Texas Advanced Air Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting-20240626_090000-Meeting Recording

June 26, 2024, 2:00PM

1h 43m 16s

Dan Dalton 0:03
Rebecca, if you're able to pull up the agenda just to flash it for folks so they can see.

Davio, Rebecca L 0:10
Umm.
Molly, can you do that?
Since you got the slides, it's OK.

Dan Dalton 0:13
I'm sorry.

Davio, Rebecca L 0:17
Umm, he wants the real agenda.
The formal posted agenda.

Allred, Molly M 0:24
OK, let me get that.

Davio, Rebecca L 0:26
I can do that.
I had it open.

Dan Dalton 0:30
Sorry, call an audible.

Davio, Rebecca L 0:33
It's, you know, it's OK.
We ought to be able to respond.

Dan Dalton 0:54
Awesome.

All right, since we are at uh - of course, right at 9:00 my computer wants to know if it should restart to install updates.

I'm going to go ahead and tell it to not do that for 8 hours because that would be extremely annoying.

Well, just want to say thanks to everyone for being here and I see a number of other folks who are just joining us now.

That's great.

Umm, so a pivotal moment actually in in the assembly of this group, this loaded group we are now at a place where the recommendations have pulled -they've been pulled together, have been refined quite a bit and now we are ready to basically vote on each of the recommendations and we'll talk a little bit more about that.

We'll vote on you the recommendations to then be assembled into the draft final report, which then will go through its various machinations to then be able to get to the legislature this fall.

So a few things.

So we'll go through kind of the agenda here as it says, you know, you'll hear from myself.

And I think I saw Mike come in, but maybe yeah, we'll double check that and then talk a little bit about the actual go through the actual recommendations and this is where members of the committee will vote.

I will note that only votes from committee members are counted, so I asked that only the Committee members vote and we're going to do a roll call here in a second.

Dan Bagwell will do that and then after we go through each of the recommendations, assuming all the recommendations are approved, well, regardless of whether they're approved or not, the ones that are approved, we'll just kind of put those off in the parking lot and those will be ready to be integrated into the draft report.

And then from there, those that are still not approved will go ahead and have a special session on those to get them over the line or to kill them off if that is what the committee decides.

Umm, so that's the kind of the legislative recommendation side of things then for the report itself we'll kind of walk through the outline that we have and some of the facets of that.

And then we'll talk more about kind of the deliverable that is, that is the deliverable that we'll want to have come forward.

So yeah, so then let's see.

Last but not least, we'll have comments from committee members public and then we will adjourn.

So at this point, Mr. Bagwell, would you mind doing the roll call for the committee members?

Daniel Bagwell 3:39

Not at all.

All right.

So I'll be calling your name if you could please speak up and the microphone if you have trouble with that.

Obviously, maybe a hand raise will work as well, but just want to verify everybody's here' or as many as we can.

Sorry, I think I muted for a second there.

Dan Dalton

Dan Dalton 4:12

here.

Daniel Bagwell

Grant Guillot

Grant Guillot 4:13

Here.

Daniel Bagwell 4:15

Thank you, George Kivork.

Ben Ivers.

Brent Klavon.

Angel Newhart.

TSTC Angel Newhart 4:46

Here.

Daniel Bagwell 4:49
Jim Perschbach.

Jim Perschbach 4:53
Here.

Daniel Bagwell 4:56
Kendall Prosack.
OK, Michael Sanders.
I believe I saw your name.

Sanders, Michael 5:12
Yes, Dan, I'm here.

Daniel Bagwell 5:13
There we go.
Hey Thomas Swoyer.
Nathan Trail.
Sergio Saenz.

Sergio Saenz 5:39
Here.

Daniel Bagwell 5:43
Jeff Bilyeu.
Alright, David Fields.
Ernest Huffman, believe I saw your name.

Ernest Huffman 6:06
Here.

Daniel Bagwell 6:10
Gus Khankarli.
Cameron Walker.

Cameron Walker 6:22

I'm here.

Daniel Bagwell 6:26

Kimberly Williams.

Kimberly Williams 6:29

Here.

Daniel Bagwell 6:33

Jason Day.

Day, Jason 6:36

Good morning everybody, here.

Daniel Bagwell 6:39

Good morning.

Maruthi Akella.

Ahsan Choudhuri.

Brent Skorup.

Brent Skorup 7:07

Present.

Daniel Bagwell 7:09

Thank you.

Andrew Chang.

Tran, Stan 7:15

Hi, this is Stan at United.

I'm Andrews proxy.

He's tied up in meetings today.

Daniel Bagwell 7:22

Right.
Thank you, Stan.
Cade Clark.

Cade Clark 7:32
I'm here.
Thank you.

Daniel Bagwell 7:33
Thank you, Amanda Nelson.

Amanda Nelson 7:38
Hello everybody, I'm here.

Daniel Bagwell 7:40
And Mark Ozenick.

Daniel Bagwell 7:56
Alrighty, we have exactly a quorum currently and we'll you know, we have 14 members counted present.
Obviously, we'll be checking as more folks join to see who else is able to join, but we do have a quorum present.

Dan Dalton 8:13
Great.

Daniel Bagwell 8:13
Thank you all.

Amanda Nelson 8:14
Cutting it close.

Dan Dalton 8:14
Yeah, I saw.
I saw Brent from ANRA checked and also, I think Kendall was there too, but she may

not have heard so.

So yes, good, quorum. Wonderful.

Alright, so let's go ahead and get started.

Molly, if you wouldn't mind pulling up the slide show, that would be great.

Umm, so I basically kind of covered my opening thoughts.

I don't know Mike, did you have things you wanted to cover before we get started?

SM Sanders, Michael 8:48

No, not really, Dan, other than a lot of hard work that's taken us to and gotten us here.

DD Dan Dalton 8:56

Yeah, it's absolutely true.

I realized that for some of the subcommittees, it's actually gotten to a place of almost a second full time job.

So much appreciated and of course obviously truly appreciate Texas State and all the work that they've done on this too.

So alright, Molly, next slide.

All right, so we talked just quickly, you know, kind of the desired outcome for today is really to approve the recommendations or to very quickly triage the ones that are not agreed upon and then move on to.

I should also note that within that approval process, we've gone, we've done actually, Texas State has done quite a bit of work on the AAM definitions for the State.

And so we'll talk about what those look like.

But then ideally move on to the actual report generation part of this process.

So we're coming around the corner, so to speak, on a 400 yard track and looking forward to kind of going across the finish line here in the next couple of months.

So all right, next slide.

Just a reminder for everyone that these are the deadlines that we're looking at.

So really trying to finalize the fodder that goes into the report so that we can actually get to a place where it will be written and be able to be reviewed in the next 4 weeks, then it goes on to TxDOT for public comment and said et cetera.

So that is why this meeting is so important.

So next slide please.

Alright, so the recommendations themselves.

Next slide.

So this is the top line.

Look at how you know - and many thanks to Texas State again for kind of putting them into kind of a framework of these three buckets, so to speak, across Texas leadership, the Statewide plan and then additional research and development that they would be needed.

And so as you can see, each of under each of these is a.

Basically a quick bullet point as to what the recommendation is, and so we'll dig into each of these.

Again, the intention would be and hopefully we will actually end early.

