want to  
22 do something like this, we have planning funds. And I said,  
23 for what. And the example was given, well, a couple of years  
24 ago, we updated some of our fixed routes. And they said, I  
25 don't have a planner on staff, and so I applied for a special

1 grant to have a study done -- I forget what consultant did it  
2 for them -- but we were able to create an extra fixed route by  
3 cutting some of our weak stops off, adding some additional  
4 ones on; and so, therefore, we actually provided a better  
5 service for the community as a whole by doing something like  
6 that.

7           And so that just kind of got me thinking that we've  
8 spent \$11-million in this amount of time, what if we had some  
9 resource to do true public transportation planning money?  
10 Most agencies that I'm aware that are spending rural dollars  
11 -- correct me if I'm wrong here, Mr. Gleason -- do not have a  
12 planner on staff. They don't have someone that sits in the  
13 back room that says, I'm going to be your planner, you know,  
14 what do we -- do we need to look at your fixed routes, do we  
15 need to look at some of your demand response service, do we  
16 need to look at different packets of -- or pockets of  
17 individuals that need public transportation.

18           When we went into Collin County, the COG had already  
19 started a process. Nelson/Nygaard did the study for us. They  
20 gave us a report this thick, surveyed individuals with --  
21 people with disabilities, we know where they're at. We know  
22 that in the fixed route there's a whole pocket of the city or  
23 the town we're not even hitting with the fixed route. So as  
24 we prepared to do greater fixed routes in that area, I've got  
25 a complete, planned-out study that shows me exactly where

1 these are. So that's something I can use now to put rubber on  
2 the road to make a difference. Does that make sense?

3 In concept, I agree with what we're doing here, but  
4 I think there might be better ways to go after it than a group  
5 of stakeholders. That's my two cents. I hope that make  
6 sense. I know that's a lot of information at one time, but.

7 MR. GADBOIS: It does, and I understand -- I mean,  
8 the idea always, right or wrong, was creating an  
9 infrastructure by which the regions could experiment with new  
10 partnerships, look at -- you know, have some resources to look  
11 at planning and the such.

12 MR. UNDERWOOD: Sure.

13 MR. GADBOIS: And what you're telling me is that the  
14 availability of funding to do that, whether it gets passed  
15 down to the locals for them to find ways to spend it, or the  
16 state allocates it out as needed, on a kind of more systemic  
17 plan, it's just not -- it's not --

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: It's not realistic.

19 MR. GADBOIS: -- there --

20 MR. UNDERWOOD: And to me, what Eric is doing now  
21 has probably been the greatest advancement towards regional  
22 coordination by attending the statewide veterans deal that  
23 you're doing. Now you guys are able to talk. Because when we  
24 get down to the local level, what the local -- use the VA, for  
25 example. And we say, you know what, here's what we could do

1 if we had something from you. And they look at it and they  
2 go, that's a great idea, let me recommend that up. And  
3 they've got 17 layers of hierarchy to go through, by the time  
4 it gets to the top, they go, I don't even know what that is.  
5 You know what I mean?

6           Whereas, at the statewide level, if Eric's talking  
7 here to the veterans on this side, they can start agreeing and  
8 push this down. And so there was some -- there's some  
9 advantage of meeting locally and deciding some of these  
10 things. But as far as actually being able to get something to  
11 break free and do something, huge amounts of work that I think  
12 could be accomplished much easier and simpler a different  
13 direction.

14           MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I think part of  
15 the PTAC work plan, one of the items was the regional  
16 coordination. And so I think, when we get back together in  
17 the new year, is to pick this up and start from PTAC's  
18 perspective, where do we think, and what -- where would we  
19 like regional coordination to go. And then, similar to how  
20 we've done the rule-making with working groups of  
21 stakeholders, is how do we do that, what are the  
22 recommendations, and then come forward with something.

23           But I think -- I'm just feeling like whatever this  
24 working group is has sort of gotten up ahead of. So we're  
25 coming up with recommendations and metrics when we haven't

1 really decided what we're trying to measure. And that makes  
2 it hard to determine whether or not we've spent the 11 million  
3 sufficiently.

4 And then my other question is, so 23 of 24, who's  
5 the 24th? And sort of what's the issue? Why don't we have a  
6 plan? We have 23 of 24 planning regions that have updated  
7 plans.

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: Who's the cheese that stands alone?

9 MR. WHITE: That's Planning Region 19, which is the  
10 Laredo area.

11 MS. BLOOMER: And so --

12 MR. WHITE: They developed a plan in 2006, but they  
13 have not updated their plan.

14 MS. BLOOMER: And what's the plan to have a plan in  
15 place with the Laredo District?

16 MR. WHITE: We have a meeting on that scheduled for  
17 December. So exactly how that will be resolved is to be  
18 determined. But it is definitely on our radar screen. It's  
19 more than on our radar screen, and it will be addressed.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: Steve, who was the lead agency in  
21 2006?

22 MR. WHITE: The lead agency in 2006 was the same  
23 lead agency that's there now, and it's South Texas Development  
24 Council.

25 MS. BLOOMER: And, are they recommended for funding?

1 MR. GADBOIS: And so, Michelle, your message is it's  
2 on our work plan and we're interested, and we want to engage.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Sorry. Yes, is that -- it's in our  
4 work plan. And I think that's the next item. We sort of put  
5 the work plan on hold with the revision to the administrative  
6 rules to address the funding. But I think that's something  
7 that whatever this work group has done, we'd like to hear to  
8 come back. But I think we need to start fresh, as from our  
9 perspective, what do we think we're trying to accomplish with  
10 regional coordination, where we've been, where do we think we  
11 would like to go, so we can provide that direction and  
12 guidance, and then see how the recommendations from this work  
13 group either do or don't fit into that direction.

14 MR. UNDERWOOD: And I'd like to hear from the  
15 industry on this too, Glenn. In January, our semi-annual  
16 meeting, maybe we could set some time aside, or maybe in your  
17 update, you could talk about this, that we're going to  
18 consider this, and we can get comments and feedback.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Can we schedule our meeting near that,  
20 one way or the other?

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'd like to do it following. Could  
22 we do that?

23 MS. BLOOMER: That's January --

24 MR. WHITE: And you'll also see when I provide you  
25 all the roster, that many of the members are transit

1 providers, too.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: Michelle, this is Bobby. As far  
3 PTAC engagement on this, if we pull together as an agency, you  
4 know, this work group again, or we're -- as Steve is  
5 suggesting, we throw -- you know, as UT helps us put a more  
6 polished version out, we throw this back towards the work  
7 group to see, you know, does this stick on the wall like  
8 macaroni should, without creating a PTAC quorum -- which is  
9 going to be easy to do these days because we have fewer PTAC  
10 members -- does the committee have a desire -- I know Brad is  
11 already part of the work group. Is there a desire for any of  
12 the other members to also be part of that process, so we can  
13 include you as well on that?

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Well --

15 MS. BLOOMER: In that work group? At this point,  
16 no.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll be there.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Are you still --

19 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll be on it.

20 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and correct me if I'm wrong, but  
21 y'all's working group sounds like what I'd call a brain trust.  
22 Y'all are sifting through and sorting, deciding what  
23 experiences have happened out there and what you might take  
24 from that to -- in going forward to develop some guidance or  
25 recommendations or, you know, activities that should be done,

1 correct? In which case, you can bring that back to us, and  
2 we'll do data points that we can -- that can and should  
3 consider and talk about and decide how we plug in on that.  
4 Okay.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: Okay.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We do have three public  
8 comments on this item. We'll go ahead and take those now.  
9 The first one -- I'll just go in alphabetical order -- is Dave  
10 Marsh from HEARTS.

11 MR. MARSH: Do you mind if Wendy goes, Michelle?

12 MS. BLOOMER: What?

13 MR. MARSH: Do you mind if I have Wendy start up?

14 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Sure.

15 MS. WEEDON: I got nominated to go first.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Wendy Weedon with Brazos Transit  
17 District.

18 MS. WEEDON: Hello. My name's Wendy Weedon, I work  
19 for Brazos Transit District. I am Director of Marketing and  
20 Quality Assurance. In that role, I'm responsible for  
21 attending all of the regional coordination meetings within our  
22 service areas. BTD services 16 counties; so, with that, we  
23 have three different COGs that we contend with, and three  
24 councils I sit on.

25 Over the past five -- I've worked for Brazos Transit

1 for five years. So over the past five years --

2 UNIDENTIFIED: Wasn't me.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Wasn't me.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: Excuse us.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Sorry.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: If you could pull that just a little  
7 closer to you?

8 MS. BLOOMER: Rob, are you on the line?

9 UNIDENTIFIED: Can you hear?

10 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, Michelle.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

12 MR. STEPHENS: I'm sorry. I was going to announce  
13 myself, it was kind of at the beginning of Steve's  
14 presentation, I didn't want to interrupt.

15 MS. BLOOMER: That's okay.

16 MR. STEPHENS: But I've been here. Thank you.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you for joining us. We also --  
18 just so you know, we also have quite a few members that are  
19 listening in, but we can't -- they can hear us, but we can't  
20 hear them, just so you know. Okay. Sorry, Wendy.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Go ahead.

22 MS. WEEDON: That's okay.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you.

24 MS. WEEDON: So I've worked for Brazos Transit for  
25 five years, and over just the five years that I've worked

1 there, I figured it up, I've spent over 1,000 hours attending  
2 these RTC meetings and work groups. That equivalates [sic] to  
3 a half-time position, staff position. And in that same time  
4 period, based on the minute orders I've reviewed, TxDOT has  
5 expended about \$480,000 supporting these RTCs in my service  
6 areas.

7           The amount that TxDOT has expended is the equivalent  
8 of three full-time bus routes, operating 12 times a day -- 12  
9 hours a day, I apologize. So if the money that was spent on  
10 the RTC groups had been, instead, utilized to provide service,  
11 we could have carried over about a half a million more trips,  
12 serviced 500,000 more patrons in our service area alone. We  
13 have had to cut routes in the past five years, several of  
14 them, because of lack of funding.

15           From my perspective, I have not seen one productive  
16 result come from any of the RTC work in planning, in the areas  
17 that I serve. Instead, the time spent in these meetings is a  
18 complete waste of time, and the program itself is a complete  
19 waste of funds; that could otherwise have been included in  
20 annual formula apportionment, where they could have direct --  
21 have a direct effect on our service for our patrons.

22           The plans themselves have always proposed creating  
23 new services at a time which we are financially hard-pressed  
24 to maintain what we currently have on the street, and that, of  
25 course, the proposals never include any new local funds to

1 support these plans that the RTC wants to accomplish.

2 We've wasted far too much time, far too much money,  
3 and I think we need to stop this program now and redirect the  
4 funds to the RTD as part of their annual formula distribution,  
5 and allow them and their local boards to make the decisions on  
6 how to best utilize the funds within the established service  
7 plans in their respective areas. Thank you.

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: Wendy, are you in 16? Is that HGAC?  
9 Is that correct? Is that the lead agency?

10 MS. WEEDON: HGAC, DETCOG and BVCOG.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED: And Wendy, so there's a federal law  
13 requiring coordination and planning, and a state law requiring  
14 coordination and planning. And you're telling us to ignore  
15 that?

16 MS. WEEDON: No, sir. I just don't feel as if the  
17 \$480,000 that have been spent have accomplished anything.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, and, I got that part. I'm just  
19 wondering what you're actually suggesting we do about the law.

20 MS. WEEDON: Well, I don't know. I do think that  
21 what Brad said did make more sense to me; to -- and again,  
22 what Steve said. The metrics, there's been no measurements.  
23 And I've been in the work groups, and they come to us. They  
24 want us to tell them what we should do to make the plans, and  
25 we're the service provider, which is fine, but we're -- you

1 know, everything always reverts back to the service providers  
2 to make the plans anyway. So in my opinion, the funds are  
3 just being thrown down the drain.

4 MR. SALAZAR: And I can tell you, there are areas --  
5 and I visited with Steve beforehand -- that, in our area, we  
6 are the lead agency, but we did not apply for any money. So  
7 we are complying with the federal mandate, but we're not  
8 asking for any money. So there are ways around that, that you  
9 can -- you can get that done.

10 MS. WEEDON: And I don't want to negate in any way  
11 the work that some of these areas probably have done or  
12 possibly have done. I'm just saying I haven't witnessed it.  
13 And I have spent a lot of hours in all of these plannings.  
14 The last one I went to was maybe two weeks ago, maybe a week  
15 ago -- I can't remember one from the next -- but we spent --  
16 in a two-hour meeting, we spent two minutes talking about  
17 regional coordination; two minutes.

18 MR. UNDERWOOD: What was the rest of the time used  
19 for?

20 MS. WEEDON: You know, projects that didn't have  
21 anything to do with it, presentations from the propane  
22 company. So when -- were you there?

23 MR. WHITE: No, I wasn't there. But to back up  
24 J.R.'s point -- and I should have clarified up front -- every  
25 year we don't necessarily contract with all 24 regions. We

1 currently have no contract with Brazos Valley COG or HGAC. So  
2 whatever they're doing is with some other source of funds.

3 MS. WEEDON: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: No, we do have --

5 MS. WEEDON: We do --

6 UNIDENTIFIED: We do have a BVCOG contract.

7 MR. WHITE: Not for regional planning, that's  
8 another --

9 UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, that's 14.

10 MR. WHITE: -- that's another -- it is a PT grant.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, we just -- yes.

