

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER!!!\*\*\*\*\*

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT  
TRANSLATION FROM THE CART PROVIDER'S OUTPUT  
FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT  
BEEN PROOFREAD. THIS IS NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT.

THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR  
DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE UNLESS PERMISSION IS  
OBTAINED FROM THE HIRING PARTY.

SOME INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN MAY BE  
WORK PRODUCT OF THE SPEAKERS AND/OR PRIVATE  
CONVERSATIONS AMONG PARTICIPANTS. HIRING  
PARTY ASSUMES ALL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURING  
PERMISSION FOR DISSEMINATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT  
AND HOLDS HARMLESS TEXAS CLOSED CAPTIONING  
FOR ANY ERRORS IN THE TRANSCRIPT AND ANY  
RELEASE OF INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN.

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER!!!\*\*\*\*\*

>> Good afternoon, everyone.

Thank you for joining us for this meeting of the Austin Transit Partnership board of directors. To the we're holding it at the temporary home of the Austin energy headquarters, we are grateful we are sharing resources with the City of Austin. Thank you for hosting us here in your new beautiful building. This meeting is called now to order.

Today is December 15th, 2021, and the time is 2:05 PM. As a reminder, the Austin Transit Partnership provides both American Sign Language and other interpreter services. We just request 24 hours' notice please if you need any of those services in the future, please contact our board liaison Cloe Maxwell and her contact information is in the board packet at each of our postings I believe we don't have any public comment today. Okay. Great.

With that, I like to move forward to our discussion items. Our first item Today is Technical Advisory Committee Reports. To start us off, I'm delighted to share the planning Standard and Equity Committee. Which I had the opportunity to attend on Dr. Burnette's behalf thank you for sharing your group with me. So, we had the agenda items we discussed, we met on December 1st of this year and we had our I'm sorry, I got the wrong one planning sustainability equity the PECS meeting happen on December 2, 2021, we had two items on our just a second update by the drag by Peter Mullan the items are as follow the members discuss the important of trees and shade that will be provided for pedestrians along the drag.

Members highlighted the safety of pedestrians when there are multiple modes on sidewalk such as share use paths for bikes electric bikes, and pedestrians and the potential conflicts that could exist and both pedestrians and cyclists both prefer the protected bike lanes during construction it is important to Build temporary Bike Lanes consistent on the drag and highlight the drag has a destination not merely a place to move through but to arrive.

This reimagining of the drag presents a chance to make a place that can thrive year round not just when the University is in session. They requested a couple more things for information.

First, the PSEC members asked about what happened to the ETOD program after the 2022 and how the groundwork has been developed for the City of Austin to take over once this grant stud and study has been performed second the request for information what are the constructions for Austinites and how do we utilize lessons learned for the project to mitigate the effects of ATP on nearby businesses.

Our next meeting we're going to discuss the City of Austin ant displacement tool and the equitable.

Transit Oriented Update again. With that, I like to pass it over. Any questions from the board? No questions?

I would like to pass it over to our Assistant City Manager, Gina Fiandaca. Thank you, Gina.

>> Thank you.

I will give an update on the Engineering Architecture Construction Committee. We met December 1st.

around the community workshops around the drag and the Fourth Street and the Blueline Bridge committee discussions and recommendations there is thought keeping items discussed EAC would like to continue meeting once a month for 90 minutes go to 2022.

They discussed the drag and the committee reviewed the primary design options for the drag and discussed the pedestrian cycling and public space benefits as well as the traffic impacts that are associated with each of those options.

The committee suggested that ATP create additional maps and show the potential impacts on the broader street network as a result of the design changes proposed for the drag.

They also recognize the potential benefits to the business owners in the drag and option B given the lack of

the current parking options on the drag and the improved streetscape condition in that particular proposal for Fourth Street the committee reviewed the potential urban design changes that would potentially result as construction of the downtown tunnel starts and the committee recommended looking at international models for areas with limited traffic conditions and recent superblock proposals in Barcelona and the downtown court.

One committee member suggested a pilot to Fourth Streetscape the urban tactical advantages and study the benefits of those impacts on future topics for this committee. Metro bus shelter update and overhead versus battery versus hybrid. Any questions?

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you so much, Gina. So, as far as the, um...we're moving onto our executive directors' report Mr. Clarke welcome back from vacation. I hope it was restful.

>> Thank you, board members, for being here today and thanks to the public for joining us. Mine is kind of short and sweet but positive.

I want to start off with some great news that yesterday we received notice from the federal transit administration receiving what is called in our world in transit a letter of no prejudice cap metro received that letter of no prejudice for Capital Metro projects letter of no prejudice is a big deal it allows us local dollars being spent for those projects now match for both of those construction grants we're going through the process.

For FTA, there is a lot of analysis to determine if you get a letter of no prejudice. It's not sending in a piece of paper and getting it back there is a lot that goes into that.

The team has been working with FTA headquarters on that and move forward with real estate acquisition activity and other aspects of the program a big component is not only local match as of today the dollars spent are working towards that match but really it's FTA giving that education hey you got steps to wrap up in the process but are you going to work through the grant process and a get grant. I don't think they have given an LNOP and not given the grant that's a step in the process that's a big deal it is something we should celebrate today considering it's only 13 days since the day of election and we had no very, very basic conceptual design, work done.

We are now receiving a letter of no prejudice from FTA. I'm also secondarily to report we had groundbreaking today at the LBJ high school half groundbreaking half pep rally. The Jaguars are going for the state championship having a big rally tomorrow a lot of us will wear purple in support of the football team.

It was a great event and highlighted the coordination between cap metro ATP, the city, AISD, how everything we do is a partnership, everything from a student made hurricane life better.

snow which were joined by those in the region including congressman Doggett. That is another groundbreaking, we got to pick up projects on schedule we committed to. they're done.

The red line is on schedules we are committed to. Now, the metro expo line on schedule that we committed to and working through the federal process just really want to thank again the entire team that is all of our staff on multiple sides including the consulting team and of course, the public with the FTA. It is a total team effort. Thank you very much.

it's a big day of celebration for those items. I think I will mention that we are probably going to have our FTA administrator joining us in February. We are working on coordinating something. We will keep the board updated as Cap Metro is hosting the SWATA and Texas Association Joint Meeting this year in Austin and we are hoping to coordinate activities more to come on that. We look forward to having national attention in Austin as well. With that chair, happy with any questions or thoughts or board members I can help with. Otherwise, that is the Executive Director report for this month.

>> Any questions, anyone? I do want to thank you Randy for getting us to this point. Letter of No Prejudice. It is indeed a big deal, thank you for the wonderful groundbreaking this morning.

It's exciting to see the joy of breaking ground and advancing the program. Thank you.

Now, we're going to move on to the program updates for the community engagement from ATP director of engagement and involvement she is joined by the chief of architecture design Mr. Mullan.

Thank you, Mrs. Nuremberg and Mullan.

>> My pleasure. I want to share a story this morning. It puts into perspective why the work we do is so important at our groundbreaking this morning. We had a woman show up she cleans houses in the Mueller neighborhood and has trouble getting to work every day and heard about the groundbreaking for this new metro rapid line and made hurricane way to the school because it was such a game changer for her it crystallizes the work we do that we do and I wanted to share that with you all.

Next our update for this month, we had a lot of activity over the last month, beginning with the community design workshop for the North Lamar transit center, we mentioned that at the last board meeting I wanted to bring it up again because we were concerned we didn't have enough representation of the folks who really use that transit center at our online meeting so we actually went to the transit center and did pop up outreach there and were able to increase engagement significantly and talk to the people who really use that area and live around that area the most. So, we're really pleased with that. We had a community design workshop on drag. We actually had two. We had a virtual one in the evening. We also had one in person at the University of Texas for students, faculty staff and some community members who attended as well. I'm pleased to say that

the in-person event had about 160 people show up in person to participate. People were extremely excited and engaged. I want to continue today and ask how they can continue plugging forward. Great event. We had 153 for the virtual meeting which was also very fruitful. Lots of engagement, lots of great feedback and Peter is here to report on some of that in just a minute. Then we had a virtual community update meeting for Callis Station. We had 122 people participate in that.

Finally last night, we had a community design workshop for Fourth Street which was really interesting. I believe we had about 81 community members attend that meeting.

As the chair mentioned earlier, we had an EAC meeting on the first of December. We had a PSEC meeting on the second. Then coming up, we have tonight a Community Advisory Committee meeting.

Then starting next year, we have our scheduled meetings for EAC, PSEC and Project Connect ambassador meetings. We have three or more community workshops designed to come in 2022; dates on those are still to be determined. I did want to continue our bylaws for the CAC and changes to the TAC charters. I wanted to stop and make sure you had an opportunity to ask questions on your engagement. Yes, Tony?

>> Got to get used to the technology here. I understand there is a media comment on the buses for the blue line bridge. Can you comment where ATP is with respect to buses on the blue line bridge? Are we going to analyze its price? It figures out what we're going to do and get back to the community on that.

>> Sure. I can answer that. Thank you, board member Elkins. Yeah, we have gotten questions at different venues at the workshop and the meeting of the urban transportation commission of the city of the possibility of buses on the bridge that is not been part of the planning to date we're going to answer those questions we're working closely with cap metro service planning bus operations as well as engineering we're going to come back to answer all those questions that explain where we are.

we will get back to the folks on that.

>> I appreciate that Peter we have talked to in the past. The keyword is a tradeoff, we can't do everything we want to do. There are some things we can do and maybe do a hybrid as long as we can do a little analysis on the community. It's a no-go because of the following things we have closed the circle.

>> That is exactly right.

>> Thank you.

>> All right. Just going to go over a few of the key points in the CAC by bylaws in your packets for approval today some of these have been revisions based on the joint powers agreement making sure the CAC excuse me the bylaws are aligned with the exceptions outlined in the JPA emphasizes closer collaboration between the ATP and the CAC requires the ATP board Capital Metro board capital council to approve the CAC bylaws which we'll be doing today.