So the intention would be to vote on each of these alphabetized sub bullets when we go through them again, only committee members are asked to vote as only committee member votes will count.

And so then, once we agree that recommendation is approved by the committee, then we will then move it on to be ready for the actual plan itself, or, sorry, the report.

DD **Dan Dalton**   11:35

So without further ado, let's dig right into these.

So if we can go to the next slide, please.

So just to be aware, there's some color coding that is in this deck.

So the blue is the primary recommendation and then the green is kind of new information, so next slide.

Alright, so this really kind of gets to, as I kind of mentioned the overarching framework of the recommendation, which is that we should that the State should clarify and the legislature should clarify the definition of AAM and then build out these key points of contact within the State government to be able to both on the at the office of the governor level as well as in TxDOT to be able to help drive this forward from a State perspective.

So does anyone?

Let's keep going, actually.

Next slide please.

So the definition we'll talk about in the-that's going to take a bit of a conversation.

So we'll go ahead and just put a pin in that for a second.

Next slide, the advisory committee itself.

So this is a recommendation that TxDOT continue some form of this advisory committee and possibly expand it to support the development of the Statewide plan, which is the later recommendation.

So let's go ahead and take a vote.

If you agree that and I think, so how-this will be the first one.

So how do we digitally do this?

Voting - there's a poll, I understand.

Davio, Rebecca L 13:15

Right.

Matt's going to do a poll and it will just say - it's generic.

It'll just say, do you agree on this, and he'll record it that it that this was vote, one.

Davio, Rebecca L 13:26

So you say.

Yes, you approve this?

And it'll be recorded, and we can check.

Dan Dalton 13:31

Fantastic.

Davio, Rebecca L 13:34

So all it takes is for the committee members to be able to vote.

Dan Dalton 13:35

Alright so.

Great.

And so you should have seen a pop-up come up with.

You've got Matt's wonderful face on the corner and then you have a yay or nay.

If you're a committee member and you do not have that feature for some reason, for you know whatever it is, please let us know and then we will go from there.

And so I think a quorum, again, uh, let us know, Matt, when you have a quorum of votes.

Which is a 14 I believe is where we got to.

Cameron Walker 14:17

Vote once, right?

Pantuso, Matt 14:17

Yep.

Dan Dalton 14:19

Yep, yeah.

You only get to vote once, Cameron, don't you try and rig this election.

Pantuso, Matt 14:25

We're at 11,12.

Dan Dalton 14:27

All right, great it actually, yeah, it shows it in real time in the chat box.

That's great.

Moment of truth.

Are there any committee members who have not yet voted?

If you have not yet voted, please do so.

Dan Harmon 14:55

Need a bell to ring like in the legislature.

With the, you know, the voting.

Davio, Rebecca L 15:05

We do need another vote.

I think technically. OK.

Dan Dalton 15:09

There we go.

Alright, thank you.

Alright, so this recommendation is approved, so it will go on to now be part of the recommendation actual paper.

So OK, so that is the process we will use going forward.

So I asked that the committee members please be ready to go on your hot little buttons to be able to click.

Yes, Mike.

SM Sanders, Michael 15:37
Uh, is the requirement to have 14 votes or 14 yes votes?

DD Dan Dalton 15:45
I think it's a requirement of 14 yes votes.
So. Umm.

DH Dan Harmon 15:54
But technically speaking, if you have a quorum, it would be a simple majority because you have a quorum of voters present and then it would be a majority of the votes.

DL Davio, Rebecca L 16:12
So if we have-

SM Sanders, Michael 16:13
Yeah, the reason - I'm sorry, Rebecca, the reason I ask is just say, hypothetically, I were to say no on one of these recommendations, right?
That would be 13 and 1 would that be sufficient for it to go forward?
Or would we have to resolve the no vote in order to go forward?

DD Dan Dalton 16:34
Dan Harmon, what are your thoughts on this one?

DH Dan Harmon 16:37
So it would be as long as a major- as long as a quorum is present to vote, it would be a simple majority, so the 13 one would be a pass.

DD Dan Dalton 16:48
OK.
That makes sense.

So we don't need a quorum of the committee to actually vote and approve each one. It's just a quorum as it was.

What was needed to create this committee meeting and then after that, it's a simple majority for the actual recommendations.

Pantuso, Matt 17:02

This is Matt from Texas State.

While we're doing clarifying.

If someone were to abstain or miss a vote, Dan, is it a simple majority of the responses, or a simple majority of the quorum?

Dan Harmon 17:14

So it would be because there is a quorum present.

It would be-as long as there was a quorum present at the meeting, then abstaining from voting doesn't matter.

It's a simple majority.

There just has to be a quorum present for the votes.

Dan Dalton 17:40

That makes sense.

OK, excellent.

Daniel Bagwell 17:43

So Dan, just to just to confirm, if you only had like 10 folks vote, you know with this be if 6 people, yay, that that passes, is that, that sounds like that's the correct way?

Dan Dalton 17:44

We'll go ahead.

Yep, that's what I'm hearing.

Dan Harmon 17:57

Yeah, that is correct, as long as there is a quorum on the meeting.

DB **Daniel Bagwell** 17:59
Thank you.

DD **Dan Dalton** 18:04
Great.

Alright, alright.

Well, the next one is going to be easier. I promise.

Alright, so we can go to the next slide, please.

So this is to create a office within TxDOT, and I'm sure it will start with just one person, but hopefully it will grow to a mighty office in the future.

But to provide additional support for an infrastructure at airports, since that is one of the biggest roles that TxDOT can help, a here in in Texas, so does anyone.

OK, so let's go ahead and vote. Please.

Yay or nay as to whether this recommendation should move forward?

See a number of votes coming in. Excellent.

Fantastic.

Great.

Alright, that one is moving forward.

Thank you very much.

Next slide please.

Alright, so this is to create a position within the office of the governor that really drives Texas leadership, both the national and international stage around not only investment in AAM, but also autonomous vehicles including AAM.

Let's go ahead and put the vote forward as to whether people agree that this should move forward.

All right, looking good.

Fantastic.

Thank you everyone for your responsiveness.

Appreciate that.

Alright, so that one is approved and moving forward.

Next slide please.

So this is the establishment of working group and includes members of the AAM industry.

So I have a real problem.

I continually forget what the what that legislation would House Bill 2340 from 2019 is there's someone on the line remember exactly what that is because I keep forgetting it.

DJ **Day, Jason** 20:25
Yeah, this this Jason.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 20:25
Jason - thank you.

DJ **Day, Jason** 20:26
Good morning, everybody.
House Bill 2340.
So this reference here is the use of UAS for disaster response in Texas and this is all about information sharing.
So, you know, back when we did that group in 2019 AAM was still UAM, it wasn't very prolific.
But AAM technologies are going to be part of disaster response in the future, so they need to-we need to bring them to the table to discuss how that all works and credentialing and training and all of that, those different pieces. Over.

DD **Dan Dalton** 21:04
Great.
Thank you, Jason.
So that'll be something we'll want to kind of capture more clearly in the report itself.
But as shorthand for today, let's go ahead and put the vote forward as to whether the group agrees to have this move forward as part of the report.
This feature makes it so much faster and easier than it going through a roll call and asking everyone.
So yeah, this is this is great.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 21:41
Yes.

