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PROCEEDINGS

MS. BLOOMER: We will go ahead and officially call the meeting to order.

Moving on to item 2, approval of the minutes from the November 2, 2012 meeting. Are there any questions regarding the minutes? If not, I'll entertain a motion for approval.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So moved.

MR. GADBOIS: I'll second.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad made the motion, Glenn seconded. All those in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MS. BLOOMER: The motion passes unanimously.

Moving right along, item 3 on the agenda, the division director's report, so I'll turn it over to you.

MR. GLEASON: You all should have this, and we sent out an updated version yesterday, so I apologize if that came late. And before I go through some of these, there may be any number of these that the committee may decide to hear more on at a future meeting, so these are just to introduce the topics and if the committee wanted to hear more about them, we'll schedule it for a future meeting.

Commission action, January was pretty much low key. February we begin to award the first of the federal
fiscal year 2012 funds that we have. We'll make a formula
award to the rural program, and it's roughly half of what
the annual apportionment to that is expected to be, and
then the same holds true for the 5310 program. So we're
starting to move out on those, and when the balance will
come whenever the apportionment amount -- actually, the
issue right now is that the authorization date doesn't
extend for the full fiscal year. The apportionment amount
or whatever you want to call it, the appropriations, they
have a full year's worth of appropriations but they don't
have an authorizing bill that allows them to distribute
it. So whenever they get that sorted out, we'll begin
working our way through that.

MR. GADBOIS: And that was a six-month
authorization?

MR. GLEASON: Yes. The apportionment amount
worked out to half of what you might expect to get for the
full year.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And Eric, are you probably
hearing the same thing as we are that probably will get
another continuing resolution?

MR. GLEASON: Yes. I mean, I hear stuff every
day and I'm hearing or seeing anything that would suggest
anything really soon.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.
MR. GLEASON: In March then, we're scheduled to move on the amendments that we'll talk about today to the formula program to allow for the census funding to be targeted.

You may recall back in June the commission had passed a minute order establishing a rulemaking advisory committee for the transportation development credit program. The committee selected Michelle to be their representative on that. The first meeting has been scheduled for the first of March, and Michelle has a conflict that day, and so I believe she's asked Brad to attend in her stead.

MR. UNDERWOOD: As her proxy that day, for one meeting only.

MR. GLEASON: One meeting only. Good to see that effort finally get going.

MR. GADBOIS: Congratulations to both of you.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Is it her for the conflict, or me for the meeting?

MR. GADBOIS: Both.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. GLEASON: The next item, the Texas Rural Transportation Plan, this is an effort that the department is undertaking as complimentary to the current long-range transportation plan that was approved in December of 2010.
It's an additional effort to ensure that there's as much
detail on the rural areas of the state and what their
needs are as there is on the more urbanized areas of the
state. And so we are working with our transportation
planning folks on that effort to ensure that the rural
transit needs are included.

And what we're doing in that regard is we've
talked and we've contracted with TTI to put together a
fairly streamlined effort through a series of webinars
that all of the rural transit districts have been invited
to join, and keeping in mind that many of them don't
typically spend a lot of time thinking about what their
system looks like in 2035 or don't have a lot of time to
do that, what we've tried to do with TTI is get them to
focus it so that if they attend the webinar and with a few
hours on the outside of each webinar they can get it done.

And what we hope to accomplish, for the first
time since I've been here anyway, is to at least have some
consistent basic level of information from the rural
transit districts on what they believe they need. And
what that is comprised of generally is the first step is
how much money are you going to need to keep running what
you've got today and to move that through that time frame
to 2035, to adjust for inflation, so what's the amount
that you need for that, and then beyond that, what do you
see as what you would do if you had more resources.

The plan itself is not financially constrained. We've kind of put a target, I think, out there for people based on looking at population growth and per capita spending levels, keeping pace with that, and so we've kind of put a target out there for people to give them a sense of how much additional funding they might be working with, but it's not an absolute constraint.

So that's happening, and the last webinar was on Monday this week, and so we hope to be pulling together that information over the next month. And at the same time, we have the regional coordination plans all being updated, and so those should all be updated if they're not already -- we've got how many in?

MR. KIRKLAND: Twenty.

MR. GLEASON: We've got 20 of the 24 in as updated, so we've got four more to come. And so what we'll have for the first time, I think, since 2006 will be the next generation, consistently the generation across all planning areas of the regional coordination plans. And we've asked TTI also to take a look at all those 24 when they're done, to look across them and to summarize for us common themes and challenges and constraints as well as particularly unique issues that may pop up. And so what I'm hoping we'll have by late spring, anyways, as
a committee -- and I would propose this as a committee --
that we'll have the combination of the effort from the
rural transit districts around the long-range plan and
we'll have the summary of the regional plans, and we can
put those two together and begin to have a conversation, I
think, about what a plan might look like.

So I'm really optimistic about that. I think
when we look at it, some of us will think we still have a
long way to go, and I think that's correct, but I think
for the first time we'll have a pretty good consistent
base of information across the entire state.

MR. GADBOIS: Can we ask as you go along or do
you want to go through this?

MR. GLEASON: You can ask questions.

MR. GADBOIS: I'm much more familiar with the
metro areas and their long-range planning efforts than I
am with what you are doing thus far with the rural, so
it's kind of a question from that frame just to make sure
I understand. So a metropolitan area will already include
some of our rural transit brethren in their planning
processes.

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: And then in addition to that, our
regional coordination plans will include our rural transit
brethren, and somewhere or another there's kind of these
overlapping circles, with some portion of the circle
already having some level of planning, and then some
portion of that larger rural circle not having any of the
other planning. Right?

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MR. GADBOIS: Is the step you're talking about
that you just expressed have hope that we'll start to see
some of the feedback from rural planning in the summary of
the regional coordination plans as the step in which we
can start to look at how all those things coordinate and
feed into each other, or is that already being done?

MR. GLEASON: I would think that would be
something we could talk about. I would say that is an
option for us to look at it. I suspect it's being done
inconsistently in some areas, but clearly that's an
opportunity for us. And I would propose that we schedule
for our next meeting presentations on both these topics to
the committee so you can kind of see what we have. So
that's it with that.

An update on the leadership seminar. Last
month we concluded the second session of the second
leadership seminar, and so to date we've had 48
individuals between the first and the second seminar, so
we've gone through that, and we continue to get really
good feedback from the participants on the program, so I'm
encouraged with that. And we do have, tentatively anyways, enough individuals, or agencies interested in sending individuals to host a third one next year, so we're moving ahead with that as well.

And finally, this is the part that we added to the director's report, we have received four nominations for the Friend of Texas Transit Award, I will say four very competitive nominations, so I'm very encouraged that way. And in the past, a member of this committee has volunteered to help the division and the department look through those applications and to make a recommendation on who ought to get the award. So while this is not an action item for the committee today, if anyone could let me know that they're interested, it would be great.

I think on the committee, J.R., you've been a previous recipient of it.

MR. SALAZAR: I'd be happy to sit in on it.

MR. GLEASON: Why don't you just shoot me a note, and anyone else, or J.R., that would be fine, so shoot me a note in the next day or so and let me know. It's not a lot of time, it might be an hour of your time to come look through the applications and rank them and give us some feedback on what you think.

MR. GADBOIS: And you're looking for one from PTAC and only one. Right?
MR. GLEASON: From PTAC? Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: So why don't we just say now that J.R. is our one?

MR. GLEASON: You can say now whatever you want and that's fine, but it's an informal conversation, it's not part of the agenda.

MR. GADBOIS: But rather than having it such that J.R. says yes, I'll do it, and Al says yes, I'll do it, and then some way or another we have to select that one, why don't we just agree. I mean, if you want somebody besides J.R., that's okay too, but I'd say yes to J.R.

MS. BLOOMER: I think Eric explained is it's not officially on the agenda so we can't take action, so we can informally agree J.R. has kindly volunteered.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. SALAZAR: And then if I could add one thing on the leadership conference, being that I had one of our employees go to it as well and she came back very refreshed and very eager to kind of incorporate some of those things that she learned at the leadership conference. But one thing that I think was important, when we look it as a state, most transit systems throughout the state have either participated as the GM or
somebody within their system, and so there's a few systems that haven't, and I think that's one thing that we worked on, to try to make sure that almost every system, and so we have got commitments from some of those systems that haven't participated in the past to get somebody into the leadership series.