Changes to current CAC bylaws are needed to comply with the terms of the JPA and the interlocal agreement with the city and cap metro as follows membership changes to reflect the number of CAC appointments scope, business mitigation, and community involvement plans for CAC review TAC delegates the acknowledgment CAC members to technical advisory as delegates and acknowledges support from the ATP and city staff liaisons any questions on that? You do have a red-line copy in your packets for your review.

>> Board member Stratton.

>> Hi Jackie. A point of clarification in terms of timing and process are we the first organization of the three to consider the changes to CAC bylaws.

>> I will defer to Brandon Carl.

>> Thank you. Brandon Carr, Deputy General Counsel, this is not approved today, it will be approved in January. I did work with the city attorney's for both the city and Capital Metro or the city attorney for the City of Austin and the capital met toe deputy general counsel to consolidate we're on the same pages so you are approving the same changes yes that is the plan CAC will look at it tonight for action they don't have additional changes and in January you should all have CAC approved bylaws to adopt.

>> They haven't approved it yet.

This is basically briefing material we're getting a presentation just as to what the intent is going forward, what they're seeing, and what we're looking to approve come January.

>> Correct. Mostly correct.

the CAC did adopt their own bylaws they weren't approved by any governing body

>> Correct, we're cleaning that up in terms of the JPA and getting everyone on the same page here's what it looks like but no action is to be taken at this time.

>> Correct.

We wanted to make sure when the JPA passes, some from the CAC and some from you all.

>> First up tonight the CAC will be voting on the revised bylaws, to the JPA after that, January we would be then the first ATP board of directors would be the first body to consider the revised bylaws after the CAC has done so.

>> We haven't made an official agreement that ATP will go first.

>> I was looking at the calendar of events and how that would work. Just curious.

>> The plan is for you all to go first.

>> Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

>> I'm sorry.

>> I applaud the adoption of the bylaws, and great we're talking about closer collaboration of the ATP and CAC. It has been a bit of a weakness anote inside the prior meetings community relations is one of the biggest risks for this program. So, we need to do a very good job of listening to the community, making sure that those comments in the community get back to the board so that we can understand and act and just a little bit of color in terms of how I think, we need to be working with the CAC you know per the J P A and the agreements, it says that all I believe displacement and equity need to be going through the CAC I see this as a meaningful collaborative participatory of community engagement for social and anti equity displacement issues. Meaning that any issues that are social equity or anti-displacement, we must collaborate with the CAC before we take any action. Right? Now that's a broad thing. What is equity, what is anti-displacement? Some things are very clear, some are a little bit more ambiguous, we need to be working with CAC as we have issues with equity displacement.

Other things that are more routine, the model should be a more informed consultant and involve model where we let them know the CAC that these are things that we're going to be talking about but not necessarily seeking their active anticipation on because they're not equity and they're not displacement but we need to work with the CAC to make sure there is agreement on what is and what isn't. So, some of the things I think we should be thinking about creating a dashboard for the board are what are the hot issues in the community. With CAC it could be with the justice coalition and the Chamber of Commerce those types of things so we understand what are the big issues and that we're briefed on those. I think we need to talk about a 3-month look ahead to the community on any types of upcoming procurements, upcoming agreement ATP policy so the community sees okay there is a policy on ABC coming up, there is going to be procurement in four months. That way the community can weigh in.

The last thing we want to do is spring policy without advance warning. A three-month-long look ahead would be something I would like to see going forward. The other thing I think is important is to have more of a bridge with the CAC and the board. I think periodically, having different board members sit in on CAC meetings every other month is something like that. To field questions and comments would be a good thing. Those are some of the things I have to think about.

>> Board member Elkins I couldn't agree more. I think the community has been involved quite a bit more since we began and we have a ways to go so thank you for your ideas.

>> Thank you board member Elkins. Board member Stratton.

>> Yes as long as we're on the top of the bylaws this is more of a procedural question I suppose. Having served on a city council commission before there is some language in here I was curious about Brandon maybe

you could address. It's article eight. Associated with committees and working groups I guess if it's not redlined it means that is in the existing bylaws of the CAC is that correct.

>> That is correct.

>> Okay. Most of article eight I recognized when I was on the Economic Prosperity Commission. It was a brand new commission of the city. We had to create bylaws for the first time. We operated off the city boards and commissions fundamentally their template. This looks very familiar to that template. I just had a question about that because in relation to that I'm looking at committees under section B it says, well first it says Project Connect Advisory Committee. Will have no committee then under B committee may be established by CAC with an affirmative vote a committee cannot meet until its creation is approved by The Council Audit and Finance Committee. I was a little curious about that if that was the intent if you all as staff are aware we as the ATP board were aware or intended to allow for or where we intended to allow for as part of the staff liaison connection that the city council's audit and Finance Committee needed to approve the changes to me that ties into city boards and commission not for this which is ATP committee. I was wondering if you all had any thoughts about that.

>> No. As you mentioned these by-laws come from the city template, so that wasn't something that we thought about but there generally does need to be higher-level approval for boards or commissions to have their own committee. It can form working groups as they want to. They do have several right now, but committees are a little bit more tricky procedurally, the city side, they say the requirement to go to the City Council Audit and Finance Committee. I don't know if you have recommendations for how that would be approved, we can leave it as no committees for the CAC for now if that works better, then maybe kind of think about if they do decide they want a committee we can come back and revisit the bylaws.

>> The CAC holds a special class any changes to the bylaws require a joint of all three parties of both ATP Cap Metro and the city council to make changes in that regard, that said, I don't know if new of us have contemplated the need for a formalized committee of the CAC very says a quote-unquote working group I don't want to exclude them from that opportunity and need I know that has been informative and useful for city commissions I don't know if instead recommending that the language be changed out From Council Audit and Finance Committee to use to the ATP board of directors, we are a five-member panel they ultimately work under our jurisdiction and with us maybe that would be? I'm open for suggestions. I wanted to make sure that isn't an oversight. And taking feedback no one is making decisions now. If they are meeting tonight to layout and make voting considerations it seems it might be appropriate to have a discussion. I am open. I don't have a preference one way or the other.

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not sure why we understood that provision. I don't know why we would stop. I'm not sure of the difference between a working group and a committee for an organization that can't take votes for action or doesn't run afoul of public meetings because it can't take action I think. Casey would know better than I would. Given that, I don't know why we would not let them form committees or workgroups, and just let them do that. I don't know why they should have to come back to anybody. My sense is the CAC helps to advise all three of the bodies the city peels, particularly invested. One of the primary functions of the CAC is to focus on the 300 million that is the city's responsibility. So, I'm not sure that it makes sense for anybody but the city to do it. But I'm not sure it makes sense for the city to do it either.

>> It's coming back in January I can talk to the CAC I will present this same presentation to them at 5 o'clock so.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a reason why we would be cautious or want to review a CAC decision to form an internal committee.

>> Randy.

>> I was going to jump in, thank you Board Member [inaudible]. Cap Metro can work with the city staff to revise the section and we have a month for it that would work for the board. There is clearly a mistake in the document not intended any other way.

>> Thank you Mr. Clarke I also want to point out the CAC's participating with our TAC the technical advisory groups now we're bringing them to the fold and participating in our meetings with their own liaisons this cross pollination is working better. It's going to take time for us to participate together. They are always welcome. I think I love your idea, Board Member Elkins. The board participates in their meetings the more we communicate the better we will be. So, yes if you want to make that suggestion for them Mr. Car that would be great.

>> Happy to do that.

>> Thank you. Is that it both of you mayor Board Member Stratton.

>> I did have one other thing I apologize for. When I was sick this weekend and couldn't do much else, I just kind of started reading and I picked up a couple other things that may have just been another hiccup in the charter documents that were provided. I was just curious because I think we went through this when we originally created the charters last summer, but I happen to notice that the EAC, all three charters EAC, P SEC and FAR all stated that the community members applicants should have assistance. [Inaudible] community engagement related to Project Connect. I thought that was the case for PSEC but we started in the EAC for Engineering Architecture and Construction. And ones related to the financial risk-related background for the FAR Committee.

>> You are correct.

>> Okay.

>> This is an older draft. I wanted to make sure of the change.

>> Thank you for pointing that out.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you, Madame Chair.

>> That is a good segue to Technical Advisory Committee amendments there are a few things we want to revise in regard to the technical committees the FAR would like to meet quarterly rather than monthly the cadence of those meetings is going to be changed all the characters amended to add the CAC Delegates on the Technical Advisory Committee three and a few other changes for Technical Advisory Committee members if anyone has questions about that I'm happy to answer if I can I would like to call on Peter Mullan for the community design workshops. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Jackie. As Jackie mentioned it's been a busy month in terms of community engagement activities, we continue to see really strong participation and interest and getting some really valuable feedback. All of these workshops that we're doing. The first one that happened in November was regarding the North Lamar transit center, specifically how we weave the light rail station planned to be in the center of the railway. You can see that here, just to orient you this is 183 on the south side, this is the existing north Lamar transit center. This is north Lamar heading to the North and the current light rail station platform is located in the middle of the roadway so we can maintain the kind of through traffic lanes. This is TxDOT right away in this location, we looked at different options on how to weave the transit center into one. I will say this is not an easy design problem given the amount of traffic lanes we have to navigate here. One of the things we focused on is how we can improve the pedestrian experience in the vicinity to better serve users of the transit center and the neighborhood in general. I will say I think we got more work to do here. I think we're going to be reaching out to TxDOT as well to pull them directly into this process to make sure we're optimizing this opportunity as we move forward.