12 MR. WHITE: But it's -- it's not considered part of  
13 this regional planning grant --

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

15 MR. WHITE: -- that we --

16 UNIDENTIFIED: But they just finished the 13 -- the  
17 13 planning.

18 MS. WEEDON: And that combined 480,000, it's for all  
19 three COGs. BVCOG, I think, was 290,000 of it. DETCOG was  
20 about 130,000, and HGAC was 60,000. And HGAC, they do take  
21 their roles a lot more seriously than the others, but -- any  
22 more questions?

23 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Wendy.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you for coming.

1 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. Just to sort of  
2 follow up on that comment, in looking at the selected  
3 activities that are requested, funding in 2014, it does seem  
4 like a lot of them are planning studies.

5 MR. WHITE: Yes.

6 MS. BLOOMER: And that could be funded elsewhere, or  
7 as Brad had mentioned, maybe as part of a planning to  
8 implement a particular project. I think it gets back to,  
9 really, the crux of it is what are we trying to accomplish.  
10 And if we don't know that in the very beginning, then how do  
11 we know -- if you don't know where you're going, how do you  
12 know if you've gotten there?

13 MR. WHITE: Well, these --

14 MS. BLOOMER: And I think that's where we really  
15 need to establish that --

16 UNIDENTIFIED: Focus on.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Or you can always claim you haven't  
18 gotten there or you have.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Or -- or we've got there, it's a  
20 success, we've done it. But what did we do?

21 MR. GADBOIS: Right.

22 MS. BLOOMER: And we don't all agree on what we're  
23 trying to accomplish. So I think that's probably the first  
24 thing, at the beginning of the year to work on, is what -- you  
25 know, in the very beginning, our goal was very clear: Come up

1 with a regional coordination plan. And we were successful  
2 when we had done that. Now we've moved beyond that, we have  
3 the plan, we've met the federal requirement, and we can  
4 continue to meet the federal requirement, but what are we  
5 really trying to do by having the regional coordination  
6 councils or committees and developing the plan?

7           Hopefully, the end goal is not to create a plan that  
8 gets stuck on somebody's shelves, and we never do anything  
9 about it. But to Brad's point is, if we do all this, we  
10 identify the gaps, we come up with the strategies --

11           MR. GADBOIS: Right.

12           MS. BLOOMER: -- and we have no funding to  
13 implement, what's the point? And then we've put this pressure  
14 on transit providers to address the gaps identified, but  
15 provided no resources to do that. And I think that's where --

16           MR. UNDERWOOD: And there is frustration amongst the  
17 lead agencies. I mean, Steve, when you were in the meeting,  
18 they get frustrated. They said, you know what -- at one  
19 point, and I cannot remember exactly who it was, a part of  
20 this work group, but they made this statement. They said --  
21 when I would bring that up, well, where are we supposed to  
22 come up with additional funds to address some of the things  
23 that you want done. And the response was, well, maybe, before  
24 you spend any of your program money, that should come to the  
25 RTC first, to approve it. And that was when I said, whoa,

1 whoa, whoa, we have boards that are made up of local elected  
2 officials, that are -- no way. And so anyway, so that was --  
3 there is some frustration level out there.

4 MR. WHITE: I would clarify, too -- and again, I  
5 should have pointed this out in the presentation -- the  
6 projects that were funded in 2014, especially since we had  
7 such limited funding this year, there were two criteria before  
8 we would even consider a project for funding. One of them is  
9 that we would only fund projects that were identified as a  
10 priority in the big regional plan. So all of these fit that  
11 category. So these are all strategic. The decisions were  
12 strategically made.

13 So the other criteria was, if -- that we would  
14 provide funding to sustain quarterly meetings of the regional  
15 stakeholder group. So all of these decisions were based on  
16 that. So all of these activities support some priority that  
17 was identified in the regional -- in the respective regional  
18 plan, that needed to be further addressed.

19 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Our second comment, public  
20 comment, is from Dave Marsh.

21 MR. STEPHENS: Michelle?

22 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, Rob. Go ahead.

23 MR. STEPHENS: Just for clarity, who was that, that  
24 gave that first comment?

25 MS. BLOOMER: That was Wendy.

1 MR. STEPHENS: Wendy; was it --

2 UNIDENTIFIED: From Brazos.

3 MS. BLOOMER: From Brazos.

4 MR. STEPHENS: Oh, Brazos. Okay. Gotcha. Thank  
5 you.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Dave?

7 MR. MARSH: Hi, y'all. First of all, thank y'all so  
8 much for letting me be here. It's very important that we have  
9 you guys being our advisory committee. I really appreciate  
10 your work. And I have kept up with your conversations over  
11 the years remotely through the wonderful transcripts that are  
12 provided of your meetings, and I find your service to be quite  
13 admirable.

14 I'm here to talk more globally and locally today  
15 about the issue before you all. First of all, I regret that I  
16 missed Dr. Abeson's tour of duty. Abeson, Evison?

17 MS. BLOOMER: Abeson.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Abeson.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Abeson.

20 MR. MARSH: Abeson. I understand he's retired from  
21 the group. But he and I were one of 31 people that came  
22 together two times in 2003, at the invitation of the federal  
23 government, to devise what was called the National  
24 Coordination Plan that became United We Ride. And I was  
25 honored to be among that group. And, however, I was just one

1 -- I was Jeremiah, wandering in the wilderness.

2           And I found the -- what I call the "industrial  
3 coordination complex" to have gotten a lot of momentum since  
4 that time. United We Ride, which is also called Blah Blah We  
5 Ride is an organization that has great intent, but no result.  
6 And I charge our local effort or our state efforts with a  
7 similar charge.

8           I think that people really enjoy getting together  
9 quarterly and talking about stuff. And I think that they,  
10 most dutifully, every five years, put together a new plan to  
11 talk about more stuff. And I don't mean that to be critical  
12 of the people involved, the organizations, or the  
13 institutions. I'm talking about the dynamics of the events  
14 that we go through to try to arrive at coordination. So  
15 that's my global comments.

16           Now back to my local comments, which is really all I  
17 know, and that is that I think I remember Rob -- Rob, you  
18 there? You're not there.

19           MR. STEPHENS: Yes. Yes, I'm here.

20           MR. MARSH: Yes. Saying at one of the previous  
21 meetings, perhaps I've been here too long, but I remember.  
22 Well, no, you haven't been here too long, nor have I. I've  
23 been here long enough to know some stuff that probably not  
24 everybody else knows. And whether that's important  
25 information to other people or not, I can't judge.

1           But I know that the rural transportation was set up  
2 particularly to coordinate disparate resources to build one  
3 cohesive transit operation. That's where we came from, that's  
4 how we got here, that's what we built over the years. We  
5 started out putting together little pieces of Title 3 money,  
6 Title 19 money, Head Start, MHMR, everything we could, so that  
7 everybody could ride -- get a ride, and there would not be  
8 four vehicles running around doing not much, instead of having  
9 one doing a lot.

10           And so from 1982 -- or the early '80s to now, we've  
11 built on that. So when the -- when the FBL-461 or whatever it  
12 was, came into fruition, we thought, oh, coordination, oh,  
13 man, I wish we would have thought of that.

14           So it gained us momentum, the groups were formed. I  
15 have a very stellar group in my region because we're in  
16 Austin. We always -- we always achieve great things with --  
17 in our capital city because we -- you know, we really are  
18 lucky in having some talented people in this area.

19           But the problem is, is that we already did that. We  
20 are coordinated. We're less coordinated now than we were in  
21 the past, but that's not our fault. That's because things  
22 have been done, like Head Start buses have to be yellow, and  
23 things like that, things that were done to dis-coordinate  
24 services that aren't going to change.

25           So in our area, what we mostly talk about -- and I

1 think you'll probably find that to be true in many  
2 metropolitan areas, is what Capital Metro doesn't do. Because  
3 metropolitan areas are not coordinated because they never had  
4 a mandate to or the desire to or the need to, because there's  
5 always been this -- this plethora of resources available where  
6 they have to do things that ended up in the end, perhaps not  
7 making coordination a high element on their plans.

8           So we've rolled along now for seven or eight years,  
9 and we've -- you know, we continue to roll along. But when I  
10 heard the number \$11-million, I had never heard that before.  
11 I was just alarmed. Not that it's not people's intent and  
12 aims and understanding of the situation that's not --  
13 everybody -- nobody is wrong here. But something is wrong  
14 because, as anyone knows that works in a country bus company  
15 like myself, you're -- you're doing all you can to get service  
16 on the street, even as large -- we're a larger organization --  
17 to get service on the street every day and try to forecast and  
18 have a vision for what your future is.

19           And if I were Capital Metro, and I had \$200-million  
20 every year, and I could say, I'm going to get that from now  
21 on, I could do a lot of big plans like Project Connect and  
22 things like that, which are all great. But I'm not. I can  
23 count on \$2-million a year. And anything else I get, which is  
24 eight or nine more million, I have to go get.

25           And so we plan by opportunity. There's a

1 coordinated call, which is a great thing, that was instituted  
2 by PTN several years ago, that lets you go out and dream for a  
3 year, and try to figure out how to be the one that gets the  
4 money to do what you want to do. And that's a good thing.  
5 That's close to being able to plan.

6 But what we don't have is the ability to -- and I  
7 noticed J.R. had a contract on the street recently which I  
8 quite admired, which was to have a consultant on call, have  
9 someone you can depend on to say, I've got to figure out how  
10 to redo my fixed route in Bastrop. What am I going to do,  
11 who's got a chance to do it? Well, you go hire a consultant,  
12 because that's what they do. I don't really need a planner on  
13 staff, but I need to have the ability to have planning  
14 assistance when I need it.

15 Now back in the dark ages, we had what was called a  
16 circuit rider here in Texas that we talked about before, and  
17 we're looking at again, to where you could -- TxDOT had  
18 consultants on staff that could do things for us. But the --  
19 what I've heard today about how the program has evolved, we  
20 use JARC money, we use state money, and so on and so forth, I  
21 got to say that planning is okay, but maybe it needs to be  
22 locally driven. Maybe it needs to be locally funded.

23 In our area the MPO does it. And the MPO, as you  
24 may or may not know -- I know Kelly and Minnie do, they got a  
25 lot on their plate already. They got a 2040 plan, they got

1 this, they got that, they got the TIP, they got a policy  
2 board; they got a lot to do. So it's kind of a sideline for  
3 them, and they're doing it because somebody has to do it. But  
4 maybe -- maybe it should be locally driven. Maybe, if it was  
5 locally driven, the MPO could more focus on what they're doing  
6 and what needs to be done in their area.

7           But I do appeal to the group to consider that the  
8 needs that we have in rural transit for planning, to use  
9 statewide planning money to do local plans that may or may not  
10 be effective, that end up primarily addressing problems in  
11 metropolitan areas that don't -- that does not address -- I  
12 don't like that. The statewide planning monies should be used  
13 to help rural systems do planning.

14           And I -- you know, again, I'm not here to say RTCs  
15 are bad and we're good, I'm just saying that we really have  
16 to, in these days, think about how we're going to plot the  
17 future. Like, right now, my RTCC -- the RTCC in my area, all  
18 good, well-intentioned people, but they don't have a clue  
19 about what's happening to us right now.

20           And right now, half our budget is about to go down  
21 the tubes because of the insanity of -- well, let me rephrase  
22 that -- because of the misguided plans of a state agency that  
23 funds a lot of transportation in this state. If I had that  
24 money to get somebody to plan what we need to do in our  
25 region, to make sense of that program, to put route service in

1 place, the dream that we have for a public-coordinated  
2 brokerage, if I had that money to turn into plans to make us  
3 -- help us do that, we could solve a lot of problems in our  
4 region, easily.

5           But when I made my presentation at the last RTCC  
6 meeting, and I brought it up, including an ATAC representative  
7 there, they all looked at me like, oh, okay, next, next. So  
8 again, they're all great, they're interested in what they're  
9 doing. But if I remember 461, the purpose of that was to  
10 coordinate human service transportation needs and the public  
11 transit assets, correct? Was that -- is that pretty much  
12 correct?

13           Well, that's not that hard. It's not something that  
14 we have to perpetuate indefinitely. The federal plans that  
15 Mr. Gadbois refers to, the federal requirements, that doesn't  
16 have to be done by a -- that council, it can be done by  
17 anyone. The state mandate, I think, is something that we can  
18 very well easily do, as well. Give me the money to plan and  
19 do things, and I can make sure that I do, as a normal course  
20 of event, the community is involved. That's what we do.

21           I work for a board of elected officials. Every four  
22 years, they have to go out and get reelected. Their  
23 constituents and what they -- their constituents think about  
24 us is damned important to them. We are connected to  
25 communities. We are at the basic level of government, with

1 county commissioners that hear from people if we don't do  
2 right. And we take our job very seriously, what we do. And  
3 our coordination of activities we do are, as I said, not as  
4 precise as they were in the good old days. But we still --  
5 it's what we do every day.

6           Coordination is a daily activity. What we need more  
7 than anything else now is the other C word, and that's  
8 "connectivity." We need to have connectivity. We need to  
9 make sure people can travel. Coordination is done; we do it  
10 every day. It's like a revolving circle. You can keep going  
11 around it, and you do. But until you connect to other  
12 systems, until you connect in your communities, until you  
13 connect your own services, you're not accomplishing anything.