MR. GLEASON: The leadership advisory group that I worked on that kind of took on the responsibility of adopting those districts that had not yet participated to go out and get someone to participate, and that worked very well. We've got, for example, I think we have Aspermont coming finally. Some of those smaller systems that have not yet sent someone yet, we typically don't hear a lot from, so that's really good.

MR. GADBOIS: Can I just suggest we do put this whole issue of rural planning on our agenda for next time, and if we can't take action that we at least shake our heads that that ought to be on there. And Michelle, help me figure out how to say this. Really what I want is not at this point to look at the details of the plan themselves, as I really want to look at kind of the process and the scope to make sure that they are coordinating, we're not yanking rural systems that are in three different overlapping circles in different directions, and that they're getting to spend their time
as effectively towards the same kind of goals and objectives in all those.

MS. BLOOMER: I think we can do that, and that was one of the things I should probably read the transcript not the day before, the morning of because we did ask at the last meeting that this item be put on the agenda and I forgot. So I formally ask that the rural transportation plan and the regional coordination plan, sort of summary of what TTI is doing be its own item on the next agenda. And that way we can discuss sort of how they fit together and then maybe you'll have some preliminary results from the rural transportation plan to share.

MR. GLEASON: We'll get both of these on the next agenda and then we can talk about them.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then I think, too, sort of followup from last time, one of your updates, Eric, was on the sort of FTA discretionary funding and we went through like the state of good repair and livability, et cetera. Could we get a summary of what those programs were and then what was submitted and what was funded? Because we had a lot of discussion about what TxDOT submitted versus what other entities submitted, and you sort of ran through all the folks that got money and we were going to follow up with sort of a summary of what the
programs were and who received funding.

MR. GLEASON: We will do that. I thought we

did throw something together right after the meeting, but

maybe not.

MR. GADBOIS: You may have.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. GLEASON: But yes, we will do that. And

for the committee's information, FTA has released another

round of notices of funding availability, of which state

of good repair is one and livability is another, and so we

are beginning to gear up for that process as well.

MS. BLOOMER: I was starting to think sort of

past see what we had submitted and how well we fared as a

state and then as TxDOT, then to sort of prepare for the

new ones that are coming out and what all those are. I

think that would be helpful for the committee members.

MR. GLEASON: We'll try and put something

together on that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then we had also

talked about following up with FTA because the concern was

that TxDOT itself didn't receive any funding, and Glenn

had asked the question if we were seeing a trend towards

more locally funded projects, and I know that was one

question you were going to ask FTA, as well as how can we

improve our proposal next time for the competitive call.
MR. GLEASON: We did have that conversation with them and while we didn't get them to indicate one way or another whether there was somehow a preference for local versus state, it does seem to us as though they are getting more sophisticated -- is probably not the right word but I'll use it -- in their review and evaluations of proposals. This is the second or third time that they've done, and every time they do it they put out $750 million, this year it's $650 million, and they get $4 billion worth of projects, and somehow some way they get through all of that and they make their decisions. And it seems as though they are trending toward those that provide a lot of detail and really take the time to completely describe the benefits and just more and more detail seems to be a good thing.

We will work more closely this time with the regional office, and while the regional office doesn't have a vote in it, if you will, at points along the way they are asked for their input, and so it seems helpful for them to know as well what we're doing.

The other message that I got is in the past at the application point of the process we have erred on the side of inclusiveness and including more projects, including a large fleet request, and the approach is then when we find out what we'll get, we'll make the decision.
down the line on how much we got and who can get what. That seems to have worked against us this last time. The extent to which they could look at the application and see individual project descriptions that when you looked at them together sort of represented a picture of a range of readiness and need, I think that tended to diminish the significance of our application.

And so for example, on the fleet side one of the things we're looking at is while the 5309 program, which is where these funds flow through, has a 75 percent of useful life threshold for fleet in terms of when you could apply for those program funds, we're going to look at something much higher than that to make our case more compelling. And so for example, if we draw the line at 150 percent based on mileage of useful life, we still have what appears to be, you know, a $15- to $18 million need which is more than we've ever gotten before anyway.

So we're going to try to take the approach on the fleet side of let's pick a threshold far and above what the program requirement is as a way of communicating need and provide them with as much summary level detail and detail on what those members of the fleet are as we can.

And then the other thing on the facilities side, and this is where last year's application really had a range, I think, of projects in it, we're really going to
have to find a way, I think, to focus our request on that
group of projects that are really ready to go because the
competition is so strong out there nationally. And
without earmarks happening, we really don't have another
way to ever assemble enough money at one time to build
some of these facilities, so we're going to have to find a
way as a state and as a community of providers and
applicants to figure out how we can make the choices each
year about which projects get sent in to make us most
competitive.

MR. GADBOIS: And I love when Michelle reads
through the notes of the meeting, she catches all these
great things that we're just not remembering otherwise.
So we had talked about starting to develop something of a
pipeline for these competitive grants.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Rather than recreating the wheel
every year and give us your projects, that we start
developing a pipeline two, three, five years out, that can
build the build the clarity, more definition, refinement
of the projects as they move through that pipeline so that
somebody from your shop can say, okay, these are ready to
go for this year's call, looking at year two saying maybe
if these five, ten, however many had better definition
around them they could be competitive, but then that gives
a year to prepare for that, and that makes us look a lot more strategic in our approach.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think, Glenn, you'll see that in the work plan and the strategic when we get to that item.

MR. GADBOIS: I just was asking now that you've talked to FTA do you have a sense that that approach is going to help us meet the direction they're going in terms of learning how to process these.

MR. GLEASON: I think it can only help us, I mean, as long as the general dynamic is this much money and this much need.

MR. GADBOIS: And more competition for this much money.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, exactly.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And this year, I believe, speaking with FTA, the process is going to be sped up, the dates are going to be sooner and earlier, and I think they're trying to get a lot of this done before elections.

MR. GLEASON: They are intending to announce their decisions in, I think, the July-August time frame, and so the applications are generally due in the April-May time frame?

MR. KILLEBREW: I believe they're due in March this time, end of March.
MR. GLEASON: So for all the five or six programs they've got some notices out for, they've kind of spread out when the applications are due, but March and April, I think, are the range of due dates, and most of them are in March, I think.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And I think last year, if I remember right, it was later on, it was like in June or July.

MR. GLEASON: Well, last year they didn't get around to doing this until way toward the end of the fiscal year, it didn't come out until June or so and they gave us about four weeks.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Thirty days to do it.

MR. GLEASON: If that, to pull it together.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Exactly.

MR. GLEASON: But they had intended last year to get it out earlier but it just didn't happen. So this year they've got the dollar amount identified, subject to authorization, obviously.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So now is the time.

MS. BLOOMER: Are there any further questions for Eric on the director's report?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Hearing none, we'll move on to item 4, final review of the proposed rule changes, and
Bobby, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. KILLEBREW: Well, good morning, members.

For the record, Bobby Killebrew, TxDOT's deputy director of Public Transportation.

I hope in your package you all have three items. One is the actual set of rules themselves. That's the copy that has the numbers along the left-hand margin of the page, about ten pages long. Also I believe there's a couple of pages of graphs which represent the scenarios. If you're looking through your packet if you can find that. And lastly should be the public comments that were received during the rulemaking process. I see some nods here in the room, and Christina, I hope you have that as well.

MS. CRAIN: Yes, I do.

MR. KILLEBREW: We've been busy since the last time PTAC met in November and you looked at the draft copy of the rules, and from your PTAC meeting in November we made some changes, one with the squishy terms and things, using Glenn's term.

MR. GLEASON: I had forgotten about that.

(General laughter.)

MR. KILLEBREW: I remember that very well. And the other thing was a date change which was on the new part of the formula which is for the census.
impact allocation. PTAC recommended that date be 2023 and we did make that change.

So we took the package to the commission and our commission adopted these preliminary rules at their December 15 meeting, after which the rules were posted in the Texas Register and we started a public comment period.

The public comment period ran January 1 through January 30. Also during that public comment period we also held a public hearing. At the public hearing we did not receive any public comments, but from the public comment period we did get the comments that were in your packets today. And I know PTAC expressed wishes to see those public comments, so those were provided to you in their entirety, I did not summarize those.

MR. GADBOIS: Bobby, did you have anybody at the public meeting and they just sat there and didn't comment, or just no one showed up?