As Jackie said, we did get a little bit disappointed in the participation on the virtual side, we followed up in-person meetings which is really important to do. And that will continue as we move the process forward. We are also on the 8th. Had two meetings regarding the drag to review the two design options that are currently being carried forward to 30%. Option A includes 1 Traffic Lane in each direction in addition to the light rail guideway in the center of the drag. Option B anticipates eliminating all traffic lanes in the drag between 22 And 27th Street maybe to 29th Street. We went through I think all of the reasons how we got to these options. These are two of many options that have been studied to really distill the main options. They are very different, obviously. We got lots of really good feedback. We also, in this case, had really I think good

renderings of three-dimensional views to show the fib they can get a feel of what this would be like. This is option A showing the one lane next to the guideway. Some of the protection measures that would be necessary to basically increase safety in this area you could see here. I think the limitation of this option is just a much narrower sidewalk area for multiple modes of travel whether pedestrians bicycles or other micro-mobility. So, that I think was apparent to the community as opposed to option B which again if you want to lose that traffic lane, you get additional real estate you can use for other purposes, dedicated bike lanes or street trees, etc. We got really good feedback. There are concerns, obviously, what it means to the traffic network-wide to remove cars off this section of the road. The engineers for the orange line have done preliminary studies in traffic modeling what that would look like. There is more to come in the next months, we will be back to the community with more information results on that. Really you have to look at this district-wide in the back there.

In terms of this is not in your packet this is late-breaking stuff that just came in actually this morning. Just in terms of one of the things we do in the meetings is have a live Mentimeter survey process. Which is really fun. You can see the results coming in real-time and people can see it. I want to call out some of them. We asked what are the top three design ideas are most important to the future of drag. There's a series of one. You can see the ones that rise to the top the daytime and evening sessions were easiest possible. Pedestrian crossings of the drag this is probably the most busiest pedestrian in the entire city that is apparent to a lot of the attendees in this meeting that would show up in one of the priorities stated

Also looking at the top three public amenities. At the top more trees and shade, we are sensitive to that. High-quality lighting outdoor cafes I think this is helpful to us as we start to develop the design and make some choices not to say we can't do all of these things but get a sense of how we prioritize. It's really good feedback. There is a list of some other notes that came from the community as well. I want to show the in-person interactive component. I will say, it was really nice to be back in person with people. It was very positive and you know, I think you can have a much more fluid conversation with the public. Anyway, that was a positive aspect of this meeting hopefully we can do more of that in the future based on depending on what happened with COVID some elements that rose to the top in terms of these conversations of the people that attend there's a lot of support for option B and given some of the benefits to the public space improvements we can make, that is not to say there are questions about some of the traffic impacts it's that we have to address and answer. We will be doing that going forward. Again we will be carrying both options forward to 30% nothing is off the table right now. This is good feedback for us to both develop the design and continue our engagement processes.

Then yesterday again we had a meeting about Fourth Street. This is interesting really about the street itself. Less about the transit facility the although we did a lot to talk about how the transit facilities would interact with the street itself this is an area where they were above the tunnel on Fourth Street and where the blue line comes across and connects to the orange line on the Westside and talking through really a lot of the details about what is Fourth Street like now. What is the history of Fourth Street? The more you study it, the more interesting it becomes. It's really a unique street in the City of Austin. It's very short. Only nine blocks long there is not a lot of through traffic on it. And there is one last block sort of the vestige of the warehouse district we went through all that analysis with the community and got good feedback about the kinds of things people want to see as we reimagine it to the future first detailed conversation on Fourth Street, we will have more going into the future it is another exciting opportunity for us to do something transformative. Happy to take any questions. Board Member Elkins?

>> Thank Peter. Watching clippings and the various news channels, there is concern on the businesses about what the lack of traffic is going to do, cutting the lanes, Sam's Computers, and various other ventures. How that is going to impact business. Back on June 16th. I made a comment about reducing lanes and reducing traffic congestion. The mayor asked for a study to be done. It's helpful with the community. We are proactive, we have the studies and the ammunition to go to the community. We have done some analysis. This is what the impacts are going to be. In cities where they have done this in Denver, this has worked very well. There is data that shows this maybe can increase business if we're not going to be backing up traffic. Having that data I think can be supportive to the community rather than saying here's what it is. We will get back to you when we have done the studies the comment was brought up in June, we could have acted on that, we are now in the middle of December.

>> You are absolutely right. We are never going to have it perfect. I would never wait to have all of the information before going to the community to start the conversation on the traffic side, we had done a fair amount of analysis with analysis and data, we can share with the community, we can do more on the business impacts for sure. We haven't looked at a concept where we take all traffic off the drag at that point. Those are some things we can go back to the community with, 100%. I think with all of these. I don't want perfection to be the enemy of the good, especially in terms of engaging the community. I want to make sure we have open dialogue in conversation. Part of this is ensuring the community does not win. This is my first conversation and continuum. Getting people's feedback as early as possible. Is really credible.

>> Thank you. Dr. Burnette then mayor.

>> Peter I'm curious what agencies we partner with to do analysis? Who are the partners that we take back to the community? How do we let the community know we're engaging these parties?

>> Certainly we're working very closely with the City of Austin transportation department on anything related to traffic or transportation. They are embedded in our team helping us do the analysis and certainly, they are part of preparing these presentations to the public. They're with us every step of the way. I think in terms of business impacts, we will have open dialogue constantly with the economic development department at the City of Austin that will be an important one as well. I think in this case, it's a good idea for us to engage with the chambers and all the chambers just to get their input as well. If you have ideas particularly on the business side if you have ideas about people we should be engaging and bringing into this dialogue, let us know.

>> We have formal community engagement meetings. Perhaps we should have formal meetings with those parties, something that comes out and goes to the community. People see action we're just not plowing through. That is the perception.

>> Okay. Yeah. No. You think we can document all that. All of our meetings are being documented on our public input portal. So, yeah. Absolutely.

>> Thank you, Peter.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Two observations it's been stated to reinforce, I'm really interested in knowing what the analysis or data shows with respect to retailers. If you increase the people and reason for someone to be on the drag it results in enhancements to businesses but I really would like to have the data for that. For this conversation that is known for us, I would really like to see that, so that I can take it back to the people that are asking me those questions right now. The other one just to mention is there was the rising of the issue with respect to buses on the bridge became a significant issue as mentioned in the media. And that's where I think we found out about it. When you are involved in community meetings like that and something rises to the level that that conversation rose to in terms of an issue that is a controversial issue or something, just a heads up to the board with just one paragraph just a real short email to everybody that says hey you need to be aware this is something significant in the public review at this point and this is you know one paragraph to understand the issue and the implications people come to us with though issues now people in the public are talking about it. We have a general familiarity with us if you would help us with that, that would be appreciated.

>> Will do. Yup.

>> Thank you, mayor. And I do have a few observations, Peter. Thank you so much for all the hard work to get us through this revealing the progress of the design. One thing I thought was very insightful that perhaps is related to also your comment Board Member Elkins regarding traffic analysis in your presentations you had

used the pedestrian counts that were done as well. So, I thought if you could tell us more information about how your team did that analysis of counting pedestrians and informing some of the design on the drag, I thought that was very revealing. When we count movement we are not only counting the movement of vehicles but people. And so understanding the movement and how you guys are studying ahead of time I think it's informing the design. It would be helpful for the community to hear more broadly and also for the board to understand you guys are doing that analysis already. And another thing that I thought was really wonderful to see, I participated in the breakout sessions for the drag and I had a behind-the-scenes happy dance. I was glad to hear the comments from the public. Things often get lost in translation. One of the things that stood out to me from the community when they spoke was for folks, the interest is so high on this effort and this line that people were logging in from another continent at two in the morning to testify to this meeting. People really care. It matters to them. These are their businesses, these are our streets together I think that I wanted to point out there is great interest and great enthusiasm for different options, and people are participating in a very unique way that has been really resonating today me, that folks were able to tune in from another continent again the Zoom ideas we're embracing to be able to do this so thank you. Thank you for that work.

>> Thank you.

>> Yes?

>> I really want to comment on you, Peter. I sat in. In some of our workshops and this one yesterday it was about urban planning as a transit project. You can see the excitement there. I want to recognize your leadership with the community in how we reimagine our streets and take advantage of the opportunity Project Connect gives us. It's never easy to think about how we move around differently but show how people can coexist as the full disclosure of the board member who suggested pop-ups to try these things, works with the city staff. We really want to see things in action. Sometimes it really helps. Thank you.

>> I appreciate it. I got to give credit to the entire team. Engineers, architects and urban designers work through these issues and put them into a form that the public can understand and from the top. I got to give Randy credit for this. I think that has always been part of his vision for this. How to take a holistic view towards these things. Having support for that approach is really meaningful to us so thank you.

>> Thank you Peter. Now we're moving onto action items for today. The first action item is five. Action Items one. Approval of minutes from the November 2021 Board Meeting. If everyone has had a chance to review the minutes I would like to request a motion and second on approvele Item 1.

>> I will make the motion.

>> Thank you Dr. Burnette. Board member Elkins second. All in favor, please say, "aye."

>> (Multiple voices): Aye.

>> Any opposed? Any nays? The motion carries.

>> If I can make a comment when we ask for things. Have an action item next to it. We ensure there is follow up. I talked about a look ahead. I like an action item to make sure that is followed up on. The mayor asked for follow up traffic. I would like an action item so these things don't get kind of lost. I think that would be helpful.

>> Thank you. Any further discussion on the meeting minutes? Or action Item Number 1? Thank you so much. The motion carries. Unanimously. So, now we're going to move onto action Item 2. Two. Adoption of ATP Records Management Policy and Approval of Records

Management Officer Appointment. As you know, we have a presentation at this time. I would like to request a motion and second on Item Number 2?

>> I will move.

>> Thank you. Board Member Stratton second by Mayor Adler. Any discussion? No discussion? Everyone in favor please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any nays? Action Item Number 2 has been approved unanimously. Moving onto action Item Number 3. Three. Adoption of ATP Investment Policy and authorization to execute each of the (i) Participation Agreement for TexPool/Texpool Prime and (ii) Participation Agreement for Texas CLASS as authorized investment vehicles. Again we had a presentation last time regarding this item. If anyone you would like to request now a motion and second on action Item Number 3.

>> [Speaking off the mic].