14           So help us, consider us. Consider us when you make  
15 your decisions on what to do going forward, and finding a way  
16 for us to really do things, not talk about them, but do  
17 things. Thank you very much. And again, thank you for what  
18 you do.

19           UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Dave.

20           MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Dave.

21           UNIDENTIFIED: Appreciate it.

22           MS. BLOOMER: Lyle, did you still want to speak?

23           MR. NELSON: After Dave speaks?

24           (Laughter.)

25           UNIDENTIFIED: Absolutely.

1 MR. NELSON: Have pity on me for following Dave  
2 Marsh. Dave, I'll get your phone while I'm here also.

3 MR. MARSH: Thank you very much.

4 MR. NELSON: You bet.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. NELSON: Blah, blah, blah, everything Dave said.  
7 And then, also, when we first started this process, it was --  
8 it was pretty exciting because you had the large groups of  
9 people, and in some cases over a hundred people sitting in a  
10 room going, all right, let's work together, let's identify  
11 these gaps and barriers. So for the past eight years, we've  
12 identified gaps and barriers, put them in a great plan, put  
13 them up on the shelf, and then waited for the appropriate time  
14 to update them.

15 To reiterate -- to reiterate what Dave said, we need  
16 to learn to start connecting people to goods and services,  
17 pure and simple. We can coordinate, we can plan, but until we  
18 connect people to the needed goods and services, we're not  
19 doing anything except meeting and saying hello to everybody.  
20 So again, blah, blah, blah, everything else Dave said.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. GADBOIS: Well, let me -- because Dave said  
23 this, and then you blah, blah, blah repeated it.

24 MR. NELSON: Correct.

25 MR. GADBOIS: But then you also just said something

1 in your own words --

2 MR. NELSON: Uh-huh.

3 MR. GADBOIS: -- that -- that begged this question.  
4 When we had originally started out, the -- part of the idea  
5 was bring more money in by getting human service investment in  
6 the services and transportation, as well as connecting to  
7 transit's resources. So invest human service money in the  
8 existing transportation services, right?

9 And then the flip-side of that was, but also get  
10 transit understanding how to work better with human service  
11 clients, something that was talked about earlier in terms of  
12 using case managers --

13 MR. NELSON: Uh-huh.

14 MR. GADBOIS: -- for example. And what I'm  
15 understanding both of y'all to say -- and correct me if I'm  
16 wrong -- is that ain't really happening; neither one of those  
17 pieces are really happening very well. Is that accurate?

18 MR. NELSON: That would be really accurate,  
19 absolutely. Absolutely. Bringing people to the table to  
20 discuss what are your needs, and how can we fulfill those  
21 needs has kind of been set off to the side, in the -- in the  
22 interest of creating what are the gaps, what are the barriers,  
23 what can we do. But we never ask what can we do.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Just really rote stuff, without ever  
25 getting to a solution.

1           MR. NELSON: And a perfect example is the -- and I'm  
2 sorry to use this kind of language -- the MTP Program. The  
3 fact that there is a parallel program being created in  
4 complete opposition to the provision of public transportation,  
5 and you can't marry the two because there are some sort of  
6 contrived requirements that disallow such, is asinine. So  
7 you're creating these parallel programs and bringing out-of-  
8 state brokers into play, to create a whole new transit program  
9 that's taking money out of the state, which could be used to  
10 enhance access to goods and services.

11           MR. GADBOIS: Right.

12           MR. NELSON: So...

13           MR. GADBOIS: Thanks.

14           MR. NELSON: You bet. Thank you all.

15           MR. GADBOIS: Thank you, Lyle.

16           MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Lyle.

17           Okay. I think we've had a lot of discussion on this  
18 item. I think, if there's no objections, the direction we'll  
19 take is we'd like to come back in our January -- Bobby, when  
20 is our next meeting, January, February?

21           MR. KILLEBREW: January.

22           MS. BLOOMER: January? And I guess see the finished  
23 product from the working group, but also add it as an agenda  
24 item for PTAC to start taking up the work plan, with this  
25 probably being the first item of significant interest.

1 MR. MARSH: And try to line up our meeting after the  
2 annual meeting.

3 MS. BLOOMER: After the TxDOT semi-annual meeting.

4 MR. MARSH: Such that we -- such that we could talk  
5 to other transportation providers.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Right. And so I guess add that we'd  
7 like an item on the agenda at the TxDOT semi-annual meeting  
8 related to regional coordination and getting sort of comments  
9 and feedback from those in attendance on experienced direction  
10 --

11 MR. MARSH: Don't recognize him, because Shelly is  
12 going to cause trouble.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, Eric.

15 MR. GLEASON: On the semi-annual meeting agenda  
16 item, that is an item that you will lead the discussion on, or  
17 do you want staff -- again, staff to lead the discussion?

18 MS. BLOOMER: I think we'll have to talk about that  
19 off-line. I have a conflict that day, and I haven't yet  
20 learned how to be in two places at one time. So we can --

21 MR. GLEASON: Okay. And then, also, with respect to  
22 the next meeting, there were a lot of different suggestions or  
23 different directions the program might go that we talked about  
24 today. To what extent did you want our preparation for that  
25 meeting to include some additional thinking on those? I heard

1 finish up the work group product, but I wasn't sure whether or  
2 not I heard you all wanted us to do anything with some of the  
3 ideas that had been brought up today. Unless you were  
4 interjecting them into the work group product or...

5 MS. BLOOMER: No. I think -- my -- I think we  
6 started the work group project, and we just need to finish it  
7 up. What level of impact or has --

8 MR. GADBOIS: It's data.

9 MS. BLOOMER: It's information, it's one option.

10 MR. GADBOIS: It's -- it's --

11 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

12 MS. BLOOMER: We'll take that under consideration.  
13 So if there are other ideas or options or thoughts on  
14 direction to move forward that PTN would like to present, I  
15 think that would be beneficial, as well; so when PTAC comes  
16 back in January, we have all the options and ideas on the  
17 table.

18 MR. GLEASON: But what I was focused on was some of  
19 the ideas that you all brought up.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

21 MR. GLEASON: And I didn't -- I wanted to make sure  
22 they were -- and I may have missed this part of the  
23 presentation, and I apologize.

24 MR. KILLEBREW: And presen -- yeah. When we started  
25 the conversation, PTAC was interested in bringing back what

1 their work plan is in January. And Michelle was suggesting at  
2 that point in time that this item is already on the work plan,  
3 it just needs to be their next focus area.

4 MR. GLEASON: Right. I heard that.

5 MR. KILLEBREW: And --

6 MR. GLEASON: But for example, Brad brought up a  
7 specific suggestion.

8 MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah.

9 MR. GLEASON: We heard some public comment --

10 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

11 MR. GLEASON: -- some specific suggestions today.

12 To what extent do you want any of those suggestions in any  
13 more detail for your January meeting. That's what I'm trying  
14 to ask.

15 MS. BLOOMER: I think we want to see all those  
16 suggestions.

17 MR. GLEASON: Okay. I mean, we can -- we can  
18 replicate them from the minutes because we'll be back in front  
19 of --

20 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

21 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: That would be great.

23 MR. GADBOIS: That would -- that would be sweet.

24 MR. GLEASON: But we won't do any additional work on  
25 it.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah. Thank you.

2 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Unless PTN staff has other ideas that  
4 haven't been talked about here or the work group doesn't bring  
5 forward, or you know, if you guys have talked about it and  
6 thought about ways you would like to move regional  
7 coordination forward -- I just -- I want to make sure before  
8 we start the discussion, we have a lot of the options or ideas  
9 already on the table --

10 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

11 MS. BLOOMER: -- in front of us.

12 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

13 MS. BLOOMER: And since the holidays will be between  
14 now and here, if they were on paper, that would be extremely  
15 helpful.

16 MR. GLEASON: Okay. All right. Thank you.

17 MS. BLOOMER: So we'll finalize the work group,  
18 we'll present an item at the TxDOT semi-annual meeting to be  
19 determined if it's PTAC or PTN, and then we'll just prepare  
20 like a white paper on what we have talked about to date.

21 MR. GLEASON: Yes. And then the semi-annual meeting  
22 will include some of the lead agencies, because they are also  
23 service providers, but not all of them. And it is not your  
24 intent to invite those others to that meeting.

25 MS. BLOOMER: No, not at this point. I think part

1 of the conversation in January can be how we proceed forward  
2 on getting all stakeholders involved --

3 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

4 MS. BLOOMER: -- involved in the process.

5 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Similar to how we did with the rules.  
7 Because if we're going to go out with some sort of change or  
8 recommendation for a change, I want to make sure everybody  
9 that has a dog in the fight has had an opportunity to comment  
10 and weigh in before we present something. Okay.

11 Okay. So I think that concludes Item 5. So we will  
12 go back up to Item 4, the presentation and discussion of  
13 TxDOT's Texas Transportation Plan 2014. And I believe we have  
14 somebody here from TPP.

15 MS. CONKLE: Good afternoon. Sorry about the  
16 miscommunication. Would you all prefer that -- I've been  
17 giving this presentation up at the front of the room, but I  
18 can certainly sit at the table here and --

19 UNIDENTIFIED: We'd love you to be up there. We can  
20 see you that way.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Or maybe --

22 MR. KILLEBREW: Can we just -- can we just --  
23 because we are recording this meeting and we're going to place  
24 an audio version.

25 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

1 MR. KILLEBREW: We need to make sure that you are  
2 close to a microphone.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Over here or over there.

4 MR. SALAZAR: There's a chair over -- right there,  
5 with a microphone at it right there.

6 MS. CONKLE: Perfect.

7 MR. SALAZAR: We don't mind not seeing Eric, but we  
8 just --

9 MS. CONKLE: Is -- can you hear me? Okay. I can  
10 set up right here. We had some problems at our public meeting  
11 with these types of speakers, people couldn't hear them very  
12 well.

13 Again, my name is Michelle Conkle. I am a planner  
14 with the Transportation Planning and Programming Division of  
15 TxDOT. Currently, for the entire month of November, we've  
16 been out in the public and with stakeholders doing a  
17 presentation for update of our statewide multi-modal plan.  
18 Some of you may know that plan as the SLRTP 2035. The acronym  
19 was actually Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan 2035.  
20 You may also be familiar with the Texas Rural Transportation  
21 Plan, the TRTP 2035.

22 So we're currently out soliciting input from  
23 stakeholders and the public on the update of those two plans,  
24 which are going to come back together to form the Texas  
25 Transportation Plan 2040, and address the metropolitan and

1 rural components.

2 Is -- do you actually have the presentation up?

3 MR. SALAZAR: Just let me know when.

4 MS. CONKLE: Okay. The first thing that we've been  
5 talking to the public and stakeholders about are the  
6 implementation of TxDOT strategic plan goals alongside the  
7 MAP-21 goals for transportation in Texas. The TxDOT strategic  
8 plan goals are to maintain a safe system, address congestion,  
9 connect Texas communities, and become a best in class state  
10 agency.

11 We also will be addressing other planning and  
12 environmental requirements, state and federal requirements,  
13 planning process requirements that you're all very familiar  
14 with, that go back many, many years. We're going to build on  
15 the two plans I talked about, the SLRTP 2035 and the Rural  
16 Transportation Plan 2035. And for both of those plans, we'll  
17 be giving updates on any progress we made towards goals or the  
18 completion of projects that were actually identified in the  
19 rural areas.

20 We're going to advance performance-based planning  
21 concepts, link planning goals to programming decisions, which  
22 basically means that as we define our goals and our targets  
23 for the first time, we're going to produce a plan that's  
24 performance-based, that's actually going to tie itself to the  
25 programs that we have, where we'll look at the projects we

1 built to see what type of progress we made toward the goals;  
2 in other words, tying our goals and our policies towards the  
3 money that we're actually spending on projects to meet those  
4 goals. And we're also going to integrate TxDOT's current  
5 initiatives for performance management, again under MAP-21,  
6 asset management, and customer service, being a best in class  
7 state agency.

8           This is actually just our schedule, our Gantt chart.  
9 If you got copies of the presentation, you could probably see  
10 it better in front of you than up on the screen. But  
11 basically, we're in the very beginning steps of the process to  
12 update the plan. What we've done is we're collecting current  
13 information, current plans and programs from all modes, from  
14 all modal representatives. We're looking at those plans and  
15 programs, we're collecting MTPs from current metropolitan  
16 transportation plans from the metropolitan planning  
17 organizations, and pulling in all current system data, to  
18 evaluate and inventory our current system.

19           We're also looking at needs, current needs and needs  
20 in the future. And as we're doing that, we're currently  
21 coming out and asking stakeholders and the public what our  
22 goals and priorities should be. We do have the strategic plan  
23 -- the TxDOT strategic planning goals, and then we do have  
24 goals that we're mandated to look at under MAP-21.

25           But we're experiencing, at least in my career as a

1 planner at TxDOT, a sea change; in that, you've actually got  
2 an administration and you've got people looking at what should  
3 you do -- what should we be doing above and beyond our  
4 strategic goals and our MAP-21 goals, you know, to improve the  
5 system. Because frankly, this is your system. TxDOT is here  
6 to help maintain that system and to move people and goods  
7 safely across the state. So we're coming to you and we're  
8 asking you, what should the priorities be.