MR. KILLEBREW: At the public hearing we had two operators show up just to be in the audience and they did not provide comment. They were strictly there to see if anybody else was going to provide comment.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KILLEBREW: So today for the committee, as we're looking at the final package, we're kind of nearing the end of the rulemaking process, today as a committee
you have the opportunity for you to provide comments on
the final rules as presented to you, or you can waive
comment which means that you don't comment at all.

After today, just kind of looking next steps
ahead before I turn back to the rules, just so you know
where we're headed on the calendar, from today we will
develop a package for our commission to consider at their
March commission meeting which happens at the end of
March. If the commission adopts these rules as final,
they will be posted again in the Texas Register and they
will become effective around April 19, if I've got my
dates correct. So just to kind of let you know what's
left in this rulemaking process. The rulemaking process
takes a long time and we've been through most of it
already so there are very few days left in this particular
rulemaking process.

So again, what you see before you is the final
set of rules which looks very similar to the preliminary
set of rules you saw back in November with, again, the
changes for those squishy terms and the one date change,
the public comments that were received and the funding
scenarios that you also requested.

And with that, Michelle, I guess I'll turn it
back to you and the committee.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think a couple of things
I wanted to highlight before we open it up for any questions. Glenn, you had asked about the public hearing, and I think where the comments came from, almost all the comments, if I recall, commented on the date, and that's why I was reading the transcript, went back to see sort of what our thought process was in that recommendation. It was linking the date back to the next census and when those impacts would occur.

Originally the original expiration date was August of 2019 which was the end of a biennium. When Bobby presented this information at the TxDOT semiannual meeting in January, I think that's where a lot of the questions came from regarding the date, and hence, the comments we've received. So I think we have a couple of options. At this point the 2023 -- I'm having a hard time thinking that far out -- the 2023 date is in the proposed rule changes.

And Bobby and I talked and we have a couple of actions we can do. We can weigh in with comment, and Bobby flagged for me that any comments that we have previously made do not carry forward so we would need to make whatever comments. We previously made the comment that we would recommend the commission to take out to public meeting with a comment that we would reopen the formula at a later date, so we would have to carry that
forward if we want to say that, or we can waive comment altogether, but I think we probably need to discuss and address the date issue and the comments received.

So I'll turn it over to the committee for discussion.

MR. KILLEBREW: If I might, Michelle, going back to your previous comment that you made during the draft phase of the rules, I believe it was tied to we don't know what reauthorization is going to do to us, we don't know what the census is going to do to us, and the census we'll probably know before reauthorization because it's hopefully going to come out soon. And at that point in time the committee felt that even though the date of 2023 might be put in there, you very much wanted to make and go on record to say that when reauthorization does happen, when census information is known that the committee is very interested in looking at this set of rules again to make sure that any actions that are taken today are not going to be detrimental in the future. And so that was the comment that was sent to the commission and that was the comment that was also published in the Texas Register for everybody to view from this particular committee.

MR. UNDERWOOD: The only other comment that I heard from another provider was the $57 million, well,
what happens if we get more money and why does that $57-
have to be in there because that's all going to go
straight to the commission if we don't say more than that,
and that was the concern. So if we were to comment, like
you were saying, Michelle, about we do wish to open up the
funding formula again after reauthorization. That would
kind of, in my opinion, kill two birds with one stone, the
$57 million and the date issue as well.

MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. GADBOIS: If you want to respond to that,
go for it.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

I think part of the concern too was that we say
for the record we intend to reopen the formula. One of
the providers I heard very clearly was that's all great,
that's your intent, but if something were to happen and
you all aren't here in five years, that gets lost.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: So trying to weigh the intent to
go back and do it versus if for some reason all of us
aren't on the committee in five years that it actually
happens and go back and reevaluate, and I think the
thought being if the date is different, at some point it
requires you to go back because the date is somewhere
sooner than 2023.
MR. UNDERWOOD: And if more money comes in, what are we going to do with it.

MR. GADBOIS: And is that your understanding of the primary argument for a shorter date, '17 versus 2023.

MS. BLOOMER: That is my understanding of the main crux of it is the thought that if we were to get more money, that creates an issue and that doesn't require us to open up the formula again to address that.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. So here's part of my question is help me understand the rationale -- because I didn't go back and read the transcript -- what's the rationale for why we suggested 2023 and are there any additional arguments for why we would set an earlier date that I'm not seeing from the comments but that maybe you have heard.

MR. KILLEBREW: I, too, like Michelle, reread the transcript but I didn't do it last night so you may have a fresher memory than I do, and there was a few pages of comments, discussion points made by the committee back in November. But what I took from it, the main point was that the census changes, the census impacts that are going to occur for some systems are not going to just occur for the next two or three years, that actually those impacts will happen again until the next census changes come about. And so a main point from the committee last time
was these are continuing impacts so shouldn't we have this
formula allocation about census impacts in there until the
next time the census would kick in which is estimated
2023. So that was the gist that I got out of reading the
transcript and the dialogue that you all had last time.
There are many other things you also said but that was
kind of the main focus point that came out in those words.

Unofficially, what have we heard as a
department? As Michelle said, we didn't have a public
meeting or public hearing at our semiannual operator
meeting that happened in January. We had it on there as
an information item to make sure that all the operators
knew these rules were out for public comment and we
attempted to explain to them what the changes were in the
formula. We had a graph up that showed how the formula
flowed and what the new allocation process would be, how
it's calculated, and that's where these comments come that
I think Brad, J.R. and Michelle heard.

As Michelle said, there was concern about I
think the date in general, that it locks us in, that if
nothing else changes, if we get more money, those systems
that aren't negatively impacted, they'll never be able to
maybe get this more money because they see it all flowing
to the census impact. If we don't get any more money but
maybe we continue to get the same we're getting now, the
extra $3.2 million per biennium that was for the census impact, some say that's fine, perhaps these systems should transition over a period of three to five years and then they should be okay, so after that five-year period then that money should be made available for other needs for all systems.

So that's what we were hearing as the feedback, it was more of that locked-in date, nothing is going to change in the world until we open up the rules again, and opening up the rules is not always a popular subject.

MR. GADBOIS: Although we have on a mater [phonetic] item an issue that would have us reevaluating or looking at the funding formula again over time anyway.

MS. BLOOMER: Correct. I think the sort of issue being is that's an intent versus if the date is locked in it would sort of require that to occur.

MR. SALAZAR: Bobby, did you get any comment other than mine from the census committee that you sent the email out to?

MR. KILLEBREW: Just for the sake of the rest of PTAC, what Eric had asked me to do, we had a census working group, as you may remember, and PTAC's representative was J.R. on that census working group that actually drafted the rules, helped us draft the rules before we ever presented it to this committee. Because we
got some public comment, because they all were focused on
the date, Eric asked me to go back and just touch base
with that working group again to see if they had any
heartburn because the date really came out of that census
working group.

I got feedback from three of the members and I
would say that the feedback was some said 2023 is fine,
2017 is okay, they didn't really have a preference one way
or the other. There were some that were surprised that
the operators didn't trust the department or PTAC to go
back and open the rules again, as you stated in your
recommendation last time. But I didn't get a large, you
know, no, we much change the date, or no, leave the date
as it is.

MR. GADBOIS: So no definitive clarity there.
MR. KILLEBREW: No. And I got feedback only
from three of the work group members, so there's not a
consensus I would say, but what I got back was they could
go either way, actually. They were okay with changing it
to 2017 or leaving it as is.

MS. BLOOMER: So our options are we could
recommend -- are we recommending adoption, either with or
without comment, so we could either keep the date as is
and recommend the rules move forward with the existing
date of 2023, we can recommend approval with a change in
the date as a motion, and then we talked about that that
would be our motion but then it's up to sort of the
department to decide whether or not to make that change,
and then it would have to go back through the process and
whether or not that change in date in the rules would
require the process to start again. Because our whole
goal here is to get the money out to the providers as
quickly as possible, and we also want to continue to
include our comment that we intend to reopen the
discussion on the formula once we know the impacts of the
2010 census and reauthorization, regardless if we keep the
date at 2023 or if we move it to 2017 or 2019.

MR. UNDERWOOD: What's significant about 2017,
though? I'm trying to think biennium. What is 2017?

MS. BLOOMER: Wouldn't it be a biennium?