>> Thank you. Do I have a second? Dr. Burnette. Thank you. Any discussion? No discussion? So please vote. Everyone in favor please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> And the motion carries with everyone's approval. Thank you. Now, we're moving on to action item numbers for. Four. Approval of Resolution Authorizing General Counsel to Proceed with the Proposed Process for Independent Analysis, including authorization to engage The Eno Center for Transportation to serve as the Independent Consultant for the performance of the Independent Analysis in an amount not to exceed [two hundred thousand] dollars (\$[200,000]). On this motion, if you recall that the last board meeting, we passed a resolution approving joint powers agreement to direct me the chair in my Xmasty to work directly with the ATP general council to develop a process and approach for the ATP Board of Directors in order to conduct this independent analysis as we embark to determine the appropriate leadership model for AT if in accordance with JPS section for.2.2. The resolution also required we present that process to the ATP board at this

meeting. And that process included certain elements. That is what our object is and what our priorities are. The community engagement process program delivers factors to be analyzed and consulted. And timeline or milestones to conclude the analysis by March 31st, 2022.

So, Mr. Berek and I have been working diligently since that meeting described in the resolution before you today and I have asked Mrs. Bereck to present a review on the independent analysis for you today. With that, Mrs. Bereck. Thank you.

[Switch captioners]

>> Thank you, board and executive director.

We have the presentation I think is added to the packet as a separate document there. Working diligently into the night on this. If you want to go to the next slide -- or I can do it.

So if you guys recall what your board chair said is at the last board meeting we had an action to adopt the joint powers agreement. Within the joint powers agreement was a certain section that required this independent leadership analysis by the board so that the ATP board could make a decision in their sole discretion as to the best leadership model. So like you mentioned, we have that analysis set out here. So I wanted to kind of remind everyone about that action, where it came from. Like the chair mentioned the November resolution requires that the ATP board put forth the objectives and priorities of that analysis, key factors they would like -- independent consultant that the board would hire and we have a proposal today of what that would be for them to consider. The community engagement process that they'll facilitate at the start of the analysis, and then a time line for how we will meet -- or how the board will meet a very ambitious March 31st deadline and then I'll go into the consultant selection.

So the objectives laid out in the resolution that was posted a week ago and is also in your packets includes honoring the contract with the voters, delivering Project Connect -- you know, in accordance with the program sequence plan, ensuring program equity and instilling program trust, which I think are honor objectives and difficult to argue with.

The key factors the board would like the consultant to consider as they're conducting their analysis and as they're interviewing members of the community or conducting the town halls described further and in the resolution include accountability, the ATP partnership with the city and

Cap Metro and their roles and responsibilities, taking an innovative approach that improves upon best practices, financing and funding opportunities and how leadership structure or the relationship might affect those, legal considerations or constraints, contract risk or the goal of maximizing ATP, designing governance structure to conduct community engagement and preserve public trust as well as -- scroll down here. Designing governance to achieve equity and anti-displacement goals and to transition to Capital Metro to operate and maintain.

So as described in the resolution in more detail, the community engagement process will involve starting in January -- which is ambitious -- as we mentioned, starting to have meetings with the folks that they called out, the community advisory committee potentially interviews with them on an individual basis and we're working with the CHC chair.

ATP board members, selected staff and consultants who have worked on the program for a while, selected board members and staff and potentially others. Part of the deliverables of the consultant would also include an early preliminary report -- largely around best practices and pros and cons of governance models. With that report with plenty of time for the community to review the hosting of in-person -- and potentially on the weekend having a virtual town hall as well so we can get as many folks as possible to the meeting to engage the community, knowing that it's not possible to interview each of the folks in our community who's interested in the outcome of the analysis..

So we're excited about the possibility of that robust process. And the time line, which is also detailed -- kind of gets a little to the deliverables of the consultant. Hopefully today we'll pass the resolution so we can get this started and meet the deadline in the JPA. The consultant would start with preliminary review, analysis and research. For the preliminary report they would interview community members, post the report on the website, conduct community town halls, be in town to do further interviews with specific individuals, meet -- once they took all the kind of feedback they got from the town hall and in the interviews that would help them tailor questions to our sister organizations and other places around the world and in this country with the relationships they have with those entities and leadership and ask them specific questions based on what they know the concerns of this community are and best practices.

And then they would present that analysis to the ATP board in March and post their final report on the ATP website by the end of the month and quickly the board would have to consider that analysis as required in the JPA and come back with a recommendation in their sole discretion in April.

So, you know, we've -- because of the time line primarily but also because of the charge that was given to me in my capacity as general counsel to ensure that we had an independent and nonpartisan and impartial and all those things organization that could -- that would also be qualified to

do this work -- that means they have to have expertise in transit industry governance and also to be independent and not have an existing contract with any of the organizations already involved. As you can imagine there are few organizations that meet that and are ready to start work -- could complete the work and conduct the community engagement process with staff assistance in terms of logistics -- this they would be able to do that by March 31st. We're recommending they engage with the center for transportation, which is the preeminent policy organization in this country on transportation issues, in particular transit governance, which, you know -- organizations from what I understand tend not to think about until it's too late. I'm excited we're taking this on early on and I think it's a good opportunity for us as an organization.

And I'm happy to speak to their work or any of the content I provided on the slides. But I should give credit to the chair who worked all this up together and I just put the slides together. So....

>> Chair: Thank you so much. I would like to open it up for discussion. Member Elkins?

>> I want to acknowledge the hard work you have done and the chair has done. This doesn't happen automatically. A lot of work went behind the scenes. I couldn't think of a better organization than Eno to do this. I think many of us read the report they came out with this summer on building for transit better where they talk a lot about governance. I think they'll do great work.

>> My understanding is they're working with the transportation secretary this week. I think it will bode our program well to work with them.

>> Chair: Any question?

>> I had some amendments. Apologies. I was sick for literally the entire weekend. Not COVID -- strep throat. One of those other old fashioned things people still get and did not -- I didn't think I was going to get here today. I was fever free enough that I could be here today. Finished up literally my final comments and analysis this morning and rapidly tried to run through some things and e-mail it out. I apologize I couldn't get this to any of you before, but I really couldn't do anything but read this weekend. But I -- if it would be all right with the chair I would like to walk the board members through each of these as just -- as individual proposed amendments to each individual section. I think that might be the most productive way and I can explain what I wanted to do.

>> Chair, would you like me to stay up here and answer questions?

>> Chair: I mean, I love to consider your changes but I believe you had sent us your comments a week ago, so did we not reflect your comments correctly? .

>> It wasn't just -- well, keep in mind that -- the comments I made were on a document in a bubble. That was me commenting on the initial draft. But once the new document came out, that document reflected the comments of all of the board members behind the scenes, and once I had an

opportunity to take a look at that and reflect on it and think about it, there were some things -- please understand, I -- you guys are awesome. Okay? Let me make that clear. You have done an amazing job, madame chair and Casey. This is amazing, what you've put together. This is a very -- we are in an -- uncharted waters, an untenable position. I think this is an excellent opportunity to really lay the groundwork and make it clear on the back end of this that we as a board, you know, are going to get -- go above and beyond to get as much open and transparent information from community sources, from stakeholders, from subject matter experts, from a reputable, qualified -- as I looked at the draft with everybody's comments on it, I thought there might be some suggestions that could direct to the independent consultant more specifically and probably -- at least I think make the product a little stronger and give us advice and make the report a little more clearer for our purposes when we advance.

so that's the purpose of this, where these came from -- based on what I saw beforehand versus the draft that got published online for everybody to see. And my proposed amendments here.

>> Chair: I mean, from what I'm seeing here, I would love to consider your recommendations, if you want to walk us through it. But please keep in mind that we have a commitment that binds us contractually through the JPA to fulfill our commitment by March, so we -- I mean, this is the first time I'm seeing this --

>> I understand and I'm well aware of the JPA requirements too. And if you'll give me an opportunity --

>> Chair: Absolutely.

>> My intentions are -- like I said, my thought process here is to my understanding this framework, this resolution is really going to be what we use as pretty much the language that goes into the contract with Eno in terms of the deliverable they'll give us back.

>> Chair: We have given -- in order to receive a proposal, they've received general scope of work. As we go through the interview process and engage the community, their analysis could be more robust as we go through, you know -- they're going to interview different committees and the committee could ask, hey, please interview this other group. So it's part of fact finding exercise. So they have a general scope of work they've given us in their analysis, so with that -- I mean, my first glance at this and within 15 minutes of walking into this meeting?

>> And my apologies.

>> Chair: I thought this could be great to put in their scope of work. As we go through a kick-off meeting or if you have specific amendments to the resolution, by all means let's consider what they're talking about and I would love to hear your thoughts.

>> Thank you. My understanding is that basically when we talk about the scope of work for

their contract and what this resolution is by the board of directors, in many ways they're one and the same because what we're basically doing is that we are laying out the process and telling the consultant in terms of in particular the key factors, these are the things that we expect you to be looking at. These are the things we expect you to be considering when you're, you know, looking at these things

and that's kind of one of the reasons -- one of the things I was looking at -- some of the sections -- in section 3. What we looked at originally and what came back as a final draft did look different in terms of the key factors versus the priorities and how those were structured in the dock -- and the document itself was structured. So I guess what I was kind of looking at is if there was a way that I could -- I guess what I got here is one, two, three, four, five -- ooh. This was just one page. There was one other page. There was a section -- there was an amendment on -- I'm sorry. There we go. Yeah.

And then -- yeah. Section five. It's five different pieces, but I mean, we could take them individually. I could just very briefly explain what I'm looking at and if I could make the motion, somebody second it, I give a brief explanation and if you like it, great. Y'all can vote for it. If you don't, shut it down and if the long run if either you, madame chair and/or you Casey -- you feel like it's not important for the resolution but you think some of this could be useful for the scope of work -- great. You know, feel free to continue to use -- feel free to continue to use it for that purpose. My main thought process of this is having gotten all five of our feedbacks together, the document did change. And my concern is that some things might have been -- we could just -- I think we could just strengthen it a little bit in terms of telling the consultant specifically what we're looking for, given the auspices of this occasion and what we're looking to come along with..