Thank you, Matt.

Like just knowledge him publicly.

Dan Dalton 21:43

Thank you.

Pantuso, Matt 21:45

Sure.

And I want to clarify, we are we're capturing names so we can validate on the back end.

Dan Dalton 21:46

Yes.

Great.

Thank you.

Grant, go ahead.

Grant Guillot 21:56

Oh, no, I'm sorry.

I was trying to-how do you vote again?

Dan Dalton 22:02

If you're on Microsoft Teams, there will be a little screen that pops up on top of this meeting and it will say yay or nay and you just choose in there.

Davio, Rebecca L 22:03

Are you?

Grant Guillot 22:16

OK. Thanks.

Dan Dalton 22:18

And if not, just to go ahead and put it in chat that you approve or do not approve of it so.

Dan Dalton 22:30

OK, great.

Thanks, Angel.

Appreciate it.

Alright, this one looks like it is moving forward, so thank you all.

Let's go to the next slide please.

All right, so this is around, uh, public awareness around AAM and having TxDOT help drive some of those communication materials.

In our conversations, this is very similar to kind of what TxDOT has done on autonomous ground vehicles.

And so if you like, for example, if you look at the TxDOT website, you'll find more information about the autonomous Ground Vehicle Task Force and that type of stuff.

So just for additional context, so let's go ahead and put the vote forward.

Would folks like to see this move forward in the overall report?

Davio, Rebecca L 23:22

Also, for additional context, this was added specifically after the discussion at the last Community integration meeting, and this is also consistent with other leader States.

Dan Dalton 23:38

Great.

Thanks for that.

Alright, looking good.

All right, let's go.

So this one is approved and moving forward to the report.

So thank you all for that.

And next slide please.

Great.

So this is the development of a State AAM plan.

You'll note the green language is to help kind of add further clarity around this and to be clear, there will be even more clarity provided when we actually write the recommendation report as well as the actual plan itself.

So this is one of the bigger items that we are recommending is for the State to develop said plan.

So yeah, so the I would say the exact nuances and of what will be in the plan is something we can talk about later.

This really the question that we're asking for.

The vote on is whether or not the State, whether or not we want to recommend that the State have an AAM plan.

So if we could put that vote, up there, Matt, as to whether or not folks recommend we have this, Kendall, please.

Kendal Prosack 24:56
Yeah.

Sorry, just a quick clarifying question for the funding about who's responsible for that funding for this Mark commendation?

Dan Dalton 25:06
That is a good question.

I'm trying to remember where we've ended up on that one.

Davio, Rebecca L 25:14
Kindle, can you clarify the question a little bit?

Are you asking who's going to manage that or where is that money coming from?

Kendal Prosack 25:26
Both.

Davio, Rebecca L 25:26
Or where is it going to umm?

Kendal Prosack 25:29
Uh, both of where would the funds be coming from?

And then who would be ultimately managing the funds?

Davio, Rebecca L 25:40
My guess - so this would be a request to the legislature for the amount currently is at $4 million.

The request was $2,000,000 for economic impact sort of and plan and then the

Statewide airspace infrastructure - that infrastructure line item to look sort of at managing that space, and figuring that out was another $2,000,000 added.

And my guess is that that money would likely - I mean, it's certainly legislative and prerogative, but my guess is that money would go to TxDOT.

Since the plan would be sort of done in coordination, presumably with the next advisory committee.

Kendal Prosack 26:34

OK.

Thank you for the clarity.

Davio, Rebecca L 26:37

Of course.

Dan Dalton 26:40

And of course, you know, I would say like most things that go to a legislature, this $4 million price tag is kind of an opening salvo in the negotiation.

I can only imagine that there will be folks who have different thoughts on what that number should look like.

So personally I'm OK with that.

I realize that it seems like a lot for a plan, but at the same time that may be actually- when you look at if you split out the economic development side and kind of see where the opportunities exist there.

Yeah, there will probably be some negotiating on scope and cost.

So-and also timeline of how and when this planning gets developed so.

But if people agree that we need a plan, that is what I would like folks to vote on. So.

Davio, Rebecca L 27:26

Right.

Yeah.

And the legislative, our legislative guides did council that sometimes it was not a good idea to just put that wild guess out there.

Uh, so they may want to.

They may provide guidance before that request comes, but hopefully we will have some insights for you on the August 1st meeting.

DD **Dan Dalton** 27:50

Good.

Great.

Thank you.

Alright, we are looking good on the votes, so let's OK-this one is approved and it will go into the report.

Next slide please.

All right.

So specifically, an economic impact study to assess where the real opportunities will come as AAM comes into the State.

So this vote would be that the plan is required to include an economic impact study.

So if we could put the vote forward.

Thank you, Matt.

Great, alright, this one is approved and will be part of the report.

Next slide.

Workforce development.

So as part of the of the Statewide plan that these organizations will be party to building out the requirements for educating the workforce here in Texas.

Yeah, with the particular focus on electric and autonomous aviation.

So if we can put the vote forward, thank you, Matt.

Excellent.

Right.

That one is looking good so that one is approved and will be part of the report.

Next slide please.

Alright, first responder training, so recommending that there be a creation of a working group to help drive curriculum around enabling first responders to address AAM related emergencies.

So Matt, if you could put that about forward.

Excellent.

Alright, that one is approved and goes into the report.

So now we are on to the mitigation of cyber risks, so ensuring that the plan has-that the Statewide plan has a section of it that actually has working groups related to evaluating cybersecurity risks.

Matt, if you could put that vote forward?

All right.

That one is approved.

Alright, so this is another big ticket item.

As you can see from the $2,000,000 price tag and it's around airspace integration.

An airspace integration system that is designed to be passive in nature, really providing information versus something that would actively control, which is obviously the role of the FAA - their traffic control system, so let's see.

Let's put this-

Yeah, we could put this forward to a vote.

Tom, go ahead.

Thomas Swoyer 31:57

Yes.

Thank you, Dan.

As one of the, you know, original authors of this I support this concept completely but I think we need to just edit out augmentation of FAA air traffic control system.

And so I apologize, I was given ample opportunity to change that before this meeting and I failed to do that and that is entirely my fault.

But I believe that we need to that augmentation of air traffic control is not the intent of this is to provide airspace awareness at the local level, not to supplement FAA directly.

That is their purview, and I don't think the State should be stepping into that, so I don't know if we have a chance to modify this at this point, but that is my recommendation.

Dan Dalton 32:48

Yeah, absolutely.

And in fact, real time.

There you go.

I think that's a good at it because yeah, I there will be a number of questions and we can further clarify that within the report language itself to make sure that there's no misconceived notion that this is designed to replace the FAA's ATC effort so.

Thomas Swoyer 32:53

OK.

Davio, Rebecca L 33:13

Can we put here to, umm, telling the way you said it-to provide airspace awareness at the local level?

So, like people are clear, when they look at it.

Thomas Swoyer 33:30

I'm perfectly fine with that.

I you know-I'm a big fan of less is more and we can clarify in the report.

So I would you know, if anything I would say take out at the at the local level and just leave it with these kinds of elements that are in there and clarify in the report so as not to-because I think the State, my belief is the State should have has a vested interest in and should own the core of the system and allow private sector developers of airspace awareness systems to be able to plug into that core and provide different services and let industry develop the capability, but the State has a vested interest in making sure that everyone's playing by the same rules with respect to information sharing.