9           We did -- again, on the top of the schedule, we're  
10 in the October/November/December time frame where we're coming  
11 out and asking -- we're bringing -- going to bring a set of  
12 draft goal areas that we'll talk about in just a moment, ask  
13 you if we've identified all the goal areas that are important  
14 to you; or if not, if we need to add other goal areas, and  
15 then talk a little bit about those -- the priorities that are  
16 under those goal areas, to help us better form the plan moving  
17 forward for the TxDOT administration, to be able to tell us  
18 where we should be putting our assets.

19           Again in the chart, we'll be working through --  
20 we'll be working through the winter months to pull together  
21 all of the data that has been submitted and take all of your  
22 comments. That's going to help us finalize a needs assessment  
23 and put a quantitative dollar amount to the different modes  
24 for the needs that have been identified by you and by other  
25 modal representatives. And we're going to come up with an

1 asset management plan that basically takes the assets that we  
2 have and comes back to you and says, where should these be  
3 put, based on the priorities that you -- that you gave us.

4           We've also had some very interesting discussions out  
5 in the public. Actually, we've had very, very good  
6 participation by users of public transportation. We've had  
7 very good participation and attendance by providers. We've  
8 actually had folks that -- we've had some assisted-living  
9 representatives. We've had some folks that use wheelchairs.  
10 We've had pedestrians.

11           We've actually -- I actually was able to assist  
12 three folks at our Abilene meeting who are sight-impaired take  
13 a survey for us and talk to us about how important public  
14 transportation is to them. And if you can believe this or  
15 not, when we got to the point about how are you going to pay  
16 for that, they were perfectly willing, for the first time in  
17 my career, not to have fares reduced. They said they'd pay  
18 more money if they could get more reliable transportation to  
19 get them where they wanted to go, and actually put that on a  
20 comment form.

21           So we really are seeing -- we're seeing attitudes  
22 out in the public change, across my career. Because what  
23 we've always said is, we're going to have to do more with  
24 less. And I think that people are starting to understand,  
25 from our perspective and from a user perspective, that that's

1 not acceptable anymore. We're going to have to do more, and  
2 we're going to have to come up with more money to do more  
3 because we're at a state where some of the system is just --  
4 is not holding up.

5           And it's not just roads. It's, again, providing  
6 services, especially out in the rural areas. And these people  
7 were perfectly willing to have that hard conversation about  
8 who's going to pay for that, and perfectly willing to say they  
9 were willing to pay for it.

10           Anyway, next slide. I'm getting a little ahead of  
11 myself. Stakeholder and public participation schedule. We've  
12 been out -- part of this -- this is all my bad. We had talked  
13 with Eric about coming to talk to the PTAC. And then  
14 somewhere along in the last three weeks, where I've been  
15 making myself crazy traveling all over the state, I just -- I  
16 just needed to get the PTAC back on my schedule. Not to  
17 mention, I had -- my Blackberry service is not very good out  
18 in the hinterlands, so I might have even missed an email or  
19 two.

20           But anyway, we've been to San Antonio, Pharr,  
21 Houston, Bryan, Lubbock, Wichita Falls, Dallas, and Abilene.  
22 In each of those cities we've held two meetings. So we've had  
23 16 meetings over the last three weeks, and they -- again,  
24 they've been very well attended. I would say that -- I'll  
25 look back to Casey to confirm this, but I'd say they were as

1 well attended by folks that represented users of public  
2 transportation and providers than they've been attended by  
3 anybody else, which is absolutely amazing to me.

4           Next slide. The TPP -- TTP goals and objectives  
5 development process. Now this is not the development for the  
6 entire plan. This is just the development process for the  
7 goals and objectives that we're going to carry forward before  
8 we do asset management scenarios. As we took TxDOT's  
9 priorities -- again, we've already discussed those, those were  
10 the strategic plan priorities -- we married them to the MAP-21  
11 priorities -- and we'll show that slide here in a minute. And  
12 we took it to the -- to the -- what -- our internal technical  
13 advisory committee, on which some folks in here sit.

14           And it was basically the straw man to bring it out  
15 to the public and the stakeholders to say, these are the six  
16 draft goal areas that we came up with, looking at TxDOT's  
17 strategic plan and the MAP-21 goals. I go back to my original  
18 question that I'm going to pose to you. Did we miss any goal  
19 areas? And if we have the right goal areas, what are your  
20 priorities under those goal areas?

21           So once we collect those, we're -- we're finishing  
22 up our round one outreach. We're going to spend a month or  
23 two analyzing those goals and priorities, and looking at the  
24 -- I guess what you would call the first pass at the needs  
25 assessment, taking that to the administration, and having them

1 finalize those priorities, based on how the needs match up  
2 with the priorities that have been given us from folks outside  
3 the Department.

4           The administration will then review and approve  
5 those. We anticipate that to be done sometime early in the  
6 winter, possibly January or February time frame. Those will  
7 become the Texas Transportation plan goals and objectives and  
8 we will proceed with the data we're collecting from that point  
9 on, to come up with measurements based on those goals.

10           We -- although we did have some folks out in the  
11 public say, well, you've already come out with goals, so  
12 you've already decided them. And I wanted to reiterate that,  
13 in several of the areas, when we get to the goal areas, I'm  
14 going to mention to you other goal areas that were brought up,  
15 and then I also reiterated, we've gotten calls already, now  
16 that we've come back, from people that attended the meeting,  
17 that were interested in adding goal areas, and that we -- we  
18 very definitely have been told that, that's a distinct  
19 possibility and we should be open to all of those.

20           And I think that, in talking with Eric and talking  
21 with PTN, we're particularly interested in what you think  
22 about the goal areas, to supplement those. Because as has  
23 been pointed many times, statewide plans are highway-centric,  
24 and we're trying very hard not to be highway-centric.

25           And again, I'm just going to fall back on the fact

1 that the people that have been taking time out of their busy  
2 schedule, and by no means people who have a harder time  
3 getting to us to give us comments have showed up. It's very  
4 touching to me to see someone get on a bus and come over on a  
5 -- in his wheelchair, to spend half a day with me, to tell him  
6 [sic] what his problems are getting around Houston. I have  
7 all day for that.

8           And we've had -- like I said, we had some folks that  
9 came in that were sight-impaired, and Casey -- all they asked  
10 of us was Casey read every one of the tables on the slide, so  
11 they would know what are on the slides. And they were very,  
12 very helpful in helping us to understand issues that are not  
13 common sometimes on the highway side.

14           So anyway, the first goal area is safety. Safety is  
15 the number one goal of TxDOT. It's also the number one goal  
16 of federal legislation under MAP-21. And it's -- and that is  
17 across all modes. TxDOT's priorities for safety include  
18 highway, bridge, transit, aviation, rail, highway, at-grade  
19 crossings, infrastructure preservation; basically make sure  
20 the roads are safe and that we, you know, have shoulders where  
21 needed, or at least have safe ingress/egress onto our system,  
22 so that the entire system is safe.

23           And so the group discussion -- and again, the format  
24 we presented this before is we had flip-charts, and we  
25 actually did a facilitated session, is what are your

1 priorities for multi-modal safety, both today and in the long  
2 term. And what we want to do for you, since there was a  
3 little bit of a miscommunication on my part, is we're going to  
4 leave you with comment forms, and we'd like to get those  
5 priorities or goal areas on those comment forms, if you  
6 wouldn't mind. And you can send those back to us. But that's  
7 -- that's what we want to know from you on safety. Again,  
8 that's the first goal area.

9 MR. GADBOIS: Can we ask questions along the way, or  
10 are you -- do you want to roll through this?

11 MS. CONKLE: No, you certainly -- you certainly may  
12 ask questions along the way.

13 MR. UNDERWOOD: That was a mistake.

14 MR. GADBOIS: That was a big mistake.

15 MS. CONKLE: Okay. That would not be the first  
16 mistake I made today.

17 MR. GADBOIS: I gave you an out and you didn't take  
18 it.

19 MS. CONKLE: Including not having this very  
20 important meeting on my calendar.

21 MR. GADBOIS: So -- and this is going to be one that  
22 I just personally am struggling with some, but I kind of want  
23 to help -- you help me understand how TxDOT is going to deal  
24 with this. So right now, integrating several modes into a  
25 road profile ends up looking like separating or segregated

1 those with actual infrastructure between, such that there's  
2 the least amount of conflict possible between, say, bicycles  
3 and cars, buses, and bicycles -- you know, et cetera, is the  
4 safest way to do it. But at the same time that then kills  
5 your capacity for cars, right?

6           So assuming TxDOT is going to look at that seriously  
7 in this plan, how does that shake out for an agency that  
8 hasn't seriously provided services for anything on their  
9 roadways but cars?

10           MS. CONKLE: Well, I don't -- I don't think there's  
11 one -- any correct answer to that question, but what I will  
12 say is we have had a lot of folks over the course of 16  
13 meetings tell us how that's worked really well for them, and  
14 how that's not worked really well for them. In larger cities,  
15 we've had a lot of comments where the roadway profile that  
16 includes other modes has created a more dangerous situation  
17 than it has solved a need, you know, addressed a need, and --

18           MR. GADBOIS: It certainly can if it's done poorly.

19           MS. CONKLE: Correct.

20           MR. GADBOIS: Yeah.

21           MS. CONKLE: And then we've had some other areas,  
22 some smaller cities, talk about how they've really worked  
23 together, say their bicycle/pedestrian coordinators with  
24 TxDOT, to determine -- even though TxDOT has a policy, I'm  
25 just going to talk about bike/ped for a second. It's the one

1 that has come up the most in conversation talked about.

2           We have had a policy for quite some time that every  
3 time that we upgrade a roadway, we look at the feasibility for  
4 bicycle and pedestrian facilities adjacent to that -- to that  
5 roadway. What some areas have done is, instead of there being  
6 an insistence that a certain -- a certain type of mode be put  
7 in alongside the roadways, they've come together, and they're  
8 making decisions that it might not be safe to do that, we'd  
9 rather have that money on an enclosed trail, we'd rather do --  
10 so there's actually conversations taking place at the local  
11 level about TxDOT's policy, where they're coming to a  
12 consensus and a win/win instead of, you know, pushing a  
13 facility that might not be safe for one -- you know, one or  
14 more of the users. Because other comments we've been hearing  
15 is that when those are not -- those -- those facilities are  
16 not separated, it makes it dangerous for the driver, as well.  
17 And so there's a lot of discussion being had.

18           And again, I don't know that there is a -- and I  
19 certainly don't have a TxDOT-approved answer for that. But  
20 what I will say is that out in the public we've heard both --  
21 we've heard success stories and we've heard stories that, when  
22 these facilities come together and they're not -- they're not  
23 meshed properly, they're more dangerous. And then we've heard  
24 success -- you know, from smaller -- and granted, smaller  
25 cities, that have been able to do this and keep their

1 bicyclists and pedestrians safe on the same roadways, same  
2 facilities as the cars.

3           So in terms of -- that is very definitely something  
4 that is going to be addressed in this plan. The policy -- the  
5 bicycle/pedestrian policy is not something that is something  
6 that exists outside the plan. But it is something that has  
7 come to the fore so much, with folks wanting other modal  
8 choices, that we're -- we need to be looking at bringing that  
9 into the plan as a goal of the plan, to find a way to bring  
10 these together, instead of just having a policy, you know,  
11 that sets a side of the plan.

12           So I think that we're making progress. I'm one not  
13 to -- people who know me know I'm one not to over-promise.  
14 But I tell you, it is progress. It's huge strides since the  
15 last time I went out with a statewide plan. We have just  
16 heard from so many people. They want modal choices. It's not  
17 just about highways for them anymore.

18           If they're the only ones showing up for the first  
19 time in history, maybe the comments will be -- you know,  
20 they're usually disproportionate to folks that show up and  
21 want to talk about roadways. And what I can say is that we're  
22 going to have to figure out how to deal with a  
23 disproportionate number of comments for the non-roadway users.  
24 But I'm not at all upset about that because this is a -- this  
25 is -- these are folks that we typically don't have

1 participation from, so we're very, you know, excited about  
2 that.

3           But yes, it will have to be looked at. And I think  
4 it's going to be a case of -- I think it will be case studies.  
5 Some of these folks have actually agreed to come together in  
6 another venue, and talk to each other and share these stories.  
7 And I think that is most important, too, because it's not  
8 always a TxDOT answer, and it's not always TxDOT-funded. It's  
9 two groups of people that never -- you know, have never gotten  
10 together before, coming together and saying, well, we'd like  
11 to hear what you're doing. It's pretty -- it's pretty awesome  
12 what's happening right now with the public involvement on this  
13 plan.

14           So -- and we'll come back to you with more as we --  
15 as we pull this together and go to the administration because  
16 it's going to be -- the goals that have been set up and the  
17 priorities are very interesting. They're very different from  
18 any other plan I've ever worked on. They very much have to do  
19 with users of our system who are challenged in some way. They  
20 very much have to do with wanting choices other than vehicular  
21 transportation, or motorized transportation. And they very  
22 much have to do with people coming in and saying they know  
23 we're going to have to pay for this, we know we're not going  
24 to be able to depend on the money that we're currently getting  
25 to enhance our system. So it's going to be very interesting

1 moving forward.