>> Just a comment. I felt's unfortunate we're getting these changes so late. We don't have an option. We have to change this resolution today, period. What's the protocol for getting changes the last minute? I mean -- this is going to take quite a while to get through all these. I'm reading -- a lot of them I have issues with. We have a full agenda..

>> I would like to ask general counsel, is there anything on here in your opinion that does not belong in the resolution but is instead to the scope of work, what madame chair said earlier.

>> Sure what I did notice and was trying to look at at the beginning of the meeting -- there is a lot of reference in the community engagement process to -- speaking and interviewing subject matter experts, I would say the draft -- the working draft that I have with Eno for their proposal -- it wasn't as clear in the resolution. They're going to go through the community engagement process which is mostly done by the middle of February, if not earlier, and then take that information -- somebody mention -- Board Member Elkins mentioned the blueprint. That's one of the works they've done.

They have robust relationships at organizations across the world. I don't know if it's necessary to call out they need to speak to subject matter experts. We can share a draft of that scope and work with the board to fine tune that. But I would say that's a major aspect of the work after the community engagement process, is to speak to the expert and staff leadership at those organizations who have different types of models of leadership and take the questions that we prepare as a group and through the community to those quote, unquote subject matter experts. I don't know that we need to add that into the community engagement process as part of the categories of others that's required in the JPA.

>> Well, I guess that -- first, to Tony's point, at the last meeting the entire resolution that -- the entire section of the resolution about this process -- we literally were -- we literally crafted it at the last second anyway. So I wouldn't necessary say -- I mean, would it have been my preference that I could have gotten this to you Friday? Yes, absolutely. Truly, I'm sorry that I got sick. That got in my way. But, you know, to -- you know, Casey, to your point -- you know, I'm not in the habit -- I don't believe a board of directors should be micromanaging a scope of work by any means, or getting involved in the writing of contracts, but I guess my concern was as critical as this process is that we're identifying here, that, you know, as I was looking at it, my concern was that there were some things, for example, that I didn't feel like were specifically called out in the resolution.

Look, I am aware of Eno's report. I know they're a policy think tank out of Washington, D.C. They have a welt of policy and understanding. Vast majority of people have a ton of experience having worked in Washington, having worked in capitol hill and federal agencies. They have individuals who have had previous years' experience at some transit agencies. I looked up and at the data -- pulled different staff members' bios. My concern is that they don't necessarily have personally on staff -- you know, nor do we have anywhere in our document do we directly task them with, at least in our resolution do we directly task them with, hey, go out and work with or interview subject matter experts who have done the same kind of work, transit -- former or current transit CEOs or board shares who have engaged in this level of project development, design and build for things of this size -- for projects of this scope. Again, they're an amazing think tank with experience and thinking innovative governance structures, and I do not want to discount that anyway whatsoever, but I want to call attention to the fact that it is not specifically stated in here in any part of the resolution that, you know, they as part of their other research -- we call out them, yes, go talk to the stakeholders and community groups but we don't specifically call out, hey, you need to go out and talk to -- or you need to have an experience base -- have someone on staff who specifically understands recent or current big transit design-build projects as in a current or former CEO or board chair..

That's all the kind of thing I was getting at. I want to make sure we're not looking at this in a bubble and that we had extra bullet points to kind of specifically highlight these kind of requirements. Some of these other things on here are just kind of cleaning up what I think are just acknowledging what the relationship is. Excuse me -- between the three parties and then also just recognition that Project Connect is more than just a project. It's a program made up of individual projects that we are conducting all at one time.

So -- excuse me.

>> Chair: Just from a quick glance, some things that add clarity, I can fully support and I appreciate what you're submitting. In the spirit of transparency this has also not been posted to the community in terms?

>> Neither was what we did last month.

>> Chair: In terms of assigning me to conduct this process?

>> Think about it. We added amendment language that stipulated how we were going to do this process and none of us had an opportunity to review that in advance. We just did it on the fly.

>> Chair: It was a friendly amendment to start this process that we would bring back today, so we had a month to go over this process together, and I believe that you did receive a copy ahead of time to review.

I do see some great recommendations here. I don't agree with striking out a complete section of financing for Project Connect. An entire section being stricken -- taken out. I strongly disagree with that. And, I mean, if --

>> With the assistance of the Project Connect officer -- nothing against Dave but this is supposed to be general counsel leading this for the independence in her role as general counsel. I don't think it's appropriate to have the program officer assisting the general counsel.

>> There's nobody else with transit expertise other than the executive director on the staff.

>> That's why we're hiring Eno?

>> In the spirit of time -- the appropriate step now is to ask for a second. If we want to move forward on the motion to approve. So with that I'd like to ask for a second.

A second to consider it. To consider the amendments. Okay. Do we have a second to consider the amendments of Board Member Stratton?

>> We've indicated some of these things we want to do. As I've gone through the list I don't think it would take that long to go through them. I'm concerned about having a process that rejects them. Based on what I've heard I don't think there's going to be the vote to add the Project Connect officers to that. The ones in the next section funded by city Capital Metro -- that's an objective fact. I don't know if it's characterized as expansion or something new. I'm ambivalent on that. Seamless

transition process -- I'm not sure I would add because we could add lots of qualifiers. Seems we want to have this be as neutral as possible and not point in one direction or the other. So I wouldn't second the Project Connect officer. I would second the funded by city Capital Metro. I don't know that I would take the expansion of the seamless operation. Striking of the finance I would not second. If the experts come back and say that's irrelevant to the analysis, let them come back and say it's irrelevant to the analysis because they certainly could do that.

The next section -- you know, we talk about Project Connect and it's a series of projects. I think you've called it Project Connect. It is what it is. I think that's how it's referred. I don't think that's a change we need to make. The detail on additional things included in operational readiness and maintenance, I'm not sure that -- I think that would be the kind of thing they would look at. I would probably let that go.

Executive director recruitment and compensation. I don't mind them looking at that but I would put in the kind of characterization of it. I would say the independent analysis should consider the implication and governance model of recruitment and compensation. .

>> Okay.

>> I would -- that would probably be something I would support. I would not support having to subcontract out with a former transit CEO. I think that adds to the process. If they think they need to subcontract out they could.

That gets to the next page. Subject matter experts -- I think that's fine. Community stakeholder and subject matter experts -- I mean, they're doing their analysis. I would expect them to seek out subject matter experts?

>> That's what I was trying to get at earlier. That will be in the scope -- not necessarily staff. The leadership at the other organizations, that's the second half of their work. The first half is understanding the Austin context and having delivered a report on best practices but taking the context to those conversations with the leadership at those organizations. But I mean we can -- I ask make sure that the scope calls out person positions within the organizations.

>> Just generally just to say seek out whatever subject matter experts you think you need.

>> Which is how they've done every other report.

>> Right and because they've done it that way?

>> Exactly. That's their methodology.

>> Doesn't offend me to say that because I would expect them to do that. That one, I would probably let that happen. I would not put in the current or former CEOs or executive staff recruiter. I would expect them to find whatever subject matter experts they think are appropriate, including another key subject matter stakeholder -- doesn't offend me to put in subject matter experts there and

in the next place.

When I look at it, going through it, that's what I would second and what I wouldn't second.

>> Honestly, thank you. I'm good with that. When I said I was coming up with a lot of ideas that I thought would improve things -- even with the financing, as I noted them -- the reasoning I put down here is I personally as I rethought this -- I thought the reason that the financing section was a little wonky and not as clean as who we are, I thought wait a minute -- does financing make a difference? Does it matter whether or not you have a second person that's the E.D. Or the E.D. Is vested with the Cap Metro CEO because -- does that impact -- does that really impact it? Because it's more of the policies that impact how we are viewed for credit worthiness than the person. I thought given that, do we need that in?

If it's the will of the body that the body is like, uh-uh, then cool. I thought some of these things were worth consideration to clarify or strengthen the document. My biggest thing -- the two biggest things that were most important to me were -- the last section, my proposed last section and operational readiness that lists out the things that I think the independent analysis should look at about transit system integration, managing transit relations, security compliance, multimodal service planning, creation of the light rail division, facilities management, asset management compliance and executive director recruitment and compensation. To me, those are risks -- real risks we need to be considering, both on the front end, the executive director and recruitment process, and then on the back end when we're operationally ready and handing this off to Cap Metro, what the requirements might be.

Some of the other things -- thank you for clarifying. It's a matter of I didn't know that would be in the scope of work. It was a matter of thinking this was going to be in the scope of work.

>> It will be appended?

>> Yeah. Just putting clarifying remarks and tweaking a couple of things.

>> Chair: I also think it's important -- thank you Board Member Stratton. It's important to know everyone on this dais will be interviewed independent as well as Cap Metro board members as well. We're looking at having a collaborative process that's been delineated. So things that could be part of the scope of work or add clarity, I wholeheartedly agree with you it can only make it better and only inform us better. So in the spirit of that, I think that it's -- what makes me nervous at this point, at this juncture is to have so many amendments sprinkled all over the place without everyone having time to look at it carefully and conscientiously. To your point about if we can take in this input and allow us to add to the scope of work as we're -- you know, if we execute with your approval this contract then, we love the feedback. So with that, I'd like to, you know, really consider if the board is wanting to second any further action on this. From a point of order, please help me?

>> So you have two options. One is to probably -- so we're clear, I think the mayor walked through the amendments that he was willing to second and you could call a vote on the resolution with those amendments or you could call a vote on the resolutions and then call a vote on the amendments. So the resolution is posted.

>> Uh-huh.

>> And then ask the board if they want to adopt the amendments described by the mayor.

>> I'm fine with what the mayor said. I just don't want to be too prescriptive telling Eno who they should and should not interview. They're professionals. They can interview the board, the community. Let them figure out how to interview and not necessarily be too prescriptive. I'm support of the mayor's?