August 2019 was the end of a biennium, so if I can do
math, two years would be just one biennium before
initially planned. But the committee that worked on it
initially came up with the August 2019. So the question
is do we think if we left it at 2019, we could compromise
somewhere in the middle, that that would give us
sufficient time to reopen the formula and do a wholesale
revision of the rules, that would address that.

Eric.

MR. GLEASON: If I may. I think we have very
intention of reopening the rules much sooner than that, and my inclination is to respect the comment and move the date in sooner, and recognizing full well that it's going to be much sooner than 2017 that we'll reopen these things anyways, and my inclination is just to respect the comment and to move ahead. I don't think that outer date, it's good that it ends at the end of a biennium, and 2023 was picked because just like this year, it's going to be 2013 before the impacts will actually be felt, okay, it's census, so the next time is 2023.

There's no hard and fast significance to it, and if we could make the decision in 2017 to extend it for another two or three bienniums, or we could decide to do something different with it, or we will realize in 2014 or 2015 when we're looking at the rules that we need to change something then. So I don't know if there's that much behind this, but I would be inclined to respect the comment.

MR. GADBOIS: What do you mean respect the comment?

MR. GLEASON: What I would do is I would probably recommend that the committee change the date, bring it back to '17 and move on, because in the end, I don't know how significant it is.

MR. GADBOIS: And let me ask the transit
providers this, because my assumption has always been part of what we're trying to achieve here in funding formula and other things is a lot more stability and assurance. Right? And the more we keep promising to revisit -- I mean, refinement is one thing, right, and we ought to be constantly looking to ways to refine our performance and all that, but having some sense of stability here is where we really want to go in the long run.

If we're looking at just that one factor, does '17 or '23 give you heartburn either way?

MR. UNDERWOOD: And we've had consistency. When is the last time we've even opened the funding formula? How long has it been?

MR. GLEASON: Longer than I might have hoped.

(General laughter.)

MR. UNDERWOOD: It's been stable for six years which that's pretty consistent.

MR. GADBOIS: The last major change was in like 2003, '04, '05.

MR. GLEASON: Well, it's the '04 and '05 time frame.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So to me we're talking about '17 or '23.

MR. SALAZAR: And we're used to it, to be perfectly honest. We're used to not knowing what we're
going to do the next year, and that's just part of it.

But I will say I'm okay on changing the date to 2017 as long as it doesn't delay the whole process and as long as we don't have to go back for all that, then I'm fine with it.

MR. GLEASON: And if it ends up doing that, then leave it alone.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Then leave it alone, because that's a whole lot of work over that many years. I'm in agreement.

MS. BLOOMER: So I think hearing the committee, if somebody would like to make a motion to go ahead and recommend approval and weigh in with comment, with the comment being to change the date, as long as the date doesn't hold up approval of the changes in the code, and hence, programming of the funds, and that we will reopen the formula in advance of the 2017 date.

MR. GADBOIS: Before we do that, can I ask staff to refresh my memory on the different scenarios in the drafts? What are we doing with each one of those? I'm not immediately seeing, besides dollar amounts, I'm not immediately seeing any difference in the scenario graphs.

MR. KIRKLAND: Good morning, PTAC. This is Kelly Kirkland, planning director for the Public
Transportation Division.

We have before you two scenarios that were produced by the Texas Transportation Institute at our request upon PTAC's request to have some idea of what might happen with the census funding formula, and we discussed with PTAC what were the most likely situations and these represent that.

And you have scenario A-2 and scenario A-5. The only difference is what happens to the Conroe area in terms of urbanization. The scenario A-2 assumes that Conroe is established by the Census Bureau as a stand-alone urbanized area. Scenario A-5 assumes that the part of Conroe that has become urbanized actually gets merged into The Woodlands urbanized area which is an existing urbanized area. So that is the only difference between these two scenarios.

Each scenario has two graphs on it, one graph showing the rural transit district impact and the other showing the urban transit district impact, and what you have is the zero line there on the percent change indicates no change, and of course, you have growth, the lines going in the positive direction are those systems that are getting more money if the funding formula does not change. And so particularly on the urbanized side you have new urbanized areas, including on the A-2 scenario.
Conroe, Georgetown, New Braunfels and San Marcos-Kyle areas, those are growing. And then you also see on the urban side is McKinney growing significantly there. Although they're an existing urban system, their population growth will get them more out of the funding formula.

And then on the rural side, of course, you have several rural systems which are growing faster than the statewide average, and the funding formula, as written right now, would give them more money. And so what you see then on the negative side there, going below that zero percent line are systems that would be basically contributing money to see that growth happen, and that is where the census funding formula in the proposed rules would address those situations. So basically, all of those systems going negative would get money to make up the difference and would essentially have no change because of the census.

MR. GADBOIS: And so on the chart with the green bars, for example.

MR. KIRKLAND: The A-5 scenario.

MR. GADBOIS: A-5 versus the A-2, Conroe in the A-2 starts getting a lot of money under that scenario, under scenario A-5 they don't get any?

MR. KIRKLAND: They're part of The Woodlands.
MR. GADBOIS: Because they merge into The Woodlands.

MR. KIRKLAND: And so you see The Woodlands there, it says T-W-O-O.

MR. GADBOIS: Is that what the T-W-O-O is?

MR. KIRKLAND: Yes.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay, got it. And do we know which one of these scenarios is likely to play out?

MR. KIRKLAND: Still too close to call. It's interesting, TTI prepared some maps and if you look at what they're forecasting the urbanization to be around The Woodlands area, the city limits of Conroe has some urbanization, and then there's an area between the city limits of Conroe and the existing Woodlands urbanized area that's become urbanized, and there's between that area and The Woodlands and there's a gap between that area and Conroe. So the census is going to make some determination and say we think it's more likely to go here, and therefore it would become the Conroe urbanized area, or it's more likely to go with The Woodlands. Even reading the rules, the accepted rules now that the census had promulgated for things about their skips and jumps and what kind of distance you go, it's too close to call.

MR. GADBOIS: Got it. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other questions before asking
for a motion?

MR. GADBOIS: I'm happy to make the motion to accept these rules as is with one change and one change only, moving the date to 2017 for reopening discussion of the rules, the funding formula.

MS. BLOOMER: Would you accept a friendly amendment that we state in the record that we fully intend to open the formula funding prior to that date?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes, I am if as we go along through this discussion we can put in bullet points or some refinement of what that intent actually means. Because we have a real plan for why we'd want to open it up earlier than that that is beyond census. Right?

MS. BLOOMER: Right. We're talking a full scale review, not tweaks to the formula.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And then the second friendly amendment would be just the caveat that changing the date doesn't require the process to initiate from the beginning, that we don't hold up approval of the rules and programming of the funds.

MR. GADBOIS: How does that work, if we say we're going to reopen consideration of the rules at a date?

MS. BLOOMER: My concern is we want the rules
to be changed so that when the funding -- well, the funding is available, but Eric, once the rules change, PTN can go to the commission and award those funds. If we change the date and TxDOT legal counsel determines that that's a substantive change that requires it to go back out for public comment, that would delay awarding of those funds, so I'm asking for a friendly amendment that if that happens that then we say leave the date as is and get the money out and we can open it again at a later date.

MR. GADBOIS: Our recommendation on a date change only applies if it doesn't undermine the ability to get the funding formula used and moving forward. Got it. Perfect. I'm happy with that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We got everything?

MR. KILLEBREW: I believe I heard the intent of the committee is still to look at these rules when information about reauthorization is known and when census impact is known, we'll change the date as long as that does not require the rulemaking process to start over again for this particular set of rules. And did I miss anything else there?

MS. BLOOMER: I think that was good.

MR. GADBOIS: And we may supply you, as we go along in our discussion, with some bullet points of things that we'll want to consider as we're revising, but we can
do that as we go along, I assume.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we have a motion.

MR. UNDERWOOD: One word: second.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad has seconded. All those in favor here in Austin?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MS. BLOOMER: Christina?

MS. CRAIN: Aye.

MS. BLOOMER: The motion passes. Thank you.

We'll move on to item 5 on the agenda which is review and discussion of the PTAC work plan. Just sort of where we left off last time, we had all committed to provide Glenn our scoring which I think we all finally did, and I was the last one so I will take all of that, and Glenn has given me plenty of ribbing for it since then, but we have the final scoring here in your packet. And then what Glenn did is went ahead and sort of identified the sweet spots to try to interpret the matrix for us.