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, having said that, kind of  
3 what Glenn was saying, that's why that was a mistake, because  
4 we're never short on words on this committee. Saying that  
5 you, you know, have all of these different -- especially  
6 public transportation coming forward and asking, when I look  
7 at this Gantt chart --

8 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

9 MR. UNDERWOOD: -- where are we going to be  
10 involved? I see this is a ongoing coordination with TxDOT  
11 Technical Advisory Committee.

12 MS. CONKLE: Uh-huh.

13 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm assuming that's not us. But  
14 when -- because there is going to be that big emphasis placed  
15 on nontraditional roadways. Are we going to be involved and  
16 hear more to see the progress of this?

17 MS. CONKLE: I will say that I have to coordinate  
18 that through public transportation. But I'll tell you what  
19 our plan is. All of these comments have been taken by our  
20 public involvement consultant and are being scanned in, so I  
21 can take a look at them. They're going to be provided to  
22 Eric, to be provided to you and anybody else who wants them.  
23 Because again, the promise we've made out there is, if we  
24 accept comments on something we can't deal with directly,  
25 which I can't in TMMP, kind of all modes, is that we get them

1 to the persons or person, persons, who can address them, and  
2 they get a chance to look at them. I think you're going to be  
3 very interested to see these comments.

4           At any time, I could be asked to come back and speak  
5 at your January meeting. We could -- I know there are certain  
6 rules that have to go with a committee like this, and I have  
7 to work through Eric. But he -- I can pass information along  
8 through him that he can give to you during the whole process.  
9 You can make comments all along the process as you start  
10 seeing the comments come in.

11           And again, I want to be -- I want to also tell you  
12 that, currently, Title 6, we're trying to meet some Title 6  
13 requirements, and it's coming from the federal transit side,  
14 before -- federal highway just hasn't caught up to it. And I  
15 will tell you, I've collected more demographic forms than I  
16 know we've ever collected in the entire department. Because  
17 I've gone to every meeting asking if I could just have you do  
18 one thing for me, please fill this out, because this is very  
19 important for public transportation funds, then the survey,  
20 then the comment form. And we have had almost a 100 percent  
21 response rate to that. So we've got some very interesting  
22 things to show you. And as soon as I get them scanned in and  
23 send them to Eric, they will come through him.

24           MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay. I just -- I'm just saying --  
25 I don't want to speak for the group, but to me, this is

1 something that we definitely would like to have more input in  
2 and --

3 MS. CONKLE: And you should.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: -- along the way, and so...

5 MS. CONKLE: And you should.

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: I mean, I don't want to take up all  
7 of our meetings, but I think this would be good for us to kind  
8 of stay involved in this, for sure.

9 MS. CONKLE: Yeah.

10 MR. GADBOIS: At least given this chart, at least in  
11 the May to July time period, where things start getting  
12 fleshed out a little more, I mean, if not sooner, at least by  
13 then we ought to look at having something come back here. If  
14 we can.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

16 MS. CONKLE: And again, and for time purposes, maybe  
17 what we could do, you have this presentation, correct? Bobby,  
18 could I have you go ahead to the table and let's just -- let's  
19 just summarize that. Because they can provide the comments.  
20 The questions we're asking for here are the group discussion  
21 questions. You can go back to those and provide us a comment.  
22 But basically, what we have here is the summary of the draft  
23 goals, and again, we start at the top with the strategic  
24 planning goals that we discussed already. The ones on the  
25 bottom are the MAP-21 goal areas. And we want to emphasize

1 that all of these goal areas are going to be analyzed in terms  
2 of people and freight.

3           And then we have the draft Texas transportation goal  
4 areas, those six in the middle, safety, asset management for  
5 all modes, mobility and reliability for people and freight,  
6 multi-modal connectivity for people and freight, which goes  
7 back to the question of, you know, parallel facilities, and  
8 we've had a lot of discussion about that, stewardship and  
9 customer service.

10           I will briefly tell you that stewardship, in the  
11 context of what we're trying to gauge with our constituents,  
12 is our ability to come to you and give you information, tell  
13 you what we're going to do, and be able to follow through on  
14 those commitments. That's what stewardship is to us; if we  
15 say that we're going to do something, that we follow through  
16 on that. And if we're not able to follow through on it, then  
17 we come and we tell you why.

18           MR. GADBOIS: Just quickly on the congestion stuff.

19           MS. CONKLE: Yes.

20           MR. GADBOIS: And this is really just to kind of  
21 understand what you're doing with it. If TTI's Metropolitan  
22 mobilities work has done anything for us, it's to help us  
23 understand that you don't really reduce congestion, you only  
24 reduce the level at which it increases or --

25           MS. CONKLE: That's right.

1 MR. GADBOIS: -- speed with which it increases. But  
2 they also have now started doing -- look at demand management.  
3 Aside from the supply side, what are we going to build. The  
4 -- how do we shift people to other modes and change their  
5 behavior. So the question is: Where in this is the demand  
6 management?

7 MS. CONKLE: Well, demand management is -- is -- I  
8 mean, we can certainly -- and I should have a pen to write  
9 this down. Like I said, this is not the normal format.  
10 Demand management is a part of congestion reduction. And even  
11 though MAP-21 has congestion reduction, what we've had people  
12 telling us is this is not really congestion reduction; it's  
13 congestion management, as you said. So demand management is a  
14 part of -- and it's also a part of reduced project delivery,  
15 because again, projects that we can implement sooner to  
16 improve congestion, that we can draw, you know, folks off of  
17 the -- off of the roadway system, other projects we should be  
18 focusing on.

19 What I can tell you is those -- the ones under MAP-  
20 21, they just are what they are. But we've had several  
21 people, such as yourself, redefine that for us. And we will  
22 be looking at travel demand. But the other interesting part  
23 of this conversation has come up, is that most of the  
24 providers and the other modal representatives that have been  
25 here, is they've encouraged us -- not only encouraged us,

1 they've more or less made a request that we start looking at  
2 other modes differently when we talk about allocating money,  
3 than just benefit/cost.

4           Because it's been rightly pointed out to us -- and I  
5 know this from many years of being in this business -- that  
6 you're not going to ever be able to compare a roadway to a  
7 pedestrian facility, to a transit project, and be able to come  
8 up with -- you know, measure those on a level playing field.  
9 And what they want us to take to our commission is to look at  
10 the fact that you're not going to -- those modes are not ever  
11 going to win on a head-to-head comparison when you're just  
12 doing benefit/cost, in terms of moving people or goods, but  
13 that, for the greater good, and because that is what we do  
14 here is move people and goods, that's what we should be  
15 looking at.

16           MR. GADBOIS: Well, it's -- so I want to make the  
17 argument that you're more explicit about the demand management  
18 side. And here's the for example that will catch the  
19 attention of the other people around the table.

20           So when we have a toll facility that we're looking  
21 at putting in, TxDOT's usual response to that is it's a  
22 leverage finance opportunity, it's a way to build the  
23 infrastructure without all the up-front dollars out of the  
24 state fund or whatever. And that's okay, and that's one way  
25 to look at toll roads.

1           The other way to look at toll roads is they are a  
2 demand management facility that as you price it, it gets  
3 people to change their behavior. But it only does that if you  
4 give people a way to change their behavior, i.e., you have the  
5 transit -- you know, and transit priority lanes or HOV lanes  
6 or something like that along the way. And if you're explicit  
7 about the demand management element and the modal options that  
8 are needed to make that really work, then part of the  
9 financing also becomes the transit operations that would be  
10 needed for that demand management.

11           MS. CONKLE: Sure.

12           MR. GADBOIS: But that side of the discussion never  
13 really happens, because all we look at is the finance side.

14           MS. CONKLE: No, it absolutely is happening. I will  
15 tell you that, really, it has come more under multi-modal  
16 connectivity. Because what we've been hearing is, even if you  
17 wanted to change your behavior, and you wanted to take, you  
18 know, one element of the multi-modal system, it lets you off  
19 somewhere, where you have -- where you're going to be forced  
20 to get back in a car, or you're going to be forced to find  
21 some other way to get to your actual destination. That's been  
22 a very, very lively discussion, about the fact that we don't  
23 -- in a lot of places, you don't need a lot of infrastructure,  
24 you just need a way to connect the existing infrastructure,  
25 and it would work a whole lot better.

1           And we've been told that -- you know, and we've  
2 asked for the data to show us, because that's what we're  
3 gathering right now, for folks to demonstrate what it is to us  
4 that they're talking about, what they need for that  
5 connection. And if they've already done the work, and they've  
6 already paid for a consultant to cost that out, we'll take  
7 that into consideration.

8           Because again, it's like there's really -- there's  
9 really -- well, there are several things going on. But the  
10 discussion is, you know -- it seems to be focused on we need  
11 more multi-modal choices. And what we're hearing is you have  
12 the modal choices, they're just not connected in a way that  
13 you can use them most efficiently. And that's why people  
14 won't change their behavior. If they can't get off of one  
15 mode and have another mode to get them where they're going  
16 safely, they won't use the first mode to begin with, that's  
17 been the discussion, and that we should be looking at a way to  
18 connect the existing facilities, and stop trying to insist  
19 that it's new infrastructure that we need, and then try to  
20 gauge that, as you said, against highways. Because that cost  
21 benefit, in terms of ridership is -- is not going to -- that's  
22 not ever going to come out in the favor of another mode.

23           But it makes absolute sense to me when someone is  
24 saying, we've got it there, we just don't have it well  
25 connected, and it wouldn't take that much money or -- you

1 know, to get these connected and change people's behavior.  
2 That's where we need to be focusing.

3 MR. GADBOIS: I agree.

4 MS. CONKLE: So yeah, it's been brought up.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Before we move on since we kind of --  
6 I did just want to -- sort of some general comments. But I  
7 did want to thank you for a couple of items, one is the cover  
8 page. I don't know how many people remember the last cover  
9 page, but I do appreciate that transit is on the cover, and  
10 it's multi-modal and not highway-centric, so I do appreciate  
11 that.

12 I also appreciate that you're coming to us much  
13 earlier in the process, which will allow for much more, I  
14 think, meaningful input than what we experienced last time, so  
15 I do appreciate that.

16 On the goals and priorities, I would just sort of --  
17 this has been an ongoing concern, is, to me, I think -- and  
18 please don't take this the wrong way. I do -- I -- safety is  
19 important, congestion is important. But in my mind, TxDOT's  
20 number one goal is not safety. TxDOT's number one goal is to  
21 move people from Point A to Point B; it's access, it's  
22 mobility. It's not safety, it's not congestion. Those are  
23 things you do as part of providing that service.

24 And so I think, back to focusing on that. But I  
25 would agree with the comments you made. It can't solely be a

1 cost/benefit analysis, and it can't solely be a through-put,  
2 which is typically, when we're looking at the highway, it's  
3 how many people can you move, and that's the evaluation. So I  
4 think that's an important point.

5           And then you had mentioned that you're analyzing  
6 current and forecasted conditions and demand and needs, and  
7 that you're taking -- and excuse me if I get these acronyms  
8 wrong -- the SORP and the RTP to make the TTP. And then  
9 you're looking at the MPO plans.

10           I also wanted to suggest maybe looking at the  
11 regional coordination plans, the item before. We talked  
12 about, you know, transit -- each -- not transit providers.  
13 But each of the 24 regions are required to put plans together.  
14 A lot of those plans have identified needs and have  
15 demographics in them that might be helpful as far as  
16 understanding the transportation component; and then the  
17 system data, if any system data for transit will be included.

18           And then sort of the quantitative amount of dollars.  
19 And I know PTN has done work to determine what we really need  
20 in order to provide service, if that has been, or will be  
21 included, as well. And I believe last time we did sort of a  
22 quick-and-dirty assessment of what would really be needed.  
23 And we might want to share the letter, the last two letters to  
24 the commission and the legislative budget board on what the  
25 true needs are. Because I think, from PTAC -- and you all can

1 correct me or add on. But sort of the priorities we have  
2 talked about, at least as it comes to funding is, like Brad  
3 mentioned, there has not been a funding increase since 2001.  
4 So again, we're asking -- we've been asked to do more and more  
5 and more and more, with technically, less and less and less  
6 and less, not even the same, because inflation, it's not worth  
7 what it was in 2001. And every time we go to the legislative  
8 budget board, I think we got an additional 3-million over the  
9 biennium, related to the census.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: That was just for census.

11 MS. BLOOMER: That was just for the census impact.  
12 So that's restoring the per capita funding for Texas. I mean,  
13 Texas has grown. So not only are we expecting to serve more  
14 people, but we now have less money in 2001 dollars to do it  
15 with.

16 State of good repair. We all got an influx of  
17 funding from ARA, which was great. We're four, five, six,  
18 seven years down the road. Now what? All those vehicles need  
19 to replace. What's the plan to do that?

20 And then multi-modal. Like you said, making those  
21 connections. If we have a commuter rail line that stops in  
22 the middle, and there's no system that connects once you get  
23 off, what's the point of building this lovely, beautiful  
24 commuter rail line that won't get you anywhere except downtown  
25 to downtown.

1           And then inner-city bus connections. We're losing a  
2 lot of our inner-city carriers --

3           UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

4           MS. BLOOMER: -- in the State of Texas, and that's  
5 something that PTAC has sort of raised on the item, is how do  
6 we continue to keep that connectivity when we're losing the  
7 private, for-profit inner-city carriers.