>> I would recommend we do it this way. Would you be okay, Member Stratton, with making the motion to amend the document by including your amendment in section 3-B that adds the words "will be funded by city Cap Metro and federal funds"?

>> Uh-huh.

>> -- because that's true.

>> Yes.

>> And skipping down to section 3-I, adding independent analysis should -- rather than "show how" -- we're not asking them to show how anything -- but say the independent analysis should consider, parentheses, without limitation,s so we're not saying these are the only things.

>> I like that.

>> Specifically the independent analysis should consider -- then the other factors that to you are important.

>> Correct.

>> So they include that.

>> Yes.

>> 3-J.

>> Can I clarify? Should consider without limitation -- where does it pick up?

>> Overall transit integration.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Effective -- to -- overall integration to effectively manage transit labor relations.

>> Well -- let me see. Specifically the independent analysis should consider without limitations how overall transit system integration?

>> Will consider how. And then?

>> Just continues -- yeah.

>> Got you.

>> 3-I. Simplify?

>> Or it's 3-J.

>> Should consider the implications of a governance model on executive director recruitment and compensation.

>> Yes.

>> That's all that that says.

>> Yes. I like it. .

>> And then it sounds like we're going to handle the subject matter expert issue in the scope of work. But certainly we want them -- without limitation, whatever subject matter expert?

>> In that case we don't?

>> We don't need?

>> Yeah. Okay.

>> Really just the three changes.

>> Yeah. City Capital Metro, adding the language in 3-I and 3-J.

>> Yeah.

>> If that's your motion, I second that.

>> I'm happy to read it, too, if you would like.

Okay. So -- and I don't have the entire resolution up here in front of me. 3-B will be amended as follows. Partnership with the city and Capital Metro, ATP was created to aid and act on behalf of the city and Capital Metro in performing certain governmental functions with respect to the implementation of the Project Connect program. Project Connect will be funded by the city, Capital Metro and federal funds and primarily be built in city-owned right of way.

And the rest will be the same.

>> The only difference is I think your wording had implementation of Project Connect as opposed to?

>> Yes.

>> Yes. We can leave that there.

>> The only change is do they -- the adding of the words "be funded by city, cap it will Metro"?

>> Okay. Understood. The next one is in section 3, Roman I. We will add a sentence at the end of the section that says "specifically the independent analysis should consider without limitation, in quotations, how the overall transit system integration will occur to effectively manage transit labor relations, safety, security and compliance certification, multimodal service planning, fair and custom systems integration, creation of a new light rail division, FTA grant management and FTA asset

management compliance."

>> Yes.

>> And just because I know I'll get this question -- creation of a new light rail division -- is that at Capital Metro.

>> Yes. These are at -- these are all the things Cap Metro is doing.

>> I would add the words of the possible creation. It may or may not be. We can't speak to that.

>> Okay. The possible creation of a new light rail division at Capital Metro. And the third amendment is in 3 Roman J. Executive director recruitment and compensation. The independent analysis should consider the implications of a governance model on executive director recruitment and compensation. .

>> Just those three changes.

>> Yeah.

>> So, Veronica, if you want to call a vote, it will be for the resolution as amended on the dais.

>> Chair: With that I'd like to make a resolution -- based on the amendments as proposed and as currently discussed by Board Member Stratton and clarified by mayor Adler. Do I have a motion to approve?

Thank you.

Everyone in favor please say "aye." .

Any nays?

Thank you.

So now we move on to discussion items. So we have the -- thank you.

The briefing of Project Connect road map, project manager and senior project controls, HDR principal manager. So welcome.

>> Thank you, board chair, members of the board. What I would like to start with, this is the 12th meeting of this board. And it is now into an important point as we go into next year. There are a whole series of critical decisions that have to get made, whether you're talking about the light rail program, whether you're talking about the funding, whether you're talking about NEPA. All those things need to be considered. What we want to do is back up and look at some of the things have been there and that's what Meg is going to do -- the different things that have been considered.

Lot of things that have been there -- as we go forward with the decisions, we want to make sure we've been able to provide the information for to consider. That's one piece of it. Another piece is going to be the pieces you have to do to get through the process. There's a very long series of items that you don't have a choice. You have to comply with those. Jen is going to do that part.

There will be detail on the CIG program -- the different types of funding, different levels. Bryan will do that. The way the agenda is put together is a recap. This is the part that Meg will do with where we've been, where we are now and where we're going to in the future. The second part is NEPA. That's what Jen will cover. She's our expert that we stole from another city, Phoenix.

Next is CIG. That will be Bryan. Bryan is the project manager for program management oversight group. I'll close it off with a list of different subjects that we can have conversations about, whether it is in this forum or workshops as we go ahead and go forward to those critical decisions that will be there in the next 12 months.

If I go to the next slide -- have I got -- I've got it. Okay.

This is basically where we are, where we're going to go ahead and move forward through. Really in the process of the different seasons we've got. We're looking now at the discussions of the different program topics. There will be a list we'll have at the end of the presentation. Those can be added to. Those can be augmented. It can be done basically in a workshop basis with the board. It can be done based upon conversations at the board meetings. It's up to which way you would prefer to do those.

In the summer we'll go through the 30 per cent design, looking at the costs, the trade offs as we start to go ahead and move forward -- we'll do risk analysis. Next month there will be an award of a contract that Greg is going to have in place to do risk analysis of contract types and many considerations. When we get to the fall that's decision time in a lot of areas. Goes to direction of trade offs, costs, things of that nature, moving out and do a public hearing for the NEPA process. When we get to the winter and beyond we're ready to move forward. As Mr. Clark said earlier with respect to the letter of no prejudice that's there for the first two Metro rapid lines that's something we'll look forward to in the future -- also for the orange and blue lines. With that as a backdrop and as a starting point, I'd like to ask Meg to come forward and do the next portion of the presentation.

>> Okay. Good afternoon, board. Thank you so much for having me. The team asked me to talk to you today a little bit about the road map that we were on and what we've accomplished to date. And I've been on this project as a consultant supporting the team since about 2017. So four years but with pandemic math I think it's a little more than that.

Let's walk through some of the big milestones. And I'll take that. Thank you.

All right. So just at a glance -- gosh. Almost three years ago exactly the Capital Metro board approved the vision plan but leading into that, we had a lot of public outreach. Some of you may know one of our more famous meetings, trance it a la mode, where we served pie. That was a fun one.

We knew the community had scar tissue from referendum of past. We listened, tried to

understand what the priorities were and also nationally the transportation landscape was changing. So it was around this time that the board approved the first vision plan. And then that spring the city of Austin moved forward with the Austin strategic mobility plan, which really cemented the role of transit and a future where mode shift in our city would be possible.

And then just about a week before lock down, city of Austin and the Capital Metro teams came together and the boards together approved what would be a system plan that we now know and recognize today. And that translated into the next step, which was to go with the community recommendations. We vetted a lot of those initial alternatives with the city and additionally with the community. And that came to be what we now know is the locally preferred alternative. It was with that that we then had what we needed to decide if it was time to pursue an initial investment. With the community the boards of Capital Metro and the city of Austin City Council decided to pursue that. Of course November 2020 the referendum passed and then the ATP was formed, which brings us here today.

.So I'm going to go through these fairly briefly. As I mentioned, this was a result of multimonth engagement process. However, in discussing this with the board and the community, some of the sentiment expressed was that actually we need to go bigger. The plan should actually be bolder. The population growth we all now know very well was starting to scare a lot of people and a lot of the community sentiment we were hearing was, please, if we're going to invest something -- invest in something, please make it last and please help us think of a sustainable way to grow our community.

Another big important step to that was the inclusion of ASMP into how we thought about the corridors. Those two plans worked in sync to be able to identify the corridors that were going to do a lot of the work in transit.

And then in April of 2019, the Austin City Council unanimously approved the Austin strategic mobility plan, and this is really important for Project Connect's role because at present at the time of the survey, transit was accounting for only four per cent of mode shift in Austin. And the goal is to quadruple that of course to 16 per cent.

And a big part of the ASMP that underscored Project Connect's role is trying to help the community understand that also having heard from the community that it is the value add of high capacity transit to have dedicated space in the transit way.

This is a phase that I think is really, really important in the analysis and in community engagement that sometimes gets overlooked. And it is really the most comprehensive study that we have done in the region to date and it really brought us some really great data that we are now able to run with because we are in a NEPA process that has a time line. So this due diligence gave us a bit of a head start, and what I mean by that is we began with a tiered screening process and that is really

beginning to work with the community to identify the project's purpose and need. It's through that lens that everything else falls. We did look at the universe of alternatives of all types of transportation modes. You can think of it as a filter. Things went to the cutting room floor because they did not meet the purpose and need according to what the community defined.

In the next tier we look at project costs, ridership, how the corridor may or may not meet the needs of the ridership based on three factors: Mode, the elevation -- is it going to be street running, is it going to be underground, or is it going to be elevated? And then also the mode, which in our case came to fruition as both bus rapid transit and corridor where that was appropriate and light rail, where that was appropriate.

And this data provided us both quantitative -- that is, all of the numerical data that the corridors were telling us -- it was a matter of understanding which corridors had the highest travel demand but with the input of the community to say that jives or it's great that your model said that; however, have you thought of -- and the have you thought of type questions is something that's been iterative throughout the process and serves as a continuous feedback loop.

And then finally we go to the system plan, which I know all of us now know very well so I won't spend a lot of time on it. It is the blueprint for the NEPA process and now we really talk a lot about the orange and blue lines, but in the end, it is the program of projects that the community is most interested in. So we try to keep that in mind and make sure that even when we're talking about the blue or orange line, that we are making the connections with how that integrates with the bus network, bike infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure, et cetera.