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: And then the third document we have is sort of the text document that lays out the guiding principles we had previously adopted and takes into account some of the items for consideration for the work plan. So I think before we talk about the guiding
principles and goals, objectives and tasks document, I'd like to turn it over to Glenn to sort of just give us a really quick rundown of the summary and our input and then the sweet spots to help us sort of focus. And our goal was to sort of take everything and narrow it down to three or four items that we wanted to focus our attention on, and then from there take those three to four items and start breaking it down into actual tasks that we can do to move us towards that, and then attaching a schedule or dates onto that as well.

So before we get there, Glenn, you want to walk us through the scoring.

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. So mainly we sent -- and I think you have it in a printed form and we can send it electronically if you really want this -- mainly we provided everybody the raw scoring so that, number one, you'd know we actually plugged in your scores, and then we attempted to provide a little bit of rather rudimentary analysis to help you kind of think through what those scores in aggregate might mean.

So for example, at the bottom of these you get some scoring in terms of what the total votes were in a particular kind of activity area so that you can then judge where did we get our highest scores and on what activities. We also do a little bit of standard deviation
across principles so that if some people are consistently kind of doing ones and other people are doing fives, that starts showing up rather than just giving you an average that may look the same as if everybody scored it a three or four.

What I did way out on the end of this sheet is start to look at some of the averaging to say where are our highest average scores, and that's what I define as the sweet spot, and that really changes in terms of what the principle is and what the different activities are.

So when Michelle was starting to develop this recommendations on how might we go from our principles to a work plan, it really helps to inform us that under the supporting public transportation as a principle that development credits and particularly 5311, but to some extent kind of all the sub programs, and financial sustainability are really important issues for that category. So that helped to guide us then in terms of what we might put down as items under the work plan and under which ones of the principles.

Now, Michelle, in her genius, went and reorganized from one through seven on our guiding principles to where might those fit into some kind of overall work plan, and that's what she's going to roll into next. I'll be happy to jump in at any point in that
discussion if you have questions about how did this or
that score or why is it here versus not here or why is it
missing, I'll be happy to talk to you about the details of
the scoring.

Thank you all, by the way, for spending the
time to go through and take your best guesses at how to
score this. As I went through it, I realized how hard an
activity I was actually asking people to do. So thanks.

Michelle, you get to talk about your next step
towards the work plan.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So like Glenn said, I had
a very difficult time putting my scores in, so in order to
help me sort of think through that process, I went back to
our seven principles, and in our seven principles we have
the principle and then there's that text, and what I
started to do was pull things out and kind of rearrange
them that made sense to how my mind sort of works. I had
started this document I think it was back in November when
I was trying to score my projects, and then Glenn and I
worked to sort of finish it off, but sort of the idea is
take the principles and the text and I think we're now
down to like two main categories: support public
transportation which was our principle number one, and
then the other one is promote coordinated transportation.
And then everything else sort of fits underneath that.
So under support public transportation we have three goals: implement an efficient and effective public transportation system; support financial sustainability of local, state and federal investments in the maintenance and expansion of critical transportation assets, and that was actually our fourth principle but it seems to fit nicely under support public transportation; and then the last goal under there is conduct regular evaluations on funding initiatives and results to guide future direction and decision making.

And so you'll see sort of interspersed throughout there, and then under each objective, so under the first goal, implement and efficient and effective and sustainable public transportation system, we have two objectives, the first one being strategically leverage all available resources to maximize service provided throughout the state. And again, that text came from the guiding principle document we had previously approved, I believe at our November meeting or maybe it was our September meeting.

And I believe the tasks, as well, I took directly from there, so the first task would be to develop consistent and transparent methods to award funds, and there's some examples listed there which fits nicely into sort of what we had identified previously. So I was just
trying to work it all together. But again, that's just how my mind works and a suggestion for how we might start to try to focus on where we want to go this year.

So I think what we're trying to accomplish at today's meeting is figure out which two to four things we want to focus on first. I think narrow it down to a goal, an objective and a task, because I think where we've been is we feel there's a lot we'd like to tackle but we're not really sure where to take that first bite of the elephant. And so I think it would be helpful if we could narrow it down to one or two objectives that have maybe two to three tasks and start there and maybe start to prioritize where we'd like to go.

And I think, Glenn, your issues sort of help us. Coordinated call was sort of ranked high in the sweet spot, transportation development credits, the 5310 and 5311 programs, and then financial stability, and those all seem to kind of be intertwined.

And I apologize we weren't able to get this out to you in advance of the meeting. Again, I'll take the full responsibility for that. But that's sort of where we're going. If we can talk through maybe, give you some time to review it and then we can talk about what some of the objectives and tasks are. My idea is this is a living, breathing document so we add tasks, we can take
tasks off, but just something to try to get us to focus
our discussion on of all these things on these four pages
where we want to focus our attention and then what
specific tasks are we going to work on to get us towards
that objective and goal.

MR. GADBOIS: Where the rubber hits the road
here is we're trying to develop sort of framework of what
we think we want to do for several years out, and then
we'll need to decide what we want our work plan to be,
given we meet quarterly, for this year -- at a minimum,
right? And so the question, I assume, in terms of the
longer term, this is overall where we want to go, we can
continue to tweak that part of it. If you have responses
today, let us know, we can make changes in this, but you
can also take it home and think about it and decide, you
know, I really want this in there, or something like that.

But what we probably ought to do is figure out
what we want to focus on over the next few months and
start to cue that up because particularly some of these is
as much staff work stuff as it is our work stuff, and so
we would be asking Eric for something and we need to give
him enough notice and get his agreement and all that good
stuff to even get that moving.

MS. BLOOMER: Do you want to take just five
minutes to give folks time to read it, to through it?
We'll formally recess for five minutes to give folks a chance to review.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. BLOOMER: We'll go ahead then and officially reconvene. We took about a ten-minute break. Hopefully everybody had a chance to sort of review the guiding principle document. I think what I'd like is for folks other than Glenn and I, since we sort of put our fingers in it, to give us your thoughts or feedback, are we heading in the right direction, what do you think our next steps are, and how can we continue to move this along. So I wills top talking.

MR. SALAZAR: I think it looks good but I do agree that I think we need to narrow it down, and so anything we can to get on a particular task or objective is good for me, so if we're ready to do that, then I'm okay with that.

MR. UNDERWOOD: To me this is a very comprehensive list, inclusive list of lots of things that we do want to do and things that are currently going on. For me, like I said, I've briefly read it, I'd probably have to look at it and think about it a little bit more to say that one, let's do this one, but overall, I'm okay with a lot of these. A lot of these things we're already doing, like we've discussed, and maybe we need to finish
them or point out that they are done already and say we
don't need to be doing this because it's already being
done. Why step in the middle of something that's already
being completed or working successfully.

But as far as I am anxious to get moving on the
work plan, I'd like to have something we can kind of hang
on the wall and say this is what we're doing right now and
let's dive into something like this. But as far as all
these things, to me all fall very much within our guiding
principles as well as much needed things around the state.

I don't know if that gives you any direction at
all, Michelle.

MR. GADBOIS: Can I ask a question? In reading
through this, which ones do you think we're already doing
or substantially done?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Well, like for instance,
objective under encourage the support, recruitment,
retention of trained personnel, principle six. To me that
is definitely being done by the leadership seminar. I
look at that, I've had two staff members go to that, and
to me that is one of the best things that I've ever done
for my staff. You get a little bit out of one, this is
what they liked, and then the second one I've had get a
little more out of this one, but putting it all together,
it is one of the best things that I've ever done for my
staff. So I think that's already being done so I don't
know that we necessarily need to get in the middle of that
except support the current effort.

MR. SALAZAR: And then I like on the first page
the goal of support financial sustainability of local,
state and federal investments in maintenance and expansion
of critical transportation assets. I know Brad and I were
having a little side conversation on the task as far as
developing a three-year list of capital project needs
statewide, and I think Eric is kind of getting towards
that on the state of good bus repair and what we may need
to do to focus in on the need for that. And so again, I
kind of think that we're kind of getting there but I don't
know how specific we need to be on those things.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And then the task long term
development strategic plans for investment, I think that's
somewhat the information that Kelly is collecting
currently with our 2035. I know that's further out than
probably what you're looking for for long-term strategic
plans for investment, but I think some of that initial
information is being collected right now. For instance,
if we're talking about facility, hopefully you don't need
two in 35 years, hopefully you can expect one to last.