8           MR. GLEASON: Michelle, when we get the minutes, or  
9 the transcript from the meeting, we'll forward this section of  
10 them to you, so you'll have them.

11          MS. CONKLE: Okay.

12          MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

13          MR. GLEASON: In addition to --

14          MS. CONKLE: I just -- that's as much for us as it  
15 is for you, so that we're -- because we're -- I mean, I think  
16 that -- again, I can't express enough that it's been -- we've  
17 gotten a really interesting mix of folks coming to the  
18 meetings, and they're asking for the things that you -- you  
19 promote and the dollars you fight for every day. It would be  
20 -- it would be a shame not to, you know, while we're in this  
21 process -- we only do this every four years -- not to try to  
22 work cooperatively to have some folks that actually know --  
23 because again, I know what I'm handed, I work with the STIP, I  
24 understand some funding categories. But it would be a shame  
25 not to have the folks that understand this better than anyone,

1 which are the people in this room, not be involved with the,  
2 you know, public involvement and stakeholder workshops going  
3 forward.

4           Because again, we've invited -- we've invited all  
5 the modes, you know, to give us -- to provide us with  
6 stakeholders that they would like at the stakeholder  
7 workshops. We've invited all of the stakeholders to provide  
8 plans. Like you said, I'm not -- I'm not familiar with all of  
9 your plans. I know some of those plans. But if it's provided  
10 to us, then we're going to give it to the consultants who are  
11 going to be working this through the asset management.

12           If we don't have it, that's a missing piece, in my  
13 mind. And it's not something that we are going to be able to  
14 recover from very easily as we're spending two or three months  
15 on asset management, if we don't get it until, say, May.

16           UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

17           MS. CONKLE: So we need to be very, very conscious  
18 in working with our PTN division to identify all the plans  
19 that are relevant to this issue, you know, issue that you're  
20 having with funding, or this issue you're having with  
21 capacity, and make sure that we get those in early and often,  
22 as new numbers come out, while we're doing asset management.

23           MR. GADBOIS: Although Michelle, in -- actually, the  
24 way I see more money happening is different than that. I just  
25 happened to, for another reason, see Maryland's DOT's long-

1 range plan of late. And they simply set goals. We're going  
2 to reduce single-occupant vehicles by 30 percent, right?  
3 Well, as soon as you do that, whether you hit it or not is not  
4 near as important as, all of a sudden, that starts really  
5 directing serious money. Are we going to get to something  
6 like that in the performance side?

7 MS. CONKLE: I -- that's absolutely. If we set a  
8 goal, we're going to have the money that we receive on both  
9 sides of the table, whether we receive it from FTA or FHWA,  
10 both come out of the Highway Trust Fund; you know, are going  
11 to be -- they're going to be looked at, in terms of, did you  
12 -- did you even come close? Did you set targets and goals  
13 that you could meet.

14 This is -- this is exactly -- I'm not going to sit  
15 here and say I know what our commission is going to do. But  
16 they've gone out and tasked us with -- with you all and the  
17 users to tell us what those goals should be. If there were --  
18 we need to reduce single-occupancy vehicles by 30 percent --  
19 I'm sorry, you said Maryland -- like Maryland did, then -- and  
20 there's a loud enough voice, and that's adopted, well, of  
21 course, that's going to drive it, because it absolutely has  
22 to. That is the federal mandate, is that these targets are  
23 met with the money that comes back to us. And if they're not,  
24 we're going to get to explain why they weren't.

25 And the only way to -- if you set that as a priority

1 and a goal, and we set it as a target, I'm just going to  
2 assume we're all going in to this, you know, well meaning, and  
3 that we're actually going to try to do that. And we're going  
4 to match up the projects -- that's, again, part of this  
5 process, is matching up the projects and the plans with the  
6 goals and targets.

7           Now again, there's been a lot of discussion out in  
8 the public -- and you'll see this when you start seeing the  
9 comments. They realize there's no more money, and they  
10 realize we can't continue to do more with less. And you  
11 understand -- we understand inflation all too well because we  
12 never indexed the gas tax, and what we're collecting right now  
13 at 38 cents doesn't go nearly as far as it did in 1990, which  
14 was the last time we had an increase.

15           So this is on the forefront, with providers, with  
16 users. And they are not -- despite what you may think, they  
17 are not opposed to talking about that, they have not been  
18 hostile. They have been saying, what do we have to do to get  
19 this system improved or that system improved, which is just --  
20 I mean, that's -- like I said, that's incredible for me,  
21 having done this for 27 years. It's usually, we don't want a  
22 this or we don't want a that. And it's like, what do we have  
23 to do to get improvements in the system. So they're talking  
24 to us.

25           And like I said, a lot of them are public transit

1 users, they're people that would use public transit if the  
2 connectivity was there. And they're bicycle -- bicyclists and  
3 pedestrians that need all types of modes to get where they're  
4 going because they have needs.

5           So we need to have -- we need to have folks out  
6 there that represent these modes, that represent the providers  
7 that need these funds out there talking to the folks that want  
8 to help us with a solution. Do you see what I'm saying? It's  
9 like they want to help, they want to know what they can do.  
10 And some of the success stories we've heard is because they've  
11 already gone to their local TxDOT office or their local MPO,  
12 and they've already done things at a local level that's  
13 improved, you know, their system, evidently they have a -- I  
14 didn't get to see it, but the next time I'm up in Wichita  
15 Falls, they just opened up a public transit hub that is  
16 supposed to be -- and again, it's amazing to me because it's a  
17 smaller city, where typically all during my education and  
18 planning we've heard, that won't work because you don't have  
19 the capacity, that won't work. Well, it's working. And it's  
20 -- and they don't have a congestion problem, which is also  
21 kind of antithetical to the way that you learn planning in  
22 school, is that -- is that we put it in here, because we know  
23 we're going to need it. We know we have an aging population,  
24 and we know we have folks that are not, you know, going to be  
25 traveling in cars much longer. So we're building it before we

1 need it, while we can afford it, and we know that it's going  
2 to get -- be well used, and it already is. They're just  
3 really awesome comments we're getting.

4           And the great thing would be that the next time we  
5 go out, is that we have folks that then can talk to them about  
6 their particular needs. And so we should -- you know, we  
7 should work together to make sure that you have an opportunity  
8 to get something out of, not only the public involvement but  
9 that you have a larger role in our plan. If --

10           MS. BLOOMER: So you hadn't -- sorry, Glenn. You  
11 had mentioned demographics. So is that being taken into  
12 consideration, the fact that we have this coming tsunami of  
13 older adults that are going to be reaching the age where --  
14 hey, I'm in there, too.

15           (Laughter.)

16           MS. CONKLE: No, absolutely.

17           MS. BLOOMER: That either don't want to drive  
18 anymore, or shouldn't be driving anymore, and that we provide  
19 them the options available to them, sort of like the demand  
20 management. If we're going to put a tollway to move you off,  
21 well, then we have to give you options, versus we move those  
22 folks into assisted-living facilities, which ends up, as a  
23 state and as taxpayers, costing us more than if we were to  
24 provide the resources they need to be able to maintain their  
25 independence, by having different modes of transportation, not

1 an automobile.

2 MS. CONKLE: That has come up. And it is -- it's  
3 been told to us that this is not -- that's not really -- it's  
4 not really an option to be considered, you know, in some  
5 mathematical formula. It is -- it is our responsibility as a  
6 DOT to make sure that there are options. And we've had people  
7 comment on that. And again, we've -- that's very much come  
8 up.

9 We -- irrespective, we do have a very large  
10 population, aging population. We have a very large population  
11 of folks that aren't old enough to drive yet. We have a  
12 thousand people a month moving into Texas. It -- it is --  
13 this is absolutely driving the discussion. It's driving the  
14 discussion about we can't do more with less because it's not  
15 sustainable.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

17 MS. CONKLE: And one of the goal areas that was  
18 proposed, and then I got a call from Bike Texas today that  
19 wanted to -- they decided they wanted to officially get on  
20 that, let's add a goal, you know, I guess a thread in the  
21 discussion was that it was pointed out that none of these  
22 goals is going to be attainable if we don't add a goal for  
23 sustainable funding across all modes. And that makes absolute  
24 sense. It's the one that -- it's the one everybody knows  
25 needs to be there, but nobody wants to talk about.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

2 MS. CONKLE: But it's the one that the public has  
3 been telling us we're ready to talk to you about it. And I'm  
4 saying if you're ready, and you're having polite, you know,  
5 discussions with us, we should be talking to you about that,  
6 you know, while you are in amicable mode to talk about that.

7 And then also, I had someone call from the biking  
8 community today saying we need to talk about economics, we  
9 need to talk about what bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
10 bring to local economics. Because if you are able to -- you  
11 know, if you're able to enhance the economy in a local area,  
12 they might be more willing to come to the table for these  
13 public/private partnerships, as long as they can keep their  
14 money in their area, which makes perfect sense to me. So just  
15 discussions I've never, ever, ever been broached about.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

17 MS. CONKLE: And so this is good stuff, I'm telling  
18 you it's good stuff. And we need the people that are  
19 representing these modes out there. And that's why when I  
20 send -- we did tell people, when you send these comments in,  
21 you know, unless you want to remain anonymous, we're going to  
22 give them to people who might be able to get in touch with you  
23 and talk to you, and I would encourage you to do so because  
24 they want to talk. I just can't -- I can only talk about  
25 things that I know about --

1 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

2 MS. CONKLE: -- and then tell them I can get this to  
3 -- you know, by -- well, I know some about that. But you  
4 know, public transportation or aviation or rail, we've had a  
5 lot of discussion about rail, so I'm going to have to get that  
6 over to our rail division, and Caroline Mays is working on the  
7 freight plan. But it's -- we've got a -- we've got a really  
8 good opportunity here, and you should be involved, absolutely.  
9 So we'll work through Eric to make sure that happens.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then once you have the  
11 plan, am I correct in assuming that the Commission will  
12 approve or adopt the plan?

13 MS. CONKLE: Yes.

14 MS. BLOOMER: And then how does the plan then impact  
15 the annual or biennium funding decisions that are made?

16 MS. CONKLE: Part of -- part of becoming a  
17 performance-based plan is we'll have to come up with an  
18 implementation. I hate plan, plan, plan. But a plan to  
19 implement the plan, an implementation plan. Because, again,  
20 we're going to have to come back and annually, starting in  
21 2015, we're going to have to report back to the federal  
22 government how we're -- how we're managing our money towards  
23 those goals we identified. They're self-identified goals, so  
24 there really won't be a good excuse for not -- you know, and  
25 we're allowed to set our own targets.

1           So we're going to have to show how we spent that  
2 money that came to us, you know, in reaching those goals and  
3 making those targets. So there will be an implementation part  
4 of this plan that -- it's a natural -- I guess a natural  
5 byproduct, if you will, to be able to connect the plans and  
6 the policies to the actual programs that are going to be  
7 funding the projects that are supposed to meet those goals.

8           MR. GLEASON: Michelle?

9           MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh. Eric.

10          MR. GLEASON: If I could suggest to the committee,  
11 so in the spirit of commenting, if the committee wishes to  
12 comment as a committee --

13          MS. BLOOMER: Committee.

14          MR. GLEASON: -- then they'll either need to take  
15 some action today, and one option is, as you've done in the  
16 past, there are a handful of you that are comfortable enough  
17 with the conversation to reflect it in a comment on behalf of  
18 the committee, that would be one approach. The other approach  
19 would be to come back in January and work with the transcript  
20 and put something together then.

21                 But I think one of the -- I think weighing in on  
22 this formally sooner, rather than later, is always a good  
23 idea. And I don't know if December is a better time for you  
24 all to hear from the committee formally, or whether it can  
25 wait until the end of January.

1 MS. CONKLE: Well --

2 MR. GLEASON: Given -- I mean, in terms of being  
3 most --

4 MS. CONKLE: Sure.

5 MR. GLEASON: -- influential, and the next time this  
6 becomes public, what it looks like --

7 MS. CONKLE: Right.

8 MR. GLEASON: -- when do you need something from  
9 these guys?

10 MS. CONKLE: We're going to be pulling these  
11 together over -- again, you know, December is just a hard  
12 month to do anything because of the holidays. And January, we  
13 have TRB, we have a bunch of different, you know, things going  
14 on. I think that our hope is to get this to the Commission  
15 sometime late January, early February. So January certainly  
16 wouldn't be late.

17 I think, also, I want to point out, if you were to  
18 comment today on it, if you have some things that you want to  
19 comment today on, it's not going to preclude you from  
20 commenting, again, more -- you know, with a more thorough  
21 discussion of the issues in January. As a matter of fact,  
22 it's just more support, you know, and shows that you had a  
23 comment to make today, but that, you know, given some time to  
24 process the things we've said -- and also, you haven't seen  
25 the comments yet. You haven't seen the comments from the

1 public, and I think you really want to see those. It's  
2 really, really good information. You could come back and  
3 comment more formally, you know, after you've seen those  
4 comments, as well. Whatever you want to do, we're going to  
5 take them both, we'll take anything you send us.

6 MR. GLEASON: But the commission may see the results  
7 of this process, around this level of information, they may  
8 see it as soon as their January meeting.