And that brings us to where we are now in the NEPA process. So just a quick look -- I'm not going to spend too much time on this because Jen is going to go into it. Effectively we are at the nexus of where we're starting to get pretty specific about design, and we're seeing community members that we haven't heard from in a while start to weigh in again, which is greater. That means they're taking interest. They're starting to understand how design might impact or benefit and/or both part of their specific geography they may be interested in. And all of this is in pursuit to the goal of seeking a full funding grant agreement in 2024. So Jen is going to walk you through that component of NEPA. But I'll pause and see if we have any questions.

>> Chair: Do we have any questions?

Thank you so much.

>> Good afternoon. I'm going to talk a little about the NEPA process, somewhat where we've been but also where we're headed. Let me advance here.

As you know, we're engaged in a NEPA compliant environmental review of the projects within the program that would utilize federal funds. There are different types of ways you can accomplish

NEPA compliance, different levels of review. It's the FTA that decides what is suitable for the project. Within Project Connect they've been cleared through NEPA using categorical exclusion. That is the simplest and is used in the cases where the FTA determined there would not be significant impacts due to the nature of the project.

Right now we're just starting to put together a CE for the central maintenance facility that would support the light rail project and we're contemplating the other uses at that facility. It's another possibility to do environmental assessment. We're not doing any of those as part of this program at this time. That's in the case where FTA has determined it's not clear whether there would be significant impacts. For the orange and blue lines we're doing EIS's, which is the most rigorous of the things you can do under NEPA. Appropriately so because they're major projects that are certain to have significant impact on the community.

The beginning of the process is scoping. For the blue and orange lines we have concluded scoping for the purposes of NEPA. That is really an opportunity to engage all of our community stakeholders to talk about the project, how we're defining, what are other alternatives to achieving the same objectives and what are the things we need to analyze in the process. Those things are woven into the work we're doing now, which is heavy analysis mode. We're looking at environmental impact statements -- working on a lot of that now. As we get to 2022 we'll work on a draft EIS.

We're going to work with project partners and really our interim goal is to get to next summer where we would be issuing the draft EIS's for public review and comment. We would have a 45-day public comment period on the draft where the documents would be available. We would conduct a hearing and probably other events to make sure people understand the documents and are able to comment on them. At the close of that public comment period, that indicates -- those are the comments we're going to take into the final EIS. The purpose of the final EIS is to respond to those comments. That could mean design adjustment -- now or in the future. It could mean additional analysis -- whatever it is. Preparing the final EIS we're documenting those responses.

Once the final is complete FTA will issue a record of decision. That signals the conclusion of the NEPA process. Another important component is it includes the mitigation commitments that have come out of the process. With us, next summer is the target for the public review period and we're looking to complete the final EIS and ROD within five months of the conclusion of the public review period.

So in -- as we get into 2022 we're engaged with a number of partners in the NEPA process.

>> As we get into 2022. We are engaged with a number of partners in the NEPA process. The cooperating agencies are a specifically defined role in the NEPA world. Regulatory agency's engagement with the project area. In our case, we are working with EPA, FAA, and TXDOT we have a much longer list of participating agencies they could be government agencies state federal-local or other organizations that have a regulatory or other jurisdiction or attachment to the project such that issues of importance that need to be addressed and also to set up for the coordination we need to ultimately implement for the project. With this slide, I want to comment a little bit on the relationship between NEPA and design. As you know. We completed 15% of design plans those were reviewed by the public and received quite a bit of feedback it was also reviewed by EIS environmental review team, that is part of the feedback loop as well that informs what we're doing as part of the 30% plan ultimately in the draft EIS we will be contemplating the 30% plans when we get to the rod final EIS, we will still be at the 30% level of design. It's after that subsequent design you see the mitigation commitments being implemented. For one. The ROD is required to advance through the capital investment programs with startings through a federal source. Not only required but required to occur in the right time frame there is a couple prescribed scheduled constraints associated with the rod one is the guidance it should be completed within two years which is a kind of efficiency guidance sometimes it can take a long time I would highlight the second bullet here, there are consequences to that that NEPA must be completed within the two-year project development phase of the program. It's necessary to do that in order to move to the next gate in the federal funding process. Another important thing is the issuance of the ROD in that it gives us pre-award authority that means we can spend money on things we later want to see federal matched for and can be reimbursed for later this is an important way to manage the schedule and cost risk for the project some we get the authority for with ROD are the vehicles which are a very Longley item. Property acquisition which is also scheduled and cost risky because even though you might know what parcels you need to acquire, you really don't necessarily know how long it will take or what your final costs will be to be able to start earlier. That helps us imagine that. Utility relocation is another important piece of the pre-authority. Utility is important on these projects the sooner you can work on that and manage the better I will pivot here. I was asked to talk a little bit about our risk management process. I know you are quite aware of all of the preliminary engineering and the NEPA work that's been on going another thing we have been doing is setting up project controls within ATP as part of that we're looking to institute a methodical process how we identify monitor and manage risks I'm going to talk about a couple key events I would say but our approach to long term managing monitoring risk on these products I think Dave mentioned there is RP out next fall and anticipated for approval of the contract to get additional risk advisory s there is a number of important issues,

we need to consider and make decisions on as we get into 2022. That includes how we're going to deliver these light rail projects, what kind of method, whether it be.

Sign building or something else. The different models of our risk tolerance. What are the best ways to deliver this that delivers our objectives? Part of that assessment will be financial and looking at cash flow requirements associated with the different scenarios in the financing needs that would have to back that up. Specific to orange and Blue Lines, we will do specific and detailed recycle analysis workshops. Design plans will be a comprehensive view of the potential risks we may encounter on these projects from the very detailed technical or stakeholder-oriented, etc. And as part of this process, we would utilize the Monte Carlo model. That is a quantitative way to analyze your risk. It's really looking at different outcomes based on probability distribution. The goal is to give you data as far as how we can navigate uncertainty on these projects of which there will be quite a bit. That kind of modeling can help us inform our cost contingency levels. A big will be to have our first initial risk register for each project that is a comprehensive risk tool that we'll use to manage them throughout. FTA is going to require this kind of recycle analysis workshop that will do their own modeling that will be prior to the grant agreements, and they will be looking specifically at making recommendations for the level of cost and schedule contingency we need to have on the probability they will take as many days it will take to drill down to all the details of the project and assess our management capability to deliver the projects. Do we understand the risks are we managing them and our cost and schedule for what we need to do? Doing this is a critical piece that has to happen before the full fund grant agreements that we determine are ready to get the federal funds. On a regular basis after it's delivered. The risk register is not just a list of risks, we score those on calculations that include probability and magnitude of cost impacts of certain risks that occur as part of the register. We identify someone who owns that risk. Somebody on the project team who is managing its opportunities to mitigate those risks to keep track of what we would do on a regular basis along each of the projects, certainly retire some risks, and identify new ones along the way.

We don't have the comprehensive yet, we know enough to have an idea of what they are. This is a list of what some of those risks might be. It looks like it's falling off the slide. This won't be the last conversation we have had about risk. I'm sure I will say one thing about this list. We have different levels of control over the different items on this list. Some we can serve to manage some are happening to us. We can monitor or plan a few. I will point out one is utilities, a big risk on projects like this. Not only the risk no matter. How much due diligence you do, once you start digging underground you don't always know what you are going to find, that is a risk also as far as working with third-party utilities and making sure everybody is coordinated and in line, working on the same path, so we get to the goal at the same time. Also a source of risk, the other one I will

mention is right of way and real estate acquisition, we can know what par Celsius we might need or pieces of land you don't know how much until we get into it. This is an area we need to manage. That concludes my slides. Happy to take any questions or comments before we move on to Brian.

>> Thank you, Mrs. Pine. I'm glad we stole you from Phoenix. I hope the weather is nicer here, so welcome. Board Member Elkins.

>> Thanks Jen, glad to see we're talking about risks that are obviously important. I would agree with those risks. I would highlight one I mentioned earlier: a top risk is one you don't think has dollars and cents. That is community relations. If we don't execute that well, we might as well go home. I would underscore the other risk I see you got there is tradeoffs. I call that scope creep and trade offers. You imagine that well. I'm glad you are talking about it. We will have more discussions for future board meetings so thank you.

>> Any questions or comments for Mrs. Pine? All right. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mr. Buchanan. Welcome.

>> Afternoon board. A little bit about the CIG process: when you elect to bring the government on as a funding partner the specific process to work through that is called the CIG for the process in this particular program. We did checks here, we got things accomplished back in August 2020, we asked for project development for the rapid lines for the expo and pleasant valley for the ability to get the LOMP yesterday and begin construction here with the groundbreaking here today. July 28th. We asked for project development for orange and Blue Lines project development is the entity that is asking to be a partner with the federal government to write a brief description of what the project is outline the projects what are the key considerations of the corridor that are improved by the probability that is looked at by FTA staff you are added to a list and entered in the project develop. I wouldn't say it is an important step, it is that initial step. There is no commitment on the FTA's behalf when you enter the project development let's go. Let's get into the program. Let's start.

So, that is the process we're in right now. That process you have seen a lot of other stuff, we have done through public outreach conversations with the community there is a lot more that needs to be brought to the forefront as you build the team and the unit that is going to be delivered to the program that is done through project management plan this is basically your business processes your policies and procedures that get documented laid out as part of the project management plan costliest paintings get refined as we move from 5 to 10 to 15 to 30% redesign schedule look at based on deliver methods through the process you hear Jen talk about third party agreements in right of way those things continue to get further defined in the two year development phase as we move through the process, we take on value engineering preliminary value

engineering to look through the plan through multiple lenses to look at what is being built to look at scope creep those types of things and look at alternatives and also accessibility a program like, this, we want to look at how stations are connected how people with all mobiles can get through use the transit system all that is undertaken plus many, many more during this project development phase.