And that would support then first responders that would support law enforcement that would support everybody looking to develop advanced air mobility systems.

Dan Dalton 34:31

Jason.

Day, Jason 34:31

This Jason real quick, I have a question.

So we're talking like UTM here or we're talking something different?

Thomas Swoyer 34:39

Umm, what I'm talking about is a-

It's like UTM.

It's kind of like the federal USS systems that are being developed, by NASA and the Air Force Research Lab that where they provide UTM capabilities.

But I think it needs to go beyond UTM as a lot of advanced air mobility vehicles may start to get to altitudes that encroach upon controlled or not controlled from a 10,000 foot level.

But several thousand feet in the air to go more regional, and I think it's, I think it's UTM but bigger, how do multiple UTM systems connect to each other and that system-that core system is what I believe the State has a vested interest-should have a vested interest in developing.

Day, Jason 35:27

Thank you for that clarification.

I would just ask, since we kind of open this up, if maybe we could.

That last line is a little vague, but to Tom's point, public safety really needs the financial backing to make this happen, right?

Public safety is very underfunded and so DPS and many of the agencies in the DFW area are working with NASA on key site stuff.

But the one thing that always comes up is nobody's got money for their-to be able to integrate with that system on the public safety level.

So maybe we could just clarify that or add another data point that's specifically about funding public safety capabilities for this system. Over.

Thomas Swoyer 36:21

I would offer-I think that's a great idea and maybe it's a Roman numeral 5 in this that just says and system including support for public safety.

Maybe that's too ambiguous or too vague for you, Jason, I'd love a comment, but I'll offer that.

Day, Jason 36:49

Yeah, maybe something like, you know, funding mechanism for public safety to integrate into airspace infrastructure or airspace integrity systems.

Davio, Rebecca L 37:06

Is that changing the bottom line?

Day, Jason 37:10

No.

Thomas Swoyer 37:11

Well.

Day, Jason 37:11

Well, the way I read this in the past is the public in bullet point #4 there was public safety, so I thought that money was already in there.

My-I guess my point is just really clarifying that some of this money goes directly to public safety to make this happen.

Thomas Swoyer 37:33

And so I'll suggest, forgive me if I'm out of turn, but I was-

I was suggesting that this $2,000,000 may be the precursor of developing a plan for how this would be implemented.

There are a lot of possible solutions and a lot of possible end users from Port San Antonio to Wisk, and you have two different drivers of what their needs may be.

So I think we have to come up with a plan for what a system would look like.

So I thought we were funding a plan, funding a study to start to develop that capability.

And I think that study is going to require third party contractors to provide consulting support to the State.

And so that's more of what I think this is right now.

$2,000,000 is not enough for an airspace infrastructure system.

Dan Dalton 38:24

Yeah, it's probably not enough for public safety to adequately use it either.

So given that, Jason, maybe we for that, you know bullet point 5, maybe it's yeah-system includes because we're the bullet points were related to the system itself.

Yeah, maybe it is just that safety.

And then we talk about the funding side of it later.

OK, cool.

I'll see a thumbs up.

Ohm. Alright.

And then I see a couple hands raised.

So let me go over there, Kendall.

Day, Jason 38:56

I think Kendall had a comment.

Dan Dalton 38:57

Yeah.

kendalprosack 38:59

Yeah.

Thank you.

If this is just for the plan, can we kind of change how it's written then cause to me right now it's reading as developed the system to provide all of these things rather than develop plan and those are very different things.

Dan Dalton 39:18

Yeah, maybe develop a plan for an AAM.

Yeah.

Excellent.

Great catch, Kendall. Cade.

Cade Clark 39:31

I was just about to say the same thing as Kendall and then also add in-

I appreciate what Thomas just brought up about augmenting.

I think it's important as we develop this report that it's clear that we're not preempting anything within the federal agency.

I know we stated that, but I think that's vitally important.

That is, umm, as is this task of our Committee here.

We're not trying to lead the legislature astray.

We don't want to get them into trouble and this needs to be as helpful as possible, right?

And we're not trying to buck federal preemption.

So I think that needs to be crystal clear.

Dan Dalton 40:13

Yeah.

And I think we should, we should put maybe even a call out box in the report that says that we are not intending to preempt so.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 40:22

Umm, we can do that and then I'm thinking that the plan requirement that the second where it says system includes, it needs to say plan includes is that correct?

DD **Dan Dalton** 40:23

Yes. Correct.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 40:39

OK.

DD **Dan Dalton** 40:42

Right.

And then Brent.

BK **Brent Klavon (ANRA)** 40:46

Thank you.

I I'm all for an airspace plan, so I'm concerned that the previous votes we also voted on funding other plans and as much as I want to see this go forward, messaging of multiple plans multiple millions of dollars might not be received as well.

DD **Dan Dalton** 41:10

Yeah.

No, I hear what you're saying.

We've got a $4 million overarching bill and then a nested $2,000,000 bill within.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 41:20

That four million included the 2,000,000.

So it's $4 million total.

We just wanted to make it clear that this was where the $2,000,000 came from, cause the last meeting I think it was still at 2,000,000.

DD **Dan Dalton** 41:35

Right.

I do remember now seeing your asterisk.

And footnote there on that first slide.

So Brent does that, but you're concerned at ease or?

Brent Klavon (ANRA) 41:46

It does.

It's just that that, you know, I was confused regarding multiple plans being funded and so it however this goes forward.

I just the asterisks needs to be bolded and underlined, so that's not-somebody else doesn't make the same mistake as I did.

Thank you.

Dan Dalton 42:04

You maybe.

Yeah, we did that on the top line.

Maybe here on this slide we also add that as a similar footnote of this, 2,000,000 is part of the $4 million overarching so.

OK, I know folks have already voted on this and agreed to it.

So does anyone feel that this new language changes their vote on whether or not they would like to see it move forward?

If so, speak now or forever hold your peace.

OK.

Dan Dalton 42:38

So we're going to assume this is this is approved and moving forward.

Thomas Swoyer 42:39

Thank you.

Dan Dalton 42:43

So thank you all.

Next slide.

Cade Clark 42:47

Dan on that last one did everybody-was there everybody able to vote?

When we were making changes.

Dan Dalton 42:53
Yeah, I show.

Cade Clark 42:56
Umm.

Dan Dalton 42:56
Do we want to?
So I don't think we need to revote unless but there didn't seem to be anyone who disagreed with the new language so.

Carvallo, Andres 43:06
You you got eleven votes right now.

Cade Clark 43:10
Yeah, I did-
I didn't vote yet.

Thomas Swoyer 43:12
I didn't get a chance to vote.

Dan Dalton 43:14
Alright, let's go ahead.

Carvallo, Andres 43:14
Need 14 votes needed?

Dan Dalton 43:15
Matt, would you submit, Matt, would you submit a new vote?

Carvallo, Andres 43:16
Fourteen votes.

CC **Cade Clark** 43:21

Sorry, I didn't mean to complicate it there for you then.

DD **Dan Dalton** 43:23

No, no, it's OK.

TS **Thomas Swoyer** 43:24

You know.