9 MS. CONKLE: Yes, end of January.

10 MR. GLEASON: Okay. And our semi-annual is --  
11 typically is not until the third week in January.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Right. I think it's the 18th.

13 MR. GLEASON: My recommendation to this committee is  
14 that you either take some action today or delegate to a subset  
15 of your group to pull together some comments that can be  
16 forwarded to Michelle in the December time frame, just so that  
17 those are in front of them as we move through the holidays and  
18 into the first part of January.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Can we do development and review over  
20 email?

21 MR. GLEASON: Not as a committee. What you can do  
22 today is have a conversation that would outline what the  
23 comments should deal with. And Bobby, you'll need to help me  
24 out here.

25 MR. GADBOIS: We can't -- we can't approve an item

1 over email?

2 MR. GLEASON: Not as a committee.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Well, we --

4 MR. GLEASON: You can send in your individual  
5 thoughts on it.

6 MS. BLOOMER: So we can submit our comments as  
7 individuals.

8 MR. GLEASON: You can --

9 MS. BLOOMER: We can submit our comments --

10 MR. GLEASON: But it -- but it would not be as PTAC.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Right. But I think what we're  
12 interested in is submitting our comments as PTAC. And based  
13 on what I heard Eric say and Michelle say is -- what I would  
14 propose is we submit, sometime in December, preliminary  
15 comments at a very high level --

16 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

17 MS. BLOOMER: -- based off some of the conversation  
18 we had today that -- the areas that we're interested in, some  
19 of -- you know, and the ideas that we've talked about today,  
20 and that we reserve more detailed comment pending receipt of  
21 the other comments.

22 But I do think it's important that when we  
23 acknowledge that this is going on, and that -- and to thank  
24 for including us in the beginning, since that was an issue we  
25 had last time, and providing some general, high-level guidance

1 at this point. And then once we can get the information, have  
2 the semi-annual meeting and get more feedback, provide more  
3 detail, more detailed comments.

4 MR. GADBOIS: But now we would have to have some  
5 discussion to agree on at least the bullet points of what  
6 would be in that communication, and decide one or two people  
7 to actually develop it --

8 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

9 MR. GADBOIS: -- as a PTAC action.

10 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

12 MR. GLEASON: Correct.

13 MS. BLOOMER: But we can go back and do all the  
14 writing and wordsmithing outside the meeting.

15 MR. GADBOIS: Right. Got it.

16 MS. CONKLE: If it doesn't come in until January,  
17 though, we're not going to exclude it. If we have it --

18 MR. GLEASON: I know it won't be excluded. And  
19 we've talked about this before.

20 MS. CONKLE: Right.

21 MR. GLEASON: But my interest is, is in when is it  
22 going to be the most helpful.

23 MS. CONKLE: Yes. When does it have the most  
24 impact? It -- obviously, we all know, working in some sector  
25 of this business, early, often and the more often you can do

1 it, and the earlier you can do it, the more impact it has. So  
2 I -- I absolutely agree with what -- with any of the scenarios  
3 that you've talked about.

4           And again, we will -- if we get into a discussion  
5 where we really need to, you know, maybe go to the commission  
6 as a discussion item, but there needs to be more time, we're  
7 not adverse and we've talked to Eric about this, with, you  
8 know, sliding the schedule a little bit. I mean, if we -- all  
9 of a sudden, we're starting to get a whole lot of comments --  
10 we were getting to the point of identifying the goals, and  
11 then people just got really motivated across the state,  
12 whatever, in January, this is not a process in my mind that  
13 should ever say your comment was due by close of business on  
14 this day. And we're -- that's not -- that's not what we do.  
15 I know that project specific --

16           MR. GADBOIS: And we get that, and I appreciate  
17 that. So I'm going to make a motion on process.

18           MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

19           MR. GADBOIS: And then, as the discussion on the  
20 motion, we can flesh out what the bullet points would be.

21           I move that Michelle take charge of drafting, with  
22 -- you select the person, I'll volunteer myself if you want my  
23 help with it. But that two people from this committee,  
24 Michelle leading that, draft a letter to be delivered on  
25 behalf of PTAC in mid-December, with the bullet points as

1 discussed and agreed to by this group. I would add the one  
2 item that we send around for -- to -- we get staff to send  
3 around to PTAC what we draft to make sure we didn't miss any  
4 points. And then it's ready to send out. Can we do that?

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Bobby, did you hear all that?

6 MS. BLOOMER: Is that an official motion?

7 MR. GADBOIS: That's not -- that's not a PTAC vote.  
8 That's just getting their -- getting their input to confirm  
9 that's what they agreed to. Can we do that in an email?

10 MR. KILLEBREW: You can make that motion. There  
11 still needs to be content to your motion, so the bullet points  
12 that you're getting to, yes.

13 MR. GADBOIS: And the discussion is going to add the  
14 bullet points. It -- but we can do that part of the process?

15 MR. KILLEBREW: The discussion --

16 MR. GADBOIS: Develop --

17 MR. KILLEBREW: -- is going to happen outside of --

18 MR. GADBOIS: No, no, no.

19 MS. BLOOMER: It's part of the motion.

20 MR. GADBOIS: The motion is Michelle and with Glenn  
21 develop a draft that will then be emailed to the group, to  
22 make sure that we got the bullet points right in text. And  
23 then we will send that off by mid-November. The discussion --

24 MS. BLOOMER: December.

25 MR. GADBOIS: -- on this motion -- December. We

1 will -- the discussion on this motion will supply the bullet  
2 points.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: Since you are now involved in that,  
4 I will second that motion.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Can I just --

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: Put a vote on the floor.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Can I just make a clarification. So  
8 this letter will be the preliminary comment letter, with a  
9 subsequent, more detailed comment letter to be -- opportunity  
10 to provide a second, more detailed letter, upon receipt of the  
11 general public comments received.

12 MR. GADBOIS: We can clarify that in the letter.  
13 That's the first good discussion point. And yes, we would put  
14 that in the draft.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we have a motion and a  
16 second, so now opening it up for discussion on the bullet  
17 points, with one of them being it's the first --

18 MR. GADBOIS: Of many.

19 MS. BLOOMER: -- first letter; provide additional  
20 detailed comments upon receipt of public comments from the  
21 meetings. Okay.

22 Some of the other things we threw out is just  
23 expressing appreciation for allowing PTAC to provide comment,  
24 and to provide it early on.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Also with that, I appreciate the

1 process generally. I mean, what I heard today, this process  
2 has been more open and engaging than what I have seen at times  
3 in the past, and so, you know, I think we ought to recognize  
4 and applaud that.

5 MS. CONKLE: We are -- we are -- I think at -- I  
6 think it's important to note, too, the process is more open.  
7 And what we've been allowed to do is we've been allowed to  
8 have discussions, where we acknowledge that we're not just  
9 TxDOT employees, we're using the system. We're no different  
10 than anybody else. And those things that are important to our  
11 users are important to us, as well. And we -- you know, we  
12 have to acknowledge, we appreciate the administration, and I  
13 appreciate my director Marc Williams, because he's out there  
14 telling us to engage, telling us to engage, but I guess giving  
15 us -- giving us the atmosphere to be able to do that. So  
16 we're very appreciative to new ways of looking at things.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

18 MR. GADBOIS: We won't talk about that part since  
19 Marc didn't come to talk to us directly.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Back to the bullets of the letter. Is  
21 everybody good with the key priority areas of restoring the  
22 per capita spending levels, state of good repair, multi-modal,  
23 and inner-city bus? Are there others?

24 MR. GADBOIS: I don't -- I don't disagree with the  
25 intent. I don't think that's an appropriate level for what

1 this plan usually is. I mean, I think that we ought to be --  
2 we ought to be asserting that this plan should prioritize  
3 multi-modal, should seek both traditional and nontraditional  
4 ways to increase investment in transit, but detailing out  
5 specific programs as an implementation issue.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. J.R. or Brad, do you have any  
7 --

8 MR. SALAZAR: Concur.

9 MS. BLOOMER: On what?

10 MR. GADBOIS: To what? You weren't paying  
11 attention.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. BLOOMER: On what?

14 MR. SALAZAR: I'm reading the survey. I'm --

15 MR. UNDERWOOD: It's very similar to our LAR, I  
16 think. I mean, what we're talking about here are some of the  
17 same things we've been talking about for a long time, so I'm  
18 -- I'm good with it. You know that. I think the survey is  
19 very good. Can I comment on that? I think it's really good.  
20 Public transportation has its own section.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: We like this, Michelle. We like  
23 this.

24 MS. CONKLE: We are listening. We are listening.  
25 We are.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: This is great.

2 MS. CONKLE: Thank you very much for allowing us the  
3 opportunity to present. We've got another -- someplace we  
4 have to be at 4:00, but we'll come back to you --

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

6 MS. CONKLE: -- and we'll work through Eric and  
7 Kelly, and work through Bobby.

8 (Participants confer.)

9 MS. BLOOMER: Can you -- you took the white board.

10 MS. CONKLE: Oh.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Can you just write it down --

12 MS. CONKLE: You know what?

13 MS. BLOOMER: -- and shoot it to Bobby or --

14 MS. CONKLE: You know what? We --

15 MS. BLOOMER: -- vice-versa.

16 MS. CONKLE: That was force of habit, that we take  
17 it.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. CONKLE: But you know, it's probably all been  
20 discussed since you all have a court reporter, so I'm going to  
21 leave it with you.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. CONKLE: All right? Sorry.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Because we can use that as part of our  
25 --

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Okay.

2 MS. BLOOMER: -- letter and discussion.

3 MS. CONKLE: I'm going to take your notes away from  
4 you. Thank you again for letting us present to you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

8 MS. CONKLE: Have a good afternoon and safe driving.

9 MS. BLOOMER: So before we take a final vote on the  
10 motion, can I just go back?

11 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, you can.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. In addition to the letter, I'd  
13 just make sure that we're going to share the PTAC minutes with  
14 Michelle Conkle and her staff, and asking Eric, can you please  
15 share the regional coordination plans with them as well, if we  
16 haven't already?

17 MR. GLEASON: Now question for the committee.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

19 MR. GLEASON: All right to share the unapproved  
20 minutes --

21 MS. BLOOMER: I think --

22 MR. GLEASON: -- with them?

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Yes, or the transcript, when it's  
25 available.

1 MR. GLEASON: The transcript.

2 MR. KILLEBREW: The transcript. Just an excerpt  
3 from the transcript that we talked about earlier.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

5 MR. KILLEBREW: So not necessarily the minutes. The  
6 minutes won't capture the level of detail.

7 MR. GLEASON: Just the excerpt from the transcript.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: Right. So I think you're actually  
9 going to provide the excerpt.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Right.

11 MR. GADBOIS: Point of order, Madam Chair. We have  
12 a motion on the table. Is that a discussion item for the  
13 motion?

14 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Well, no.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: Point founded.

16 MS. BLOOMER: I've been schooled in Roberts Rule's  
17 of Order. So we have a motion and a second. We will call the  
18 vote.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Well -- well, I think what I'm trying  
20 to get at is we probably have more discussion, I mean, more  
21 bullet point items we want on the letter.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Oh.

23 MR. GADBOIS: And we have to finish that first.

24 MS. BLOOMER: I thought we were done with that.  
25 Okay. So more items. Because all I got out of -- was concur.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Him was survey.

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: And I'm the same.

3 MS. BLOOMER: And -- okay.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So we've talked about -- and I  
5 just want to confirm that these are bullet points -- more  
6 money for -- more investment in transit and multi-modal; that  
7 the plan ought to seek ways to provide stronger connectivity  
8 between modes; that demand management needs to be an element.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Options to make demand management  
10 viable needs to be --

11 MR. GADBOIS: And then it ought to be such a -- it  
12 ought to be sufficient priority in this plan, such that it  
13 reframes the relationship between things like toll roads and  
14 investment in options. I mean, but -- you know, but even  
15 broader than that.

16 You know, looking at, for example, behavior change.  
17 We've got a number of people that are -- y'all are used to  
18 carrying now that are completely transit dependent. But you  
19 have a lot of other people you could serve, if we're talking  
20 about serious change in travel behavior.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Uh-huh.

22 MR. GADBOIS: And then it needs to direct the  
23 funding accordingly. What else did we --

24 MS. BLOOMER: Can we weigh in on their goals?

25 MR. GADBOIS: Yeah, and I think we ought to. I

1 mean, so the congestion, for example, you were taking -- and  
2 safety, I don't -- you were taking issue with safety. I don't  
3 have as much an issue with that because people actually really  
4 care about that. But on the congestion --

5 MS. BLOOMER: Well, I care about safety.

6 MR. GADBOIS: I know, but -- but --

7 MS. BLOOMER: But to me it's not the primary goal of  
8 TxDOT. It's a secondary goal.

9 MR. GADBOIS: We can argue over drafting points over  
10 that.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. GADBOIS: But on the congestion stuff, without a  
13 doubt, you know, congestion has driven a lot -- reducing  
14 congestion has driven a lot of what they do, the Department  
15 has done thus far.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

17 MR. GADBOIS: And to the extent that we can reframe  
18 that --

19 UNIDENTIFIED: I would just say, I don't think you  
20 want to get it so lengthy that it's, you know, something  
21 that's not to the point.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Oh, we're still at half a page, maybe  
23 a page.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: I was going to say you think.