There are elements that need to be done as part of the review. There are standard templates that will be filled out. There is a 20-year development that will be brought to bear in the program that includes operations and maintenance portions needed by the Cap Metro side of the house brought into the program. Integrated project schedules. In the contracting plans and documents. What is the way we're going to deliver the program? Identification of the third-party agreements preliminary technical report you saw pictures early days of boats out on the river and collecting soil samples that is all part of our due diligence during the project development phase, all that needs to be completed in two years that clock started on the orange and blue line on July 28th of this year, we have two years to complete all that get through all that work with FTA. Work with staff, work with the partners to bring those policies, and procedures together along with 30% plans, and along with the great community assets and stuff get it all documents and move into what is next called engineering. So, moving into engineering is another formal task on the program. You must continue to develop all those documents you started as part of project development that continue to be refined. A lot of the elements are now started to be completed or things are starting to come into very clear what is needed to implement the program that will lead eventually to new starts full funding grant agreement. As part of that process, you have to get into the annual report, there will be a rating of the program that will go with the FTA it will be put into the program if it meets all the criteria the availability of program funds is there. And considerations related to whether or not the grantee is ready to go into that. This is where the discretionary part of this program comes in. This program is not guaranteed. It is discretionary. You have to work through all this and work all your other means and methods to try to get into this program and get into the new starts annual report and president's budget. What is a grant agreement? This is very clear. It's a contract. It is a contract with the federal government to perform and how the grantee will perform under that and what other responsibilities and the roles of each individual and quite frankly, how much money is the federal government going to put into the program? That level of financial commitment is locked at engineering as you move in that process. So, it will not change and that is your one opportunity to negotiate with the federal government on that one on that financial share

It also has a schedule associated with it all. So, it defined a period of performance for the grant and how the FTA is going to oversee that as a partner.

The FTA. When you get to your signing agreement, there is a lot that goes into it. They don't just hand them out. They will not if you are not ready, they're not going to give it to you. It's very important for staff at this particular moment to work through all the due diligence to work through the risks to work through everything and get everybody as comfortable as possible. That the project is from before. Once that is complete you get the FTA, through another oversight group of people called the PMOC. They will write a letter to the FTA recommending this particular program get this grant agreement and we will move through the federal process. I know I have taken 1,000 pages of rules and regulations boiled down to eight slides but I would be happy to answer any questions on the process.

>> Thank you Mr. Buchanan do we have any questions on the team. This is a lot of information. I hope we take it home and read it carefully. Thank you so much.

>> Madame Chair, I thought Medicaid was complex until I got to the transit world my gosh I'm glad we got a team like this assembled navigating this for us. Wow, this is some crazy stuff. Thank you all.

>> Yes. Intense. Thank you.

>> Those are all the fun things we get to do. And it is very prescriptive as both Jen said and also Brian said, there are all of these things you have to do. The NEPA process is very rigid. FTA has OP's each one of those procedures is what you are evaluated against you have to get to a point when they go through all of those reviews, all of those several times you send a procedure in it goes back you wind up going through it again it's just an arduous process. There is at the end a readiness report. The readiness report is what the recommendation is that goes from program management oversight contractor back to FTA that will basically say they are ready to move forward with FGA, it is a long process it is something that I think that every single one of us within the group is proud what we have been able to accomplish, from Pleasant Valley in the period of time we have gone through. We're looking to do exactly the same thing with this. Go ahead and move forward as quickly as we possibly can so we are able to get to that full funding grant agreement as we get to that full funding grant agreement something Jen said is the ability to have preaward authority we will do things that start to do the relocation of utilities acquisition or real estate. Those will be things done using the local portion of the funds long before we got the contract with the voters. It's something that is there that shows to the federal government the FTA, the dedication and interest that the locality and transit agency has to go ahead and move forward with the program to kind of quantify it. Two of my last experiences in Houston, there was \$300 million that the agency had spent in California. It's something that takes that initial investment, it takes that dedication to get to that point you are signing a contract and a point that Brian highlighted is you sign the contract, it is for a finite deliverable that is a very great level of detail that is there. It will be the number of rail cars that have everything in it. And it will have a schedule. Those are the things

you are signing up for when you sign that grant agreement; it doesn't move the needle in the future for anything that is funding. It is something that is there that guarantees that the agency is making sure that the time frame and dollars there aren't going back and Brian said, when you go into entry in engineering that is the time you commit to what those dollar amounts are. As we look to the future with all of those things as a backdrop, we have gone through collectively and looked at the different items that we believe should be part of the discussion that goes forward with the board. These are items that we believe are critical to go ahead and go into the next phase to get us through the decisions that you are going to need to make between now and basically this time next year. It is pretty much everything is here are things we have looked at that we believe are items that need to get done, there may be others you desire to go ahead and some you want to delve into deeper that can be done in a format like this today it can be done in a workshop that is something collectively and collaboratively to work through and talk through. To see what is the best way to go ahead and move forward I think you have seen from everything that is presented today, there is a tremendous amount of work that has to be done between now and this time next year. And it's going to take that collective effort to get us there. It's to take the experience that is part of this overall this time to get us there. Without that experience, you do not get there. I joked about stealing Jen from Phoenix, we stole people from New York and California, we have one of the best teams with a super leader taking us in a great direction.

As looking forward, we will look at the 30% design estimates what Greg will do with the new consultant he's bringing on board more work on the initial risk assessment looking at detail than what we have right now in terms of the initial risks, we are seeing most of which are risks you are seeing in the early part of the marriage program. As we go forward in the fall, it's decision time beyond that; it takes us to the NEPA process, the contracting, and things of that nature. That is where we go and what we're looking forward to over the next year. That is not to say we haven't accomplished a lot this year, we have accomplished a tremendous amount this year there's a lot more to do as we get through the next 12 months that concludes our presentation today either myself or any of the presenters will be happy to answer any questions you may have

>> Thank you Mr. Couch. Do we have any questions from the group? I don't know? I don't know if you signed us with so much information. [Laughter].

>> Great team as usual. What we're hoping to get dialogue with you, we have a fair amount of topics we have to cover with you all. Most of those topics, we refer to as the functional, we run through the Tom ploy indicated topics, we get to the summer the majority ATP focuses on is the light rail component. The cost is estimated by the financial model. We have a financial strategy by then. Erica is leading and how much money we can get out of D.C. back here and we have initial risk and contracting methodology those will lead to big board decisions, we got to get towards this is the 30% design what is our methodology going past 30% design

contract methodologies so the team can develop specifications when we hit record of decision, we are into the next contracts we do not want here's record of decision now six months later is the contract. We need to know what we're going to do. Design building all of these different methodologies have be worked through as I mentioned the Orange Line can be six projects, we have to think about how that is going to cut and how that works the topics at the top drive the entire process one thing we would love the input from the board. Question: have individual conversations and pick through a little bit more how you prefer to go through those topics? Is it the way we did that with staff today? Presentation style and you know we have a variety of different knowledge on the board regarding different topics. And that is to be expected, so right of way in real estate different members of the board have a very high level versus more of a novice level. What is the right formula? Do you want to package 2 or 3 of these together in a workshop? There are a couple that work well together. We have been thinking of a Cap Metro ATP specific workshop. Ultimately this is transportation for Cap Metro to operate and maintain. Any dialogue or thought now again later, we can take a crack at how we think that should be laid out but we want to be sure to tell us do these topics make sense? [Inaudible] help drive the decision process with the staff.

>> That takes us to the next topic you heard from this board. I'm sorry for the board I will give you next. We want to be more involved and be able to not just have presentations to us, but really create a work group to hear our expertise and opinions from this board. I think the way this board was assigned in particular, each of the expertise we bring to the table, we will help we would love the opportunity to participate and have more input so I love the concept of us having workshops and less presentation that is something I would like for us to consider strongly so mayor you had a point?

>> Mayor Adler: It was exactly what you said. I think that lays out that framework really well. I think just working through these kinds of elements is important. I think setting them in this forum not only educates us to the decisions we have to make but also an opportunity to raise the hard issues with the community so they can see them being debated and they know what they are. Tony asked for us to start identifying the major risk issues and having us start talking about those and weighing those. I support him in that effort with respect to risk issues, we know there are forced choice issues that we are ultimately going to have to make. So, the deeper dive in succession on the design elements we see bubbling up the cost implications for that. The sooner that we start beginning to get a feel for the hard choice that we in the community are going to have to make and what the scale of the choices are, I think the more reasoned the decision we make so I agree with the chair just lay it out and I think that we're eager to get involved in that process.

>> Thank you. Board Member Elkin.

>> A brief comment. I know we're tight on time for this. Say a great roadmap for topics. Some things we should talk about are recurring things that happen every quarter. I would like to see the budget every quarter. I like to see a top ten risk analysis every quarter. I would like to see a top community hot button list every quarter. And these types of things can happen as needed. I think one of the real priority ones for me would be delivering procurement strategies. I know we're bringing on an advisor, which is really important because some of these delivery models will require earlier versus later, for instance, the benefit of progressive design Building upfront. Right? We don't need to wait for you to do procurement to the ROD. You can get the funding after the ROD comes in. Those retirement things we nuked to talk about.

>> There are restrictions on how far you can advance engineering also before you get to a ROD. What you can and cannot do under NEPA. What consultants are precluded from participating at that point. It's also with things that are there getting to 30%. One of the discussions, we had is being prepared for the ROD to get the contracts out the door. I would love to find a way to get to progressive design a month from now. It's just not something when you look at where those federal regulations are, you have to be very careful how you do that.

>> Thank you Mr. Couch. You have your mic on the mayor.

>> Sorry.

>> I'm guided by the light. So, any further questions? No? Before we move on, thank you Mr. Couch before we move onto our executive session, we lose a lot of the audience I want to make sure I capture this. Anything that we want to add at our next board agenda? Anything you want to bring up that we would like to include.

>> [Speaking off the mic] has already been discussed.

>> Okay. I like to know the Austin Transit Partnership will now enter an executive session pursuant to 551.07 for. The Texas Government Code for personnel matters related to the director seven. Executive Session one. Section 551.074 of the Texas Government Code for personnel matters related to Executive Director FY21 performance evaluation and FY22 performance metrics. Thank you everyone for your patience as we complete this Executive Session. Thank you.

(Meeting in Executive Session)

(WebEx session complete)

(No audio).