DD **Dan Dalton** 43:24

It's OK.

And just for clarity, we only need a simple majority, so we do not need fourteen votes.

Carvallo, Andres 43:45

Thank you.

DD **Dan Dalton** 43:45

All right, looking good.

Alright, so this one is moving forward and next slide.

So this is the encouragement and I actually I'm going to put a little bit of chairman rank here and rename this one a little bit.

Just I think it should be infrastructure and uniform standards just to add further clarity.

So this is around the idea of how do we on the one hand make sure that across the State we are using, we're encouraging the use of consensus based standards.

But at the same time, this is also doing a service to the local entities to make sure that they are-

You know that there's one kind of homogeneous source of truth, so to speak.

And so there's a whole enablement side of this recommendation as well as the standards exist out there.

But then there's also making helping communities at the planning and zoning level to be able to use those standards.

So how do we basically recommend that the legislature find ways to encourage the

local communities to use those things, whether that be through the TxDOT level or further down at the local level?

So umm yeah, I think infrastructure uniform standards.

If that works?

Let's go ahead and put that to a vote as to whether the plan should include the encouragement for uniform infrastructure standards.

Yes, Cameron.

CW **Cameron Walker** 45:24

Dan, I had, I just had had a quick thought on.

The middle part of that sentence, it says support uniform planning and zoning language, we have to assume prepared by the State.

Normally the term enabling language is in there which allows the community to utilize it if they want.

If you leave it like this, it could be perceived as being forced on everybody who has a zoning ordinance.

Versus a choice there.

There are many Timbuktu's in Texas that aren't going to have vertiports but still have a zoning code.

So that's why I would suggest that the amendment and support uniform planning and zoning, zoning, enabling language which gives you the choice, not the force.

DD **Dan Dalton** 46:22

Yeah, I think that's a reasonable.

Yeah, that's a reasonable ad.

Umm, does anyone disagree with that?

OK.

All right, so this is passed and will be part of the report.

So next slide please.

Electrical infrastructure.

So requiring the report capture an estimate of the needed electrical generation and transmission capabilities and that is that part of the report is done in conjunction with utilities, ERCOT and others, so let's go ahead and put this to a vote as to whether we believe the plan should have this section in it.

Alright, that looks good.

Looks like that is approved and that will be part of the report.

Alright, so now we are exiting out of the subchapters of the report itself and going back to the overarching recommendations.

You'll remember the first recommendation was-overarching bucket was around leadership.

The second one was around the State level plan which we've just gone through and now the last part is around AAM Research and development.

So the recommendation is to direct the legislation to direct TxDOT to create an R&D program leveraging State universities here in Texas and specifically focusing on the items within the parentheses and using matching funding from federal grants and whatnot.

So the vote, if we could put a vote forward and that is whether or not to recommend that Texas do this.

Alright, submit.

It looking good and Cameron, I see your hand is still up.

I think that's from the previous question around enablement.

So yeah, cool.

OK, alright.

And it looks like yes, this is now part of the report.

Excellent.

Thank you.

Alright, so Next up.

OK, so first of all, thank you.

Congratulations.

We have now approved all of the recommendations that will be part of the report, so I thank you very much for your diligence and your focus on this and at this point the-we'll talk a bit more about definitions and whatnot.

But with the recommendations now that we've just approved, Texas State will help us actually craft the report itself.

So thank you for that.

So these are some of the things that, we had as additional Todo's that are not necessarily recommendations.

But things that we're kind of put in the parking lot, so to speak, one of them was for Texas to add an AAM member to the Aviation Advisory Committee for those that might not know, there's actually a whole separate Aviation advisory committee that

has been there with the State for some time now.

And so this would be a recommendation.

Well, I use that in air quotes.

Request a TxDOT to add an AAM member to that to that advisory committee.

When an opening occurs, so we're going to just move that forward.

Don't really need to vote on it unless anyone objects to that and would love to hear your thoughts on why we would not want to have someone from that community- from this community on that advisory committee.

But does anyone have any concerns with that?

OK, great.

The other thing was to invite the IWG this is this is the US government's integrated working group on aim for them to come host a meeting in Texas.

So I was in DC.

What?

Two weeks ago now.

And it was informed that the IWG will actually be finishing up their report and briefing it out at the end of, I think August or early September.

So I actually don't know if there will even be time for them to host a meeting here in Texas as they are currently in the process of drafting the report.

So we will certainly extend an invitation for them to come on out, but I just want to manage expectations because I think and maybe Scott, yeah, maybe you've got a little more real time information on that.

Scott Shtofman 51:19

And the other thing I wanted to bring forward is that the IWG already did hold a meeting in Texas previously.

I participated in it.

Ernest participated in it.

I think there may have been some others as well earlier this year.

So I would, like you said manage expectations on what this ask would actually cost to happen or not.

Dan Dalton 51:39

Yeah.

And one thing we might do is assuming that the committee does move forward, is

when the IWG report comes out, there's going to then be the whole implementation phase of said recommendations.

So maybe it's a matter of having them come out next year once the report is out.

We've all had a chance to digest it and whatnot and see how Texas can take advantage of some of the opportunities that it-and recommendations that the report actually puts out there.

So, but we will not lose the thread on this.

We will absolutely make the overtures for the IWG to come on out.

So alright, next slide please.

So last but not least is the we are going to vote on this as to how we want to define AAM within the State of Texas.

So if we go to the next slide, as you'll probably remember, we had a long conversation, a couple conversations actually around the idea of not only the vehicles themselves kind of drones all the way down to air taxis and everything in between and the different capabilities and use cases that those aircraft have, but also kind of as the Venn diagram describes here, there's additional conversation around what airspace each of those uses, where they share that be digital infrastructure fuel and again use cases that are shared.

So our good friends at Texas State went through and looked at kind of how some of the definitions across the federal government, other States, maybe some of the recommendations made by organizations such as AUVSI.

And so we go to the next slide.

We'll see kind of where they ended up.

So basically tried to look across all the definitions and the committee members and thoughts as to what makes the most sense, making sure to enable, you know, being able to enable and differentiating the funding of these various activities, acknowledging the items that are listed there, but also making sure not to conflict with anything.

So when we when the team did all of this, they got to the next slide, which was the proposal on the following definitions.

So as you can see, they went through and identified some key terms for each of these.

So there are five federal definitions, and one that is going to be a little bit different from the federal.

So we'll go ahead and talk about the ones that are a little bit more unique now.

So basically that right column that AAM aircraft definition.

So let's go to the next slide here.

So these are basically the-

The first one is actually the FAA's definition of AAM, and I believe I cannot remember where that exactly is from.

I believe it's from a CFR, but I can't remember.

And then within that, the proposal is using-again trying to make a hybrid across the different definitions that were proposed, putting forward this AAM aircraft definition.

So take a look at that.

If you can't see it, it says that AAM aircraft are highly automated.

Fly at lower altitudes can be used for commercial, public service, private or recreational purposes, and have multiple types differentiated by weight and the type one is less than or equal to 299 lbs.

Type 2 would be over 300 lbs, so are there any concerns with this definition of AAM aircraft?

Cade.

Cade Clark 55:30

It yeah.

Thank you.

Umm.

As I mentioned earlier, with the getting ahead of federal preemption, I'm getting a little nervous in getting ahead of the FAA in defining what an AAM aircraft is.