25 MS. BLOOMER: Well, and I think what I'd like to do

1 is, you know, sort of just -- we can talk about the general  
2 letter off line, but hit just really the high points and the  
3 key things, is -- you know, maybe it's just reframing the  
4 focus.

5 MR. GLEASON: If I could, this page is what they  
6 really --

7 MS. BLOOMER: Want.

8 MR. GLEASON: -- are looking for comments on right  
9 now.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

11 MR. GLEASON: You want to boil it down to the  
12 simplest thing.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

14 MR. GLEASON: And so I think, if the committee has  
15 some consensus, thoughts around -- in addition to what you've  
16 said, but specifically on this page, or wants to frame those  
17 points in the context of this page, that will make sense.

18 MR. GADBOIS: Well, it's just so -- so -- and I was  
19 trying to figure out how to say this, to see if you all agreed  
20 with it. Maybe this is back to your point that the Department  
21 needs to be looking at moving people and goods, not vehicles;  
22 and congestion, therefore, kind of misses the point.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

24 MR. GADBOIS: How about something like that?

25 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Because moving people then gets it  
2 back to we're going to look at effective ways to move people,  
3 not build roads for cars, but look at transit as a real  
4 option, et cetera.

5 The other one that bugged me up there is economic  
6 vitality. And so let me just ask you all's opinion on this.  
7 I actually think what they ought to be looking at is economic  
8 value or economic development. Economic vitality I don't get  
9 as a goal, much less something that you could actually  
10 measure. I mean, it -- because that then becomes very  
11 relative to, you know, who thinks what's vital.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

13 MR. UNDERWOOD: One thing I don't really understand,  
14 since we're talking about things we don't understand, customer  
15 service. Am I missing that? What is that?

16 MS. BLOOMER: What does that mean?

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: What does that mean?

18 MS. BLOOMER: Well, we skipped those slides.

19 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

20 MS. BLOOMER: I think there's --

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: Oh, they're in here? Oh, yeah.

22 MS. BLOOMER: And I'm sure we all read this before  
23 we came.

24 "Includes educating all transportation stakeholders  
25 on the plan decision-making process, soliciting and

1 providing opportunities for input, then integrating  
2 customer feedback into the transportation plan and  
3 project delivery process."

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

5 MS. BLOOMER: So I think, in that context, that  
6 would be something we would continue to encourage TxDOT to do,  
7 to be open. And I think, you know, linking it back to this  
8 process, it's much more, I would say, inclusive and customer  
9 service oriented than the past processes.

10 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, do you -- I feel we have enough  
12 for at least our first high-level --

13 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

14 MS. BLOOMER: -- comment, since we moved do that.

15 Are we read to take the motion?

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: Call the vote.

17 MS. BLOOMER: All right. I have a motion and a  
18 second. We will take a vote. Rob?

19 MR. STEPHENS: Aye.

20 MS. BLOOMER: All right, Rob. Glenn.

21 MR. GADBOIS: Aye.

22 MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

23 MR. SALAZAR: Aye.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, aye. Brad?

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: Aye.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Motion passes.

2 Now since we've taken care of that, Eric, just for  
3 my notes, the follow-up items I have is to share the PTAC  
4 transcript, just that portion of it related to this  
5 conversation with TPP; to share the regional coordination  
6 plans with TTP. If we have transit asset management plans or  
7 vehicle capital replacement data to share with them -- because  
8 that was one thing she mentioned -- if we don't get it in now,  
9 as far as what the financial need is to maintain the existing  
10 system --

11 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Yeah.

12 MS. BLOOMER: And then, at the point when TPP has  
13 the public comments, that you will share those with PTAC.

14 MR. GLEASON: What was the thing on the regional  
15 coordination plans?

16 MS. BLOOMER: Well, she mentioned that there -- you  
17 take -- that they've gone to the MPOs and gotten the  
18 metropolitan transportation plans, and they have the TIP and  
19 the STIP.

20 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

21 MS. BLOOMER: And they're looking at all plans  
22 available. And my --

23 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Is we should be sharing our regional  
25 coordination plans with them; hence, the consultant, because

1 there's a lot of ideas, needs, gaps --

2 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

3 MS. BLOOMER: -- that they could pull from.

4 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

5 MS. BLOOMER: They're going to love us. They have  
6 to read all that. But I think if we want to be part of that,  
7 that would be a good opportunity. Were there any other things  
8 related to that?

9 MR. GLEASON: Unh-unh.

10 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If not, we will close Item 4.  
11 And we're working our way up the agenda. So Eric, if you'd  
12 like to give your division director's report, with the laser  
13 disc version.

14 MR. GLEASON: I'll just go over these real briefly.  
15 I think they're pretty straightforward. The administrative  
16 code changes are in effect. Good job, everybody. Coordinated  
17 call projects is out. We've extended the application due date  
18 until February.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Excuse me. Excuse me. How did Brad  
20 do?

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you very much.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Inspiration.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: He was inspirational.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. GADBOIS: Thanks to Brad.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Something about it taking a long  
2 time, and it was finally over.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Plenty of industry participation.

5 MR. GLEASON: Program workshops. We are -- you  
6 know, this is part of our new and improved -- Chris is not  
7 here -- new and improved 5310 effort, where we are kicking off  
8 our process a little later than we normally do, just to allow  
9 us to take advantage of the new administrative code, pieces of  
10 that. And we're attempting to make some improvements in our  
11 outreach efforts for that.

12 And then, at the November meeting, just last week in  
13 Tyler, the Commission did expand the membership on the Bicycle  
14 Advisory Committee from seven to 11. They added members from  
15 the Tyler area, Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso.

16 MR. UNDERWOOD: Those have to be appointed by the  
17 Governor and Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker of the House?

18 MR. GLEASON: No, just -- this committee --

19 MR. UNDERWOOD: Oh, gotcha.

20 MR. GLEASON: -- has that requirement.

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you for that clarification.

22 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, have we had any luck --

23 MR. GLEASON: No.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: No.

2 MR. GADBOIS: This is the only commission that isn't  
3 appointed by commissioners, TxDOT commissioners?

4 MR. GLEASON: To my knowledge, all of the department  
5 advisory committees, with the exception of this one -- I don't  
6 know for sure -- that all the ones I'm familiar with, the  
7 Commission does -- the Port Advisory Committee, the Freight  
8 Advisory Committee, the Lone Star Rail we have appointments.  
9 So the Commission does all those. The Commission used to do  
10 this committee.

11 MR. GADBOIS: This committee.

12 MR. GLEASON: And then, several sessions ago, there  
13 was a change put in place that actually --

14 MR. GADBOIS: Well actually --

15 MR. GLEASON: -- took it back to the way it used to  
16 be before the Commission did it, so it's --

17 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and I thought that was supposed  
18 to be for all of the commissions, not just this one. That's  
19 why I'm surprised.

20 MR. GLEASON: No, it's just this one, it was singled  
21 out.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

23 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, the fifty-three --

24 MR. GADBOIS: What does the industry do, guys?

25 (Laughter.)

1 MS. BLOOMER: It was -- never mind. The 5310  
2 program workshop, those are for the 5310 funding that the  
3 Department has to award, correct?

4 MR. GLEASON: That's correct.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

6 MR. GLEASON: That is correct.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any questions for Eric on the  
8 director's report?

9 MR. SALAZAR: I don't have a question, Eric; just a  
10 comment. I know, on the 5310, it seems to get bogged down  
11 here. And I don't mean to do that. But I have heard some  
12 comments of -- and I don't know why transit providers are  
13 being upset over the public outreach. You know, why are we  
14 trying to invite more people to the table? There's not enough  
15 money to begin with. Why are we asking Bobby's MHMR to come  
16 to the -- to the meeting, and that kind of stuff. It just --  
17 just so you know.

18 MR. GLEASON: Well, and part of it is because the  
19 new MAP-21 requirements actually are much more explicit about  
20 needing to do that. So it's not just because we're trying to,  
21 you know, get people to coordinate.

22 MR. SALAZAR: Right.

23 MR. GLEASON: It really is much more explicit about  
24 the need to have those folks at the table, and so part of it  
25 is that.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Well, and I'll be less politic than  
2 you will be, which won't surprise you at all.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. GADBOIS: Some places -- I mean, is -- you know,  
5 Dave sat here and kind of showed in his discussion, some  
6 places do, you know, a really good job of trying to be --  
7 coordinate, and bring people in --

8 MR. GLEASON: Sure.

9 MR. GADBOIS: -- and be innovative and all that sort  
10 of stuff, and other places don't. And you know, and as a  
11 state you've got to deal with the whole range, right?

12 And so some people that are doing well have to  
13 suffer a little bit more process, and others have more process  
14 than they want.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Is -- since we now have the new 5310  
16 process established and all that, and I don't believe we had  
17 it in place at the July semi-annual, is that an item on the  
18 January --

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

20 MS. BLOOMER: -- semi-annual? So maybe it could be  
21 explained to folks that are there why, if it's a requirement  
22 for MAP, this is why we're doing it, so they don't just think  
23 it's --

24 UNIDENTIFIED: But I -- there are some things in  
25 there that I do like. For example, there's -- Brad and I are

1 in the Fort Worth/Dallas district, that I'm not -- no longer  
2 judging his application, and he is no longer judging my  
3 application.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Yeah.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Yeah.

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: I look forward to doing that every  
7 year, generally.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We already had -- any more  
9 public comment? We've lost our public.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: They're not there.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Next meeting date. Bobby, do you  
12 happen to know? It's the last Tuesday of --

13 MR. KILLEBREW: January, that's what's scheduled.  
14 Y'all had communicated you might want that closer to the semi-  
15 annual meeting. The last Tuesday in January is January 28th.  
16 The semi-annual meeting is the 14th.

17 So it's that --

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Or the 15th.

19 MS. BLOOMER: I think it's the 15th.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: It's the 15th.

21 MS. BLOOMER: 15th.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: And just so you know, too, on that,  
23 the RFP for the MTP is January 16th.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: 16th.

25 UNIDENTIFIED: Well, you know, it was the 6th.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: I know that. I know.

2 (Laughter.)

3 UNIDENTIFIED: And we made all the plans and then I  
4 just talked to Dimitri a couple weeks ago --

5 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: -- and, oh, it's going to shift up  
7 two weeks.

8 (Laughter.)

9 UNIDENTIFIED: There it is.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Hey. You know what, if you don't  
11 have it done by the 15th, you're probably not going to make  
12 the 16th, either, right?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: Probably not going to have it done  
14 anyway, so I'll be there anyway.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Are we going to need time, though,  
16 between the semi-annual and the PTAC meeting to prepare the  
17 comments or thoughts that we'd want to keep the meeting at the  
18 28th?

19 UNIDENTIFIED: I could do the 28th or the 21st. It  
20 doesn't matter to me.

21 But I mean, I kind of like having it be more fresh  
22 on my mind, the things we heard at the semi-annual; so  
23 therefore, it would lend itself to the 21st, but that's --  
24 either way, I'm fine.

25 MR. KILLEBREW: So you're looking at the week

1 following the semi-annual.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: Uh-huh.

3 MS. BLOOMER: But as far as PTN staff time and being  
4 able to turn that around.

5 MR. KILLEBREW: Turn what around, the comments from  
6 the PTAC?

7 MS. BLOOMER: The comments from the semi-annual.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: Or from the semi-annual?

9 MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh. And the comments from today,  
10 and the comments from the working group finalized on a  
11 regional coordination piece, in addition to the TTP.

12 MR. KILLEBREW: What I would say is anything coming  
13 out of the semi-annual you may not see until the day of your  
14 meeting.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

16 MR. KILLEBREW: If it's the 21st. We won't make a  
17 commitment to get that out to you the Thursday before -- we'll  
18 try. But it may be that, with everything else happening, that  
19 you may see that for the first time --

20 MS. BLOOMER: At the meeting? Does anybody have  
21 issue with leaving it at the 28th?

22 UNIDENTIFIED: I don't think so.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

24 MR. GADBOIS: The 28th is --

25 MR. KILLEBREW: And if it's the 28th --

1 MR. GADBOIS: The 28th is close enough, and with  
2 staff notes, that will keep Brad's mind fresh enough.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He's not that old.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you.

5 MS. BLOOMER: All right.

6 MR. KILLEBREW: So we'll leave it at the 28th.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Leave it at the 28th.

8 MR. KILLEBREW: All right.

9 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Anything else from anybody  
10 or Rob?

11 (No verbal response.)

12 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Hearing nothing --

13 MR. STEPHENS: No, I don't have anything to add.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Move to adjourn.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Move the meeting to adjourn. All  
16 those in favor, say aye.

17 PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Aye. Meeting is adjourned. Thank  
19 you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: And members, Michelle Conkle asks --  
21 they're looking for input on these, if you can. But if you  
22 all can fill out this survey sheet today --

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: -- and I can get that to her. It's  
25 part of that Title 6.

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

MR. GADBOIS: And is that in the --

UNIDENTIFIED: It is.

UNIDENTIFIED: That's part of the three pages that she handed out.

(Whereupon, at 3:37 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, KIMBERLY C. McCRIGHT, CET, certified electronic transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 119 constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript from electronic recording of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

DATED this 15th day of October, 2013.



---

Kimberly C. McCright, CET  
Certified Electronic Transcriber