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P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BLOOMER: We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order. That's number 1. Item number 2, Approval of the Minutes from the March 4, 2009, and October 23, 2009, meetings. Do I have a motion?

DR. ABESON: I'll make a motion so we can begin discussion.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We have a motion. And a second?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Christina, second.

MS. BLOOMER: Second. Okay. Any further discussion?

DR. ABESON: I just want to be sure that the minutes from whatever meeting it was B and I've now lost track B where we talked about Title 43, Part 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter C, Rule 1.8, which related to other entities' internal ethics and compliance procedures. Okay? The committee discussed the provision that's B which Ginnie sent out yesterday, I believe, where there's a provision that says, "Appropriate care is being taken to avoid the delegation of substantial discretionary authority to individuals whom the organization knows or should know have a propensity to engage in illegal activities."

I recall that the committee discussed it. I was specifically very concerned about why such language
would be there in the first place, and want to be sure
that that is on the record in whatever minutes is
appropriate for whatever meeting that conversation
occurred.

MS. MAYLE: It looks like that was the October
23 meeting.

DR. ABESON: So that has no bearing on the
minutes that are before us now.

MS. MAYLE: If y'all are going to adapt the
March 3, then no.

MS. BLOOMER: Well, we can --

MS. MAYLE: Let's do them separately.

MS. BLOOMER: Do them separately?

MS. MAYLE: Yes. Thanks.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we'll hold your
question --

DR. ABESON: That's fine.

MS. BLOOMER: -- for now. On the March 4,
2009, minutes, those are the minutes that have come
back -- I think this is our second or third time. There
was a question I had raised last time regarding, I believe
it was Item 4. And what Ginnie and I have been able to
discern based on reading the transcript was that had
initially happened was there was a motion to open the item
up for discussion, and then there was a second motion that
you made, Al, to change to the word "competitive" to "any."

DR. ABESON: Uh-huh.

MS. BLOOMER: And that motion was seconded and approved. And then, for some reason, the committee went back and took action on the first item, which we didn't need to to begin with.

So Ginnie has added a little clarification note there, just to -- so when we go back a year from now and try to figure out why we took action on that item twice, we'll know. So I think we've resolved any issues we had regarding the March 4, 2009, minutes. So I guess we'll take that one separately. And if -- is there any further discussion on the March 4 minutes?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: No? Okay. Seeing none, can I have a motion for approval of the March 4 minutes?

DR. ABESON: So moved.

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Second.

MS. BLOOMER: And a second. And then I guess, all those in favor? And what I'd like to do to sort of manage the -- I guess there's only one on the call -- is just go around and have roll call, and you can say yes or no, if that's okay.

Vince?
MR. HUERTA: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Al?

DR. ABESON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Christina?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Michelle, yes. Okay. The March 4 minutes have passed.

Going back to the October 23, 2009, minutes, is there further discussion or a motion to approve with that revision? And, Al, I think you were referring to Agenda Item 5. You would like some note added there about the discussion that was had related to that particular section?

DR. ABESON: That's correct.

MS. BLOOMER: Then would you like to move for approval of the minutes with the caveat that that language be added?

DR. ABESON: I would welcome that approach.

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

MR. SALAZAR: I'll second.


MR. HUERTA: Aye.
MS. BLOOMER: Al?

MR. HUERTA: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Christina?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Michelle, yes. All right.

The minutes have all been adopted.

Okay. Moving on to Item 3 on the agenda, in accordance with 43 Texas Administrative Code 1.83(c), final review of the draft revisions to 43 TAC 1.8 concerning internal ethics and compliance program, as it relates to those amendments to Chapter 31. Whew.

MR. KILLEBREW: That's a lot. Good morning, members. For the record, I'm Bobby Killebrew, the Deputy Director of the Public Transportation Division. Eric will join us later this morning. He had some schedule conflicts with some meetings downtown, but is planning to be here before today's meeting concludes.

I'd like to also say, Happy new year. This is the first time that I've had an opportunity to see some of you for the new year. And welcome, Christina, to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee.

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Thank you.

MR. KILLEBREW: We appreciate everyone joining
us this morning on the conference call.

Now on to business. Rulemaking. This committee serves a very unique position with the department begins rulemaking processes that involve public transportation. The -- some members of the committee have been more involved in rulemaking because of their tenure on the committee. Some members are new at this. And even if you've been around a long time, rulemaking can be very confusing. I wish I had an item to hole up in front of you to show you on time line on rulemaking, but this morning is another spot on a fairly long time line in the rulemaking process.