The definition itself isn't that-doesn't really raise too much concern per say.

It's just my concern is getting ahead of the FAA.

So I guess I'm registering a concern which isn't necessarily helpful, but it's a concern as to what does that get us and where does that put us and how does that help us by being ahead of the FAA?

Dan Dalton 56:20

Yeah, that's a.

It's a fair point, Jason.

Day, Jason 56:24

Yes.

So I I've said this before and I think this alleviates that concern.

I don't think we should necessarily define it for the State.

I think our definition should be for these recommendations, right?

So for the purpose of these recommendations, AAM aircraft or blah blah blah.

So we're not saying this is the State definition, we're saying this is what we're talking about.

So it's providing context instead of a definition.

Cade Clark 56:53

Suddenly my concern has gone away.

Thank you, Jason, that it's a great compromise.

Dan Dalton 56:59

So if we can clarify that on the slide, then just to as a footnote that this is designed to provide context for the report itself and that the AM aircraft definition itself is not actually the definition is not designed to be a recommendation in and of itself.

I like that.

Davio, Rebecca L 57:18

Umm, so I don't think Sarah or Nick or on here and I may be, I may have misunderstood, but I believe that they said we need a definition, maybe that can be kicked down the road to the plan and but at some point in time.

See, you know that's where this came from was they said we need when they were giving us guidance.

We need a definition.

Dan Dalton 57:55

OK.

Yeah, maybe we'll circle back with them offline to see.

Uh, because I want to make sure we actually scratch the right itch.

So, Scott.

Scott Shtofman 58:04

Yeah.

Just for clarification on that FAA source definition that comes from the FAA

reauthorization that got passed this year, which is a definition specific to that act, it's not meant to be a broader modification of the CFR's, it is based on our work with the committee they used it for that similar to the recommendation that we just got on how we could define this.

That's specific to the report and I think that helps us understand sort of where we are in the space that we don't have a settled federal definition yet.

So we got to work with what we have based on where industries moving, based on where the federal government is moving, and based on where we're working with the State of Texas.

I think as Nice as it would be to have like this is the set in stone definition for Texas. We don't want to be somewhere where Texas is over its skis or running a different path than industry or the government at the federal level, and could be blindsided by a change to a definition.

DD **Dan Dalton** 59:09

Yeah, that's actually really good clarification on this AAM definition being in the reauth versus in statute.

Uh, so that's helpful for sure.

So maybe with the way we think through all of these definitions, then for at least for the near term, is that all of these are designed to provide additional context for the report itself.

As you know, almost as a biblio- not a bibliography, but a list of terms at the back, a list of acronyms, whatnot.

And then if we get to a place, so we'll take that as homework that if it is actually desired by the legislature to define some of these terms in statute and law then or recognizing those are two different things.

But if it is, if there is a desire to actually define some of these terms more officially formally, I should say that we'll bring that back to the committee.

Excellent.

OK, Mandy.

AN **Amanda Nelson** 1:00:11

Yeah, just a quick comment on the proposed AAM definition, I guess, and this is a question for the group.

But are all AAM aircraft definitely highly automated or can they be highly

automated?

I think there are potential platforms out there that maybe just involve different propulsion systems and not necessarily the high level of automation.

I'm just kind of curious if the group agrees with that.

I think they have various levels of automation.

Can be highly automated, can fly at lower altitudes, can be used for commercial.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:00:43

Yeah.

No, that's-

AN **Amanda Nelson** 1:00:47

I'm not sure that they are all highly automated.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:00:52

Yeah.

No, that's it's a fair point.

Yeah.

We start getting into definitional weeds now.

AN **Amanda Nelson** 1:01:04

I know, but that's what happens when you define things.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:01:07

Yep, no, it's true.

It's true.

No.

And so my first thought is to put an order there at the end instead of an and.

But then, yeah, you kind of get it, but by doing that, then you get to like all forms of aviation.

And this is one of the reasons I believe that they have not defined this term at the federal level is because-

AN **Amanda Nelson** 1:01:32

Yeah, exactly.

So I mean, I share Cade concerns.

I also share, I think it's a good you know what Jason was saying to really make it clear that it's for the purposes of this report.

And do you think we probably need to chat with Sarah and others about what they're actually looking for because we are kind of in a precarious situation here.

Dan Dalton 1:01:51

So maybe what we do just in the near term is say for the AAM aircraft that to your point they can be highly automated, fly at lower altitudes used for you know et cetera, et cetera.

So I think, yeah, that's a can be and then I would remove the other.

Amanda Nelson 1:02:07

Yeah, can be or includes Jason just put up.

I like that too.

Dan Dalton 1:02:13

Yep.

And then and then we can probably remove.

The other can be this kind of in the middle of that sentence.

Uh, Brent.

Brent Klavon (ANRA) 1:02:26

I'm with the definition and the intent and defining it for what we're proposing, but it should align with our requests, so we're coming to the legislature with quite a few requests that ask and so as long as it's an alignment with everything, what we want from them is we have to do research.

We have to study this.

We have to plan for that and I'm OK at the end of the day that we capture it.

So as long as those two are in line that they have to be sanctioned, is my point.

Dan Dalton 1:02:59

Yeah.

Is there anything that jumps out at you as to whether this might not be in alignment with some of the recommendations?

BK **Brent Klavon (ANRA)** 1:03:08

The more ambiguous the better for me.

And the less detailed, better and so that we're not backed into a corner and force that, uh, we're limiting ourselves somewhere down the road.

And I so I'm not able to give you specifics, but as long as we don't back ourselves into a corner for studies and research and trying to define the problem going forward and that's the point I'm trying to make.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:03:36

Yeah.

I mean, as an example, you almost make an argument for, yeah, removing the weights for example.

Hmm.

OK, ohm, let's see.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:03:51

It should-

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:03:52

So go ahead, please, Rebecca.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:03:52

Should we remove can be highly automated.

If it can't be highly automated, does that add anything?

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:04:01

Yeah, I mean, you could kind of play that game for all of them, right?

Like what if it doesn't operate at lower altitudes?

Or have. Yeah.

Yeah.

So I actually think that leaving it as can be, helps to give folks an idea of kind of the range in the realm that AAM is a little bit different but-

Patrick, let's have you go next.

Patrick Egan 1:04:31

Unless there's some like scientific data for type one and type 2 and they're just arbitrary numbers and we already saw this with the drone thing and 250 grams, which was totally arbitrary.

And it is caused tons of problems with what the OEM had on anything besides the this top definition or the FAA's definition, you're just I think you're going down the wrong rabbit holes, but that's my opinion.

Dan Dalton 1:05:04

Yeah, Jason.

Day, Jason 1:05:08

Yeah, I think we should remove recreational purposes.

I don't, I don't-

I I'd like a comment from somebody who sees any AAM technologies that's truly recreational at this point.

Dan Dalton 1:05:22

Yeah.

Well, and so the issue is we're basically in this definition, we're blending AAM.

So let's just use, you know, as a whisk aircraft, for example, and we're blending this definition with a small UAS.

And so that's part of the challenge is that the recreational purposes, absolutely the small UAS as it would be defined here, type one that that is that's I think one of the challenges that many States don't do is they don't combine AAM with sUAS, they actually keep them separate.