MR. GADBOIS: So what I hear on those two,
under number one -- for Christina who is not here and
can't see us pointing to it -- under number one is goal number two, those two tasks you are saying are shovel ready and that we're already starting to do work on them, and is that an argument for we ought to focus and finish, focus some attention to get that wrapped up and done?

MR. UNDERWOOD: I think that's probably some low-hanging fruit because it's already -- I mean, am I correct in that Kelly? You've got some of it in task two but as far as the three-year capital needs list statewide, that shouldn't be too terribly difficult because we're doing that for state of good repair.

MR. KIRKLAND: Yes, there is overlap between that and some of these things that are already happening. We're going to have to go further than we are now, though, to get to some of these points. The three-year capital project, particularly on the facilities, that's going to need some more attention.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. But we can focus on getting the framework, what work might need to be done and working on timeline stuff so that we all kind of understand trajectory where we're going with it, even if we can't have that three-year plan. But at the same time, we also need, what I hear is the feds just did a call, so if we're going to do kind of a three-year approach, we
probably ought to be quick about figuring out how we want
to ask people for that, how we want to frame that and
communicate that to folks as they start providing
information for this next round. Right?

MR. GLEASON: This committee is a policy
advisory committee, and so what I would normally do is
look at these tasks, for example, and I would look, let's
say, to develop a three-year list of capital project needs
statewide. I don't necessarily think that the committee
may be in the business of adopting a specific list of
capital projects, as opposed to maybe using that list to
then step back a level or two and talk about some policies
that might help guide the development of the list or how
we implement it. Does that make sense? I mean, some of
these are more specific than I would imagine the committee
actually taking action on, but the information that they
bring with them would help the committee step back and up
and work on some more general type policy statements.

MR. GADBOIS: So the task as framed now is
really the outcome we want, not the task we want to do.

MR. GLEASON: I think that's what I'm saying.
It's a boundary, the boundary between policy and
specifics.

MR. GADBOIS: And I get that, and really our
intent is, as I understand it, that's the outcome we want,
we know you will do a lot of work on that, and that's your purview and responsibility. So in reframing this what we look at is policy, advice on, something like that to help in the development of a three-year.

MR. GLEASON: I'm just thinking out loud here. We have a list from last year's state of good repair application of all the facilities people said they needed. Now, we could assemble that list for you all and you could look at it and it would give you a sense of the scope and range of kinds of facility projects and the kinds of needs that are out there. And that's easy to do, we don't have to go out necessarily and generate the list of capital projects. Here is a list that is at least representative of folks thinking right now of what they need, and you could look at that and you could see the range of stuff in there and say: So how do we want to try and help organize through some policy statements how we look at this list. Does that make sense?

So it's much easier for us to come up with a list that is representative enough to allow you to develop policy direction from than to necessarily think that we've got to come up with the list. Does that make sense?

MR. UNDERWOOD: And in the same way you could use PTMS for fleet. Right?

MR. GLEASON: Right. So we'll get to a point
using the policies then of a list, if you will, but we
don't need to necessarily feel like we've got the most up-
to-date, most comprehensive list. As long as it's
representative, then I would think the policy direction
could evolve from that.

MR. GADBOIS: And it's not our intent to
develop the list, that's the local properties giving you
their projects and you develop the list. Our intent here
on this particular item, I think, is provide some level of
guidance on how that might be organized, as you suggested,
but also the conversation that happened at the last
meeting where you were talking about this with all the
providers, the annual meeting in July or whatever, is how
do we start lining that up with other strategic priorities
so we can prioritize, select better, more competitive,
whatever the adjectives are, and give you some guidance on
how that might work. Make sense?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Makes sense.

MS. BLOOMER: So we just talked about sort of
which ones we think we're already doing and transitioning
to more policy type statements. J.R., you had mentioned
that there were some you would be interested in. I guess
my question is do we think we can talk about those today,
do we want to -- I know we all want to kind of just get
going, but do we want to take some time and have folks
identify their top three that they'd like to focus on, do we want to try to do that here today?

And then we can task folks sort of with an interim charge between now and the next meeting to tweak this a little bit more towards the policy side, come up with a matrix of what we're doing, what we'd like to see, who we think should be doing what, and sort of a time frame of when we'd like to accomplish that so when we get to the next meeting we can take the top item and then start delving into that and actually maybe have that particular item, say it's do ABC, it's on the agenda, we can talk about that specific item, and we can move forward.

MR. GADBOIS: Can I make a proposal? There's some low-hanging fruit here, so let's talk about the draft first. My proposal would be step one is let's work on refining this so everybody on PTAC gets a swipe at what might we want to see a little differently, including staff, how might we phrase this differently to make sure we're observing roles. Okay?

Then we also agree today there's some low-hanging fruit that's also timely that we really probably ought to work on sooner rather than later. The one we just discussed is one of those, and I'm hoping we have one more that can make the list, and then we could agree on
who's going to work on each one of those to help develop whatever happens.

And then three, we all come back to the next meeting ready to schedule out the rest of this so that we start building it into a timeline and real work plan.

Does that make sense as a proposal?

MR. SALAZAR: Makes sense to me.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad's thinking.

MR. UNDERWOOD: The only issue is we meet once a quarter, then we do all this in the meantime, and then we come back in June and we have this, and from June we go to like September and it's like now we'll start working on it, and I think we've lost another year, I guess.

MR. GADBOIS: Well, but my proposal is both: let's work on refining this but also let's take on one or two low-hanging fruit items where we can do real work in the meantime.

MR. UNDERWOOD: As long as we're doing something, let's move it along, I guess is my only thing.

MR. GADBOIS: And I'm completely in agreement. We've done enough talking about it.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Let's just do something.

MR. GADBOIS: So for the proposal's purposes, one would be to focus on helping to provide some guidance to staff on the organizing and prioritizing of the three—
year list of capital projects.

MR. GLEASON: Can I just interject? Yes, recognizing that the current notice from FTA is out and it will be due before we meet again, so we're going to have to run the traps on that one. However, I will say that if we think about how we make those decisions, we can present to the committee our thought process, perhaps as a starting point, for different approaches to that.

MR. GADBOIS: What I would hope is you get one to three of us who say we want to talk to you about how you're thinking about an approach and maybe give you some advice on how that approach might go, and then we'll all bring that back to this group for consideration in the long run for any additional refinements that we may want to do for future calls. So I'm suggesting that much like these other advisory groups that you've got formed around rulemaking and et cetera, that one to three of us are going to serve as kind of an advisory group for you as you're starting to put out this call, framing it, messaging it for the providers. Does that work for you?

MR. GLEASON: Well, we've got a statewide call scheduled already for Monday afternoon, and I've already got folks developing lists of fleet and all that kind of stuff, so it's moving really quickly. If what you're suggesting is at some point in the next sort of four-week
time frame there is an opportunity to bring a working
group of folks together, or to solicit thoughts, at least,
on how to help us make some of the decisions we need to
make. Is that what you're thinking about?

   MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

   MR. GLEASON: So what would the committee need
to do today to do that?

   MR. GADBOIS: Some people are agreeing. Bobby
is saying no?

   MR. KILLEBREW: I was telling Eric, his
question was what would the committee need to do today to
make that happen, and my comment would be you don't need
to take any action. I think what Glenn is suggesting is
that the department have another working and this
particular working group may be PTAC members. I don't
think we're advocating that the committee actually set up
a formal subcommittee because that goes through a whole
other formal process. I'm seeing lots of nos on that one.

   So I think since there is such a very short
turnaround on this NOFA, this notice of funding
availability, that we would welcome some input from a
working group, even to look over our shoulders as we have
to go forward very quickly and put this stuff together,
perhaps even review our application as we enter it into
grant.gov to see if you think there may be some tweaking
that would help us be successful in getting funding.

MR. GADBOIS: Exactly. And so what I'm thinking is you've already put out a call for projects, you're going to have to figure out eventually which projects are actually going to go into a submission and how to make that submission as competitive as possible. Right? And we have an interest in figuring out how to provide some guidance on how to organize and how to prioritize such that that's as competitive as possible. To the extent that we can help you in your thinking through how you make those from this and learn from it to give more refined guidance in the long run, then we want to do that. That's the proposal.

MR. KILLEBREW: And I think as long as we don't have a quorum of PTAC members in that work group, we're doing fine.