Joining us this morning from our legal counsel is Suzanne Mann. She will be here to walk you through what the committee will be looking at this morning to take action on. To give you just a little background -- and I don't want to steal Suzanne's thunder, but to give you just a little background on how this all plays out, I'll do this very simplistic, because as you know, as a bureaucratic agency, state agencies have a lot of rules and regulations when it comes to rulemaking. But your particular role in rulemaking, you have basically three opportunities during a rulemaking process.

When it becomes necessary for the department or the Transportation Commission to go into a rulemaking
process, as an advisory committee, we're supposed to contact you and say, Hey, look, we're fixing to make rules about XYC; what do you think? And during that process, as individual members, you let the department know what you think. When we get back your comments, if you choose to make comments, then we draft a set of rules.

After we draft a set of rules, we then bring that drafted set of rules to you first before we go to our Transportation Commission. And as a group, as a Public Transportation Advisory Committee body, you then at that point in time can make comments on those rules. And you can do a couple other things. You can waive your comment or defer your comment or so forth. But you have an opportunity to make comment.

That particular item happened back at your October 23, 2009, meeting. And at that point in time, the committee said, Take the rules to the commission, and the department took the rules to the commission. They did that in December of 2009. The commission adopted those rules as preliminary rules and put them out for public comment. We are still in a public comment phase today. The public comment period ends this coming Monday, February 1.

After we finish the public comment period -- and it can happen during the public comment period as
well -- this committee gets another opportunity, and
that's today's opportunity, to comment once again on the
rules. And that's before the department takes the rules
to the commission for a final time to say, Let's adopt
these and put them into action.

So today, what the committee's charged with is
the opportunity to comment on the proposed rules before
they go to the commission for the final time. Now, you
can waive that final review if you wish to, or you can
make comment as a Public Transportation Advisory Committee
body.

Now, I went over that very quickly, and I just
wanted to make sure that I didn't lose someone along that
narrated time line. If we go forward today, the committee
says, Okay, let's adopt these rules; it's a good thing to
do, then we take them to the commission. These are
scheduled, preliminarily scheduled to go to our commission
in February -- excuse me -- March. They're in March.
Assuming the commission does adopt them in March, as the
department files them with the Secretary of the State, 20
days after filing with the Secretary of State, they will
become final.

Now, I also know that Suzanne is going to go
over the rules in particular. There's also a date in the
rules that talks about the effectiveness of the rules,
even though they've become final, about when this actually
would become effective with our grants. And she'll cover
that in just a minute. But I wanted to kind of lay out
that little time line for you.

Today the committee has an opportunity to make
their final comment. The department will then probably
take it to the commission in the March meeting, and if the
commission adopts it, 20 days after filing with the
Secretary of State it would become effective.

And so with that, I'm going to let Suzanne lead
you through the actual rules themselves. And I'll turn it
over to Suzanne.

MS. MANN: Hi. Good morning. I spoke to you
in October about the proposed rules, and nothing's changed
from the draft in October to the draft now. So I know we
have a new member, Christina, and you may not recall what
we talked about them. Obviously, you do, because you
brought up a question that I think you had at the time.
So let's just go over this, a little bit of the history
again, briefly, especially for Christina who's new to the
committee.

The reason that TxDOT is proposing these is
because TxDOT, a couple of years ago, created an internal
compliance program. We did that because the United States
Sentencing Guidelines say that if you have an internal
compliance program and you were to violate federal law, if you have a program in place, then the penalties could be lessened. So -- and it's also just a good thing to do.

We had this -- TxDOT had a lot of this in place in various places throughout our policies. We had it -- a lot of it in our human resources manual. We had it in a lot of places. But we pulled it together and actually created an office, the Internal Compliance Office, to do this in accordance with the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

The United States Sentencing Commission is an arm of the federal government who sets all of the penalties in violation of federal law. So you saw -- they'll say, For this penalty, it's three years in jail and $10,000, or whatever, for this violation of this law. And they can actually -- they say in their application guide that if you have an internal compliance program, then it can be lessened, fines can be lessened.

The University of Texas System adopted a program several years ago, and it took them seven years to do their program. And they wrote a book about it. And TxDOT is doing pretty much what they're doing. And we're in our third year of it, and we've almost completed it.