And so that's yeah.

Davio, Rebecca L 1:06:06

Just FYI, the fly at lower altitudes used for commercial, public sector, private and recreational purposes came from the existing State definition for this that was used for this committee.

DJ **Day, Jason** 1:06:22

Roger.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:06:26

So I think it's OK for now.

Uh, but I think we will probably when we see the report, I think that'll help give us greater guidance on whether or not, for example, we need the weights.

I think it gets back to this overarching question for this entire committee, which is are we including small UAS in AAM and so far we have been when we talk about things like UTM and other.

So this is now just kind of putting that like bringing it to a head of like, OK, what is, how do we want to capture the scope of this report and maybe it's not as simple clean definition like we have in this bullet, maybe it's the committee looked at AAM aircraft ranging in small UAS all the way up to large UAS that include various.

I mean, it may just be that we need to put more words around this then is captured in a bullet point or three so.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:07:31

And we welcome that I think because as the people that are going to be doing the first draft of the report, we're saying like, is the drone that's carrying the organ transplant.

Is that part of this?

Is the drone that's going up and doing, the first being the first responder on site?

Is that part of what should be referenced in this this report?

Can that be listed as a case study?

So that's what we are trying to get to, to understand.

DJ **Day, Jason** 1:08:07

Yeah, I'm just going to throw out one final comment.

I think we're getting hung up on the size and the type of aircraft.

It's really not about that.

It's about purpose, right?

Sometimes the stuff that Kendall's flying we have-on public safety have bigger drones than that, right?

So when you start getting into the size of the aircraft, that doesn't really mean anything.

It's about what you're doing with the aircraft.

That really drives this definition in my opinion.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:08:41

Yeah.

And the size, the weight rather was designed to pull from, for example, the AUVSI prepared recommendations.

So Mandy.

AN **Amanda Nelson** 1:08:55

Yeah, just one other element.

I think that may be missing from this proposed aircraft definition is around the propulsion system itself.

I think that's really key to what AAM is.

What AAM aircraft are, is that they're leveraging emerging propulsion technologies.

So that's one of my thoughts.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:09:15

Yeah.

No, I had.

There was something missing from it and I could not put my finger on it.

You're absolutely right.

That's what it is.

It's the propulsion too.

So I think at this point, let us take this offline and we'll take some turns on it and we'll bring it back to the committee for further consideration.

So I think I can safely say that we do not agree on the current language, so it's good.

It shows people who actually are paying attention in invested in this, so I appreciate everyone's feedback on this and out of all the things we voted on today, I having one that we don't agree on is totally fine by me.

So we'll take this offline.

We'll work on it some more.

It will probably look more like a paragraph form than it will bullet point to help make

things a little bit more clean.

So OK, so let's move on to the next slide.

So this is a basically from-

For those that don't know, the AAM coordination and Leadership Act was a bill that was passed, I don't know a year or two years ago now, we started it years ago at the federal level, but basically it was designed to help provide some clarity at the federal level and also help create things like the US governments Integrated Working Group.

Of and so this was the definition that that for example, that IWG they're using this definition when they were building the scope of their report and their interviews and whatnot.

I think it I'm fine with this.

I don't-

Does anyone-again this would be the intention here would be that this would be for the definition used for the scope of the report.

This would not be a recommendation for, not necessarily for use by the legislature in it to make it formal in a law.

So we can always talk about whether the-and that is another part of our homework, which is to go find out if they actually do need these definitions in law, and we'll bring that back to the committee.

So we still have time to talk through that, but does everyone agree that this is a reasonable for the scope of the report?

Does anyone disagree?

OK, great.

Next slide.

Alright, so this is now.

This is actual statute.

This is from the CFRs themselves around what UAS unmanned aircraft and small UAS are.

Again, for the context of the report, any objections using this?

Yeah, great.

Next slide.

All right, we're now at the report outline stage.

I would ask if folks want to take a break, but we're on the home stretch of this, so we're going to keep going.

If you need to take a break, go ahead.

But I would love to just keep moving so the next slide please.

Alright, so I don't know.

Rebecca, do you want to kind of talk through these next few or?

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:12:30

We, you know, again we have tried to listen.

We've been at all the committee meetings, we've tried to consider your points, we've tried to consider the direction from the legislative experts, including all the folks at TxDOT, and so we we're saying in our mind, what is the purpose of the report? What is the main point and you can see here that the purpose is to provide information and recommendations to support the Texas Legislature's decision making around the advanced air mobility issue and the main point is AAM is coming to Texas, Wisk is already announced, you know, United's already said so.

Those kinds of things.

But the real issue here is in order to maximize that, to make Texas a leader that has been said again and again, we want Texas to be a leader State in this and maximize the economic and social benefits that it can bring, that the State should invest $4 million in leadership planning and research.

So those are the three recommendations and the amount of money that's currently on the on the table.

Any comments?

Any suggestions?

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:13:51

No, I think you're good.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:13:51

OK.

Again, got a thumbs up.

OK.

And I should tell you that we have received guidance as Molly is pulling up the next slide.

We've received guidance that trying to have a big, long, lengthy report isn't necessarily the report here and in college we would say the university would say you don't get an A for a long paper.

So our intent is not to have a meaty paper, it's to have a compelling report that provides background information so that legislators that haven't-and the other people that will read it, who don't know what AAM is, who don't know the potential use cases and the value and what it can mean to our State's economy and to our quality of life here in the State, that we want to be able to lay out those issues and then also the challenges and in response to those challenges say this is what we're asking from the State.

So basically an introduction, define AAM where's the activity happening that will be in State and also with a nod to some of the things going on around the country to show that there's competition and we do, we do need to take action to be a leader and then the benefits, the challenge and that the recommendations.

How the State can help.

So those are the first level headings.

Any comments, suggestions on that?

Is there something that's missing?

We sort of chose to currently use the idea of asking a question as the heading and then providing the answer to that in in the write up.

Comments, suggestions?

Dan Dalton 1:15:52

Yeah, I have just little things here and there.

You know, like when we say like, where is the activity happening?

Davio, Rebecca L 1:15:54

OK.

Dan Dalton 1:15:57

Maybe it's like where is the activity happening globally?

When I first read that I was like, well, wait a minute, like in Texas or so, just little clarifying things.

And then maybe #5, where it says challenges, maybe it's, you know, gaps and opportunities or something like that versus just the negative side, so little things, but we can talk about those offline, Jason.

Davio, Rebecca L 1:16:21

OK.

So the opportunities just to clarify, because we had this debate internally and if you can resolve it, that's wonderful.

I'm saying like, let's give them a solid list of the benefits.

Here's the things it's going to be better for the environment.

It's going to improve transportation congestion.

Like, here's this list consolidated of all the benefits and then.

OK, well, there's lots of good stuff that could happen.

What are the challenges if you prefer the integrated like, here's the benefits and challenges together, we can absolutely make that.

But if you would provide that guidance, we would appreciate it.

Dan Dalton   1:16:58

Yeah.

No, I actually I like keeping #4 separate.

I think just for #5, it's more about not just.

Yeah.

And I think you've got it.

Maybe.

Maybe =maybe we're talking about the same thing, where, like for me it's gaps and then where those opportunities exist to fill those gaps.