MR. GADBOIS: So two rather than three.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think, Glenn, you're suggesting a very informal, sort of at this point we want to get a little bit more informed about what the process is and how it works, and if possible, provide some feedback so going forward we have a better idea of how we can sort of help frame the policy around using like the three-year list and all the information to better position the providers in the state to be competitive for those
calls.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I just never want to see this group get involved in saying this project is in, this project is out, making those types of decisions, nor micromanaging the staff to say we would like you to do it this way, don't do it this way, because it's what they do, it's what they're professionals at. And for me, no more than I would want someone at my agency going do this way, not that way. I think we have to respect that as their job and professionalism in what they do.

MR. GADBOIS: Completely agree.

MR. UNDERWOOD: But to be involved in the process, to kind of see how it is so that we can maybe push something later from a policy standpoint of this is the way we'll do it, I don't have an issue with that.

MS. BLOOMER: I think that's the first task we need to work on, is just refine the work plan to take it up a little bit higher. In order to do some of the policy and sort of the guidance that we're tasked with doing, there's some information we need, but I think what happened is some of that got in here as tasks and they're not really things that we will work on but that we might need to help us make those decisions.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I agree.

MS. BLOOMER: But we don't necessarily intend
to tell you how to put the three-year plan together, but just that that would be something that would be beneficial in our work going forward to sort of help prioritize the needs.

So why don't we do this, I understand everybody is just let's get her done and start moving, last time we had the ability to sort of do an interim charge, we have the ability to do that again today, so maybe if the committee would sort of give Glenn and I an interim charge to continue to refine this, an interim charge to the other committee members to take a good look at it and help us sort of with comments as far as how we get it up to the policy, those things you think we're already doing that we can sort of capture as low-hanging fruit and accomplishments, as well as sort of things on your top two list that you'd like to see, and then we can sort of bring that all together, see what comes to the top, and before the next meeting get out a refined list, the top two items, and possibly even start working on one or two of them.

MR. GADBOIS: And an interim charge to staff to also give their response.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. If you guys have comments as well and sort of information on what you're currently working on and what would be most beneficial to you.
Because one comment Al had made is that this needs to do quite a few things. One is we need to make sure they're activities that are beneficial and sort of support the activities of the division. We don't want to do anything that is either duplicative or isn't helpful, we're here to help you help us help the providers -- if that makes sense. So we don't want to do anything that doesn't do that.

And we also want to just start put PTAC out there to sort of enhance our reputation and sort of what we can do and that we are moving forward to do things. I also commit at the next semiannual meeting -- because at the last one I shared our principles and sort of our process -- that I would bring back our work plan, and I'm hoping to have an actual work plan with timelines so folks can see this is what we as PTAC are working on on your behalf, and please hold us accountable, we're trying to do X, Y and Z.

MR. GLEASON: You've got 30 minutes on the July agenda if you want it.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: We can stick with the ten minutes but have a handout to share with folks, because I tend to get up and say the same thing: We're PTAC, we're here for you, this is what we're charged with doing and here are
our members. So take something different to them: We actually are trying to do something, here are the to three things we're trying to do, and here's our schedule to do them. So I feel that crunch too.

I'd also like to maybe suggest if we could have a conference call in the interim, I know we tend to meet quarterly, if we could have a sort of interim conference call to keep it moving so we're not waiting till our next meeting which would be in May?

MR. GLEASON: We're going to time the next meeting, if I can jump in, we're trying to understand when the department is going to be moving the rural transportation through commission, and right now, as I understand it, it's a May-June type timetable. So we have a question right now to the folks leading the effort: When is the soonest possible point in time that we could get something in front of this committee for you to look at and review and have an impact on.

MS. BLOOMER: The rural transportation plan. So bring it back to the committee officially.

MR. GLEASON: That's going to drive when we get this next meeting scheduled, and so it's February now, it will be late April for the rural transportation plan draft that we could look at? Do we know anything about that yet?
MR. KIRKLAND: Probably late April, early May.

MS. BLOOMER: But I think back to Brad's point, that's another two to three months that has gone by and we're not really any closer to actually starting the work.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And I guess could we respond maybe via email to you before we have the phone call?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, that would be my hope, that we can do that all sort of individually and then we would come back with a revised plan for folks to sort of say yes.

MR. UNDERWOOD: On the conference call.

MS. BLOOMER: On the conference call, not do that at the conference call.

MR. UNDERWOOD: And the next meeting have one of these things identified and move forward.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay.

MR. GADBOIS: Although that proposal -- which I'm fine with all the parts you've said so far -- doesn't include us deciding to work on something now, but we've got at least one thing that's even more timely than an interim call, us getting involved to any extent in this item around the capital projects. We need to do that now. Right?

MS. BLOOMER: That's part of it. We can do
that now and continue what we had sort of worked out was ultimately we want to be more involved going forward, setting sort of the policy, but we want to get a little bit more involved so we can gather some information to better position how we go forward. I think we can do that now.

We'll get your comments on the document itself, on what we're currently doing, what you think we're currently doing, as well as your top one to two that you'd like to tick off. If we could get that, say, by March 5.

MR. UNDERWOOD: You won't even be in the country then, Michelle.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: You have until I'm back in the country and at work, Tuesday, March 6, and then from there we can work to refine it, and then maybe we can schedule a conference call late March, early April, and then identify those one to two things we want to start working on, and between April and the next meeting actually start tackling one or two items, in addition to the one related to the upcoming calls.

MR. GADBOIS: Although there may be another one. I've got to ask a couple of questions. Coordinated call and regional coordination plan, what are the timelines on those?
MR. GLEASON: We're currently evaluating a set of proposals for the coordinated call to award federal fiscal year '12 funding. We will likely be in a position, assuming the balance of the year's apportionments are available, in the May time frame to go to the commission with a set of recommendations on that. And then after that, the next one -- in other words, for the following year -- we typically look at releasing the request for proposals in mid July. So if it was the intent of the committee to try and influence, for example, what that next RFP looks like, then we're looking at a mid July time frame.

MR. GADBOIS: And maybe a little earlier if we're looking to use the current one as any kind of a learning opportunity.

And so maybe given the timeline you just talked about, sometime in May-ish you would be ready to talk about this is how we scored, what we're presenting to the commission kind of review, so it could be May or a little after that, but start to help us understand what happened in this last call, how things were selected, what we might need to problem-solve so that we can start looking at how we evaluate what metrics we use, et cetera for the coordinated call. End of May or sometime later than that, but not before May.
MR. GLEASON: Correct. And it will depend on the decision-making, where we are with everybody on that.

MR. GADBOIS: Yes, but not before May is safe.

MR. GLEASON: Not before that.

MR. GADBOIS: So that's not urgent.

Regional coordination planning, what timing?

MR. GLEASON: Well, we just signed a work order with TTI that I think it envisions an initial product and a summary of what's in all the updated plans by the end of March. So we should be able at the next meeting time frame, it may not be a complete set of work but we ought to be able to have TTI come in, and we talked yesterday about making sure their work plan included a presentation to the committee on what they found, and so again, I think that would be something in the May time frame would be ready to roll.

MR. GADBOIS: So you've already developed a scope of work with TTI and they're now off doing that research.

MR. GLEASON: Well, two things. One, we've got 20 of the 24 plans are in, and so I don't know exactly what they're doing now, and I don't know what the timing is we expect on the other four. So yes, in some fashion they're going to begin working on that, and assuming the remaining four come in in a reasonable time frame, or else
they don't and we'll just have to move ahead with the ones we have, we're anticipating some kind of initial description summary by the end of March.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Can I suggest another place we may be able to, for lack of a better word, insert ourselves and learn is maybe some number of us or a quorum of us be somewhat involved in the conversations of what TTI is looking at in terms of reporting, and maybe suggesting other things that they might be able to look at in reporting? Because we've got another big item here. Coordination is very important to some people on this committee, regional coordination planning is one of those big pieces.

And so there may be, it seems to me -- this is, I guess, a question -- seems to me there's a learning opportunity from our side, is our learning opportunity going to muddle up too much you actually getting work done in terms of development of a report on the regional coordination plan.

MR. GLEASON: So what you're looking for, if I can paraphrase, is an opportunity at some point in the development of their work where an informal working group could sit down in a session where we're getting briefed on what they're learning, what they're seeing, and we're kicking around ideas about how to organize it and what the
themes might be, and this, that and the other thing, and just to give you a flavor of what's out there.