And I think that's maybe what you're talking about in section 6 is kind of like here's the challenges and then here's the ones the State can help with.

And then I mean maybe there are, maybe there is another part of this.

So it's like that there's also, you know, challenges that the State can't help with and that the industry even for example, we've talked about an industry association a number of times, maybe that's maybe there's an area within that that we also kind of flesh out.

Davio, Rebecca L   1:17:45

OK.

Maybe looking at the sort of sub bullets underneath will help us figure out.

There's also a potential to-

Yeah, go ahead.

DJ **Day, Jason** 1:18:00

This is Jason just have one, uh one comment and it's kind of political, you know, anytime you're talking to a political group, you want to make part of it about them, right.

What's good for them?

So maybe #4 or what are the benefits to Texas and Texans?

And really point out right, the economic development tax revenue, more money for them to play with.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:18:24

Yeah.

Molly, can you go to the next slide?

Kind of like that, Jason, yeah.

DJ **Day, Jason** 1:18:33

Yep.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:18:36

Yeah, I was advocating for Texans to sort of like, it's not just about more revenue, it's about direct benefit to the State as well.

I mean to the residents as well, but certainly the economic improvement is going to mean more money for State coffers and.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:18:59

Yeah, Cameron.

CW **Cameron Walker** 1:19:02

I might throw in the idea that you could-

You could have a bullet point about what if you sit on your hands and do nothing?

Look, look what's happening here, here, here and here, and there's enough experience in this audience to State what's going on.

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:19:22

Yeah.

Cameron Walker 1:19:22
The two, yeah, yeah.

Davio, Rebecca L 1:19:26
Thank you, Cameron.
That that was brought home in the last Community integration meeting where Kim was saying that we had an advantage in autonomous vehicles and sort of lost it because we didn't-
The State didn't take that leadership role, so thank you.

Dan Dalton 1:19:52
Excellent.

Day, Jason 1:19:52
Yeah.
This Jason again kind of to his point real quick where is this activity happening?

Day, Jason 1:19:58
I'd like to see a lot of not mind numbing but some solid data in there on you know these.
This is how many drone deliveries were going on, you know, in North Texas and this is how many public safety UAS flights are going on.
This is how many disasters to quantify this to show that this is already happening, and this is how we accelerate it.

Davio, Rebecca L 1:20:25
We would love that, too.
Please, please, please send us that data because that's really going to add meat. For example, as we've said many times in the benefits and the economy, we can point to the national data, you know from Deloitte, the national estimate.
But where we can bring that home and say, wow, this many things are already happening here I think would really strengthen this.
So please feel free to send that to us.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:21:04

Yeah, it's a good call.

All right.

So unless there's anything else, and so if and if there is anything else that folks think of offline, feel free to shoot myself or Rebecca or any of the dance.

Uh, or Mike sent us a note.

Unless know your thoughts on, you know additional sections, but for the for the near term these will be the first level and second level headings that we'll be driving towards in the drafting of the report.

Alright, excellent.

Well, thank you, Texas State.

We truly appreciate the amount of work that you are about to embark on.

So thank you.

Truly, truly appreciate that.

Uh, alright.

So with that Next up, the next meeting will be August 1st, and over the next four or five weeks or so, Texas State will go ahead and start the drafting process.

As it says there, it'll be hybrid that August 1st one will be hybrid, so I will plan on seeing folks in person if possible.

They're at TxDOT, the committee member Bios.

Rebecca, can you remind me what that one was about?

DL **Davio, Rebecca L** 1:22:17

Yes, in the report we will include an approximately 200 word bio about all the committee members in the back as an appendix and we sent out a call for those initially, we haven't gotten them all and we will do a reminder to those of you that we're still missing and that's just a little housekeeping kind of thing.

And if, while I have the floor, if I could explain that at the August 1st meeting, we will go through the report.

Clearly, we're not going to read it to you, but we'll.

Try and give you the overview and share with you the copy and that will be-

Like as we said, we need to have comments pretty quickly because we have to turn that final draft into TxDOT all signed up, ready to go for their continued action by no

later than September the 3rd.
And we prefer not to work over Labor Day if possible.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:23:29
Yeah, agreed, Patrick.

PE **Patrick Egan** 1:23:33
Yeah, I know it's just a committee member bios, but again, I'm going to-
I'm going to grouse about it because I think it's a- it's a chide- or a high chapper, you know, again, the company that I work for is an OEM that's been in Texas, and I'm going to drive this.
I'm going to beat this drum until my arms are tired.
20 years spending small business money in Texas and we're not even going to be mentioned.
Is that what-is that what I'm hearing?

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:24:02
Where would so are you referring to your company or small businesses in general?

PE **Patrick Egan** 1:24:08
I'm talking about my company that's spent small business money, paid taxes, paid wages in taxes for 20 years and that's, you know, I you know I again we talked about participation in this committee and I'm seeing all of the hallmarks of where everything comes off the railroad tracks right here.
I'm seeing big companies come in and carpet bag and, you know, get more representation than people that have actually Texans are companies in Texas that have actually spent money here.
And so I'm going to protest this.
I think that any small businesses or whatever that participated in this action is spent all of their money and resources should at least get mentioned somewhere in the report.
Not too is disservice to the taxpayers of Texas, and I'll leave it there.

DD **Dan Dalton** 1:25:04
Yeah, we can look into how-I'm not sure how that was reflected in the last report in

terms of non-committee members who were party to it, but happy to take it as an action offline and happy to talk to you personally about kind of the committee membership and whatnot.

I know Dan Harmon would also be happy to have that conversation, but we will.

We will look at a way-

PE **Patrick Egan**   1:25:26

Well, I mean, OK, we'll just or you know, I remember like the first meeting I asked, I wanted to become a member and I guess that just kind of fell by the wayside.

I tried to get on before the meeting.

I tried to get on the last iteration of this, so I don't.

You know, maybe you could suggest a small business.

How does small business get the same treatment as you know, Wisk or Joby or something else?

We have to get, you know, lobbyists.

What? What?

What do we have to do to get representation?

Maybe you know we could take that offline too, but to me it's, it's a disservice to the taxpayers here.

DD **Dan Dalton**   1:25:57

Yeah.

Yeah, I mean, yeah.

Yep.

No, I appreciate your perspective.

There's a number of small businesses on this line already that our committee members and went through the proper process to get there and so happy to talk to you about that.

We did submit you for a late add on the committee decided not, not me.

It's a separate board and we can talk about why they decided not to go forward.

So, but yeah, we did submit you.

So just so you know, but yeah, again, happy to talk to you and Dan Harmon about that offline.

So we don't take up that anyone else's time.

And then as an action, though, we will look at how we reflect more of the small

businesses that were party to this but were not necessarily committee members.

So, alright.

Any other comments from the committee members?

All right, Mike, anything else for you?

Right.

Any public comments?

Excellent.

All right.

Well, thank you all for your time today.

I appreciate it.

We tried to get keep this moving quickly and so it looks like we got to that and hopefully we'll give you some time back to your day.

Look forward to seeing Texas State, what you produce over the next couple of weeks.

And yeah, thank you again all.

And if there's anything else that you think of after we hang up, please let us know.

Otherwise, have a great rest of your day and happy 4th of July.

Thank you all.