MR. GADBOIS: And you know, this is a question that's not getting answered, do we even have any date on it. But yes, that informal conversation.

MR. GLEASON: I think if the committee's interest is to get going on something sooner rather than later, I think we can look at that. I mean, I have always imagined that the product of their work is a work in progress even after they're done, and it would form the basis for ongoing conversations here about what to do next. But if the intent is to kind of jump in on that sooner rather than later, I'll talk with Kelly and we'll talk with TTI and maybe there's an opportunity as they're pulling their thoughts together for some folks to see that too.

MR. GADBOIS: So my proposal would be those two things, would include those two low-hanging fruit that are also very timely.

MR. GLEASON: So this would not be a special session for this, it would be something we're already planning to do, can focus it in and learn about what's going on.

MR. GADBOIS: As an informal working group.

MR. GLEASON: As informal as some of you can
be.

MR. GADBOIS: Yes. I can be as informal as the next guy.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: So Glenn, if you want to submit an email or tick them off, your low-hanging fruit, your priorities. Brad, J.R., Christina, your thoughts too.

MR. UNDERWOOD: March 6.

MS. BLOOMER: March 6. Saw Brad stick it on his iPad there, high tech. So would somebody please put it on my calendar since I seem to be the slow-moving member of the committee.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: And then we'll come back with an interim conference call so that between now and our next meeting we can actually have done started working on a couple of the low-hanging fruit items that we've talked about here.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Any date for that conference call yet, Miss Michelle?

MS. BLOOMER: No, Brad.

MR. UNDERWOOD: TBD?

MS. BLOOMER: It's to be determined.

MR. GADBOIS: Can we quickly agree to who might be working on which low-hanging fruit? The one low-
hanging fruit is informal working group on the three-year plan; the other informal working group is on the regional coordination plans. I'd like to volunteer for the second of the low-hanging fruit, and probably volunteer Al, since that's his mantra, as well, but I'll wait and let him do that.

Anybody want to work on three-year?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Like the staff, we're going to be preparing our own state of good repair. It's going to be a very busy couple of months for us.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R., do you want to just get us your low-hanging fruit and your top priorities.

MR. SALAZAR: Sure, I can do that.

MS. BLOOMER: And we'll leave it at that, and if Al is interested in the coordination. I think I'm more interested, as far as the coordination goes, on sort of what comes out of that study and how that can help inform where we'd like to start moving things in the future versus what TxDOT does. So like you're working on your state of good repair, we're working on our plan.

So I think we have a plan going forward to finalize our work plan, start on one to two low-hanging fruit items between now and our next in-Austin formal meeting in the May-June time frame. So if there's no more discussion, Christina, are you still there with us?
MS. CRAIN: Oh, yes.

MS. BLOOMER: I just want to give you an opportunity, since we've been monopolizing the conversation on this side, if you had any thoughts or comments you wanted to share; otherwise, we'll move on to public comment.

MS. CRAIN: Go right ahead.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Moving on to public comment, we do have a couple of folks here, and before we get to the public comment, is it okay to ask the folks in the audience to introduce themselves and the organization they are with, and then we'll turn it over to one of our members who would like to make a public comment. So if you could just tell us your name and who you're representing today.

MS. LUTZ: Beverly Lutz with Alamo Area Council of Governments.

MR. RAMOS: Joe Ramos, also with the Alamo Area Council of Governments.

MS. CAVAZOS: I'm Perla Cavazos with the Rural Transit Alliance.

MS. BLOOMER: And sir?


MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you.
And then, Perla, you have registered to speak and provide public comment.

MS. CAVAZOS: I just wanted to come by and introduce myself. I'm Perla Cavazos. I'm a policy analyst with Texas Legal Services Center, and the Rural Transit Alliance is a project of TLSC.

I've probably emailed or communicated with some of you and we had recently a statewide meeting in late January where we had over 53 individuals attend, it was great.

But let me just say that what we are is a coalition of rural and small urban transit providers of disability advocates and people with disabilities and other social service providers, and what we're trying to do is improve access to public transit in rural areas for people with disabilities. And we started having meetings midyear last year, some conference calls. Mr. Kirkland provided us some information and TxDOT has been really great in just helping educate us because what we see is there's kind of different views and different languages that are spoken between the transit providers and advocates and social service providers, and so what we're trying to do is hopefully just kind of bridge that gap in communication and get folks talking to each other.

We had a great meeting two weeks ago, again, 53
people, and about 20 were transit providers, and then the others were consumers and advocates. And we went through an exercise similar to what you are doing which is coming up with some guiding principles and a huge list of activities that now we have to prioritize. So that's kind of where we're at right now.

What we have been interested in and tried to get some of early alliance members involved in was the regional coordination plans, we had some conference calls last year, and just encouraged folks that didn't even know that these plans existed, just to communicate. We sent it out to our list serves and we made calls, and we even got some like legal aid providers on the phone with I think it was Steve -- I'm not sure if you were on there, Kelly -- but just to kind of share some examples of stories that they have about clients that are having trouble getting to their appointments.

They live in rural areas, and for example, Social Security Administration, those hearings are happening in the urban areas so they have to figure out how to get to those hearings in the urban areas and oftentimes it's not very easy, and if they can't get to those hearings, they can't get their benefits. So just that's one small example.

But I'm really interested in this conversation
you had about the summaries on the regional coordination
transportation plans because we really want to take a look
at those and see where the gaps are in providing transit
for people with disabilities, and also look at best
practices so we can share with the coalition.

And that's about it, but thank you so much for
the time. Just wanted to share who we are, we're new kids
on the block.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, thank you for coming,
Perla.

And I know, Brad, you were at the meeting, the
Rural Transit Alliance meeting in Austin, and as well was
I. Did you want to say anything.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I was at the meeting, you did
have good attendance, I thought that was great. I think
that some guiding principles that you are working on show
to be progressing well, and just best of luck. Thank you
for coming today. Appreciate you stopping by and sharing
with us.

MS. CAVAZOS: And thanks for being there, too,
by the way. It was so important to have the transit
providers there and just hear that perspective.

MS. BLOOMER: Just for, like Perla said, for
those that weren't there, it was a good mix of disability
advocates, there were some rural transit providers there
as well as lead coordination agencies that were represented, and I think it's a good thing we were there, kind of bring it in. I still encourage how we can help you sort of tap into the existing regional coordination efforts that are ongoing in each region and sort of tap into that existing framework to leverage your expertise to help us, and vice versa, as we move forward. I think there's a lot of synergy there and together two voices that become one are much louder than two voices going off on their own. So ways that we can help sort of facilitate your efforts by incorporating them into our regional coordination efforts I think is something we'd all be interested in facilitating. So thank you for coming.

MR. UNDERWOOD: Very well said.

MR. GADBOIS: Regional coordination planning has been talked about. Are you also engaged in or have opportunities to engage in the rural strategic planning effort?

MS. CAVAZOS: Well, that's something I just took a note of right now because I want to learn more about that.

MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: So I think that's what we're sort of offering, we'd like to help you get in contact with who the 24 regions are, who the key folks there are, who you
need to be talking to in order to sort of tap into. Like in our region the Council of Governments is the lead agency, I have a staff person, be able to put you in contact with that staff person so if there's advocates you have in our region that should be participating in our process that we haven't been able to get to the table, either because we don't know about them or know how to get to them or just haven't been able to convince them, that you could sort of help us get them to the table, I think that would be of benefit to both our ongoing efforts.

MS. CAVAZOS: And I think the advocates that I've been talking to realize that we could probably do a better job of motivating our folks to go and get involved and keep going back, because I think that was one of the concerns of the providers is how do we keep them engaged, they might come to a meeting but they don't say anything and they don't come back. And so we want to help facilitate that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, great. Well, thank you again for coming.

Any other comments from the public?

MR. GADBOIS: It's so exciting, I don't know why they don't keep coming back.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: The next meeting date we'll plan
for late March, early April for a conference call, and then I think we're shooting for we talked late May, early June, depending on commission action on the rural transportation plan, having another meeting in Austin.

If there are no other items, I'll take a motion to adjourn.

MR. UNDERWOOD: So moved.
MS. BLOOMER: Second?
MR. GADBOIS: I'll second.
MS. BLOOMER: All those in favor?
(A chorus of ayes.)
MS. BLOOMER: The meeting is officially adjourned.
(Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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