One of the things that the Sentencing Guidelines ask you to do is a large organization should
encourage small organizations that work with them to adopt an internal compliance program. So we're supposed to encourage our partners to adopt internal compliance programs, especially those that take money from and through us. So that's why we're doing that. We're doing this not to public transportation entities. Back in -- a year ago, January of 2009, we required our total equity partners and our transportation corporations to adopt this. And they had the deadline of January of 2010, like this month, to come up with their internal compliance programs. So we have all of those actually in my office to be reviewed. And I've been helping them over the last year to create those.

So what we're doing is gradually encouraging our partners that money flows through TxDOT to adopt internal compliance programs. So that's the whys of where we are. And back in October, like Bobby said, you adopted a motion to ask TxDOT to go forward with the proposal. TxDOT did the proposal. Now we're in final-adoption stage. We're about to get to there.

And what the rules specifically do, it changes 3139 in Title 43, it changes just that section, to say that to be eligible to receive state or federal public transportation funds from or through the department, an entity must have adopted an internal ethics and compliance
program that satisfies the requirements of Section 1.8.
1.8 has already been finally adopted by TxDOT, because
that's in our general rules that apply to everybody. And
then as we require entities to come onboard with these
internal compliance programs, we are changing the sections
that apply to those entities.

Am I being clear in what I'm saying? So like
the transportation corporations section was 15 or 27. I
get them all mixed up; I haven't memorized this stuff.
But it was one of those. And the total equity was the
other one. So we referred in their section to the 1.8.
So the 1.8 have already been adopted, those specific
requirements of what's in an internal compliance program.

Now, where did we get those? Did we just make
up the 1.8 and say, Hey, this looks like a good internal
compliance program? No. Where those came from, and
specifically the one you have a question about, which was
a very good question, because it's so lawyer-y sounding
and so what-does-this-mean sounding, where those came from
was the United States Sentencing Guidelines, word for word
almost. Now, we made them a little simpler to understand.
We actually followed the UT example. But the one you're
specifically asking for came from the United States
Sentencing Guideline. I mean, I'm quoting from that, "The
organization shall use reasonable efforts not to include
within the substantial authority of personnel any individual who knew or should have known through the exercise of due diligence has engaged in illegal activities or other conduct inconsistent with an effective compliance and ethics program."

What TxDOT did to fully satisfy that -- we thought we were probably fully satisfying it anyway -- we do criminal background checks on our employees in a certain level. Do we do it on every person in the whole department? No. But a certain level of our employees who might have decision making over money or certain things, we do criminal background checks on. So we expanded our criminal background check policy to include a little bit lower in the chain of command. That's what we did to comply.

So basically it's just be careful who you trust, who you entrust funds to, is more what that's saying. It's just do a due diligence to make sure that you're not hiring people who are going to steal from you. But those requires that are in Section 1.8 come directly from the United States Sentencing Guideline requirements.

With the -- we did add -- let me just -- we did add the requirement of a written employee code of conduct. It's number 9 in that 1.8. We added that, because if you do that, you're going to necessarily comply with the
things over here in this first requirement of having a compliance program.

    So I spoke at the -- what did I speak at, Bobby?

MR. KILLEBREW: Yesterday we our semiannual operators meeting here in Austin --

    MS. MANN: Yes.

MR. KILLEBREW: -- in this room, and Suzanne did a presentation to our operators as well as our staff.

    MS. MANN: And so at that point, what I'm trying to do is tell them what they're about to have to do and then tell them how we can help them. So I wanted to get some ideas on how can we help you comply with this.

And we are going to -- well, several ideas came up that were excellent. Most likely, I'm going to have a model of how they can comply with this, especially after I cheat and go off of -- oh, I shouldn't say that -- off of -- transportation corporations, some of them have had lawyers look at this and have some great ideas, so I may take some of those as a model.

    But after I review all those, I'll come up with a model of how to comply with this easily. They wanted to see what TxDOT's done. TxDOT has 14,000 employees, and ours is a lot bigger than what a lot of them are going to have to do. So although a lot of ours on line and we're
willing to share that with anybody, but they don't have to
go to that kind of extent.

So if there's any questions about the whole
thing, I'll be glad to answer them.

Oh, let me talk -- yes, let me talk to you
about the deadlines a little bit. So now we are -- so we
did the proposal. TxDOT proposed the rules in December --
is that right? -- and final adoption is March 25. And
then they're filed with the Texas Register on March 26.
And they become effective on April 15. Okay? So they
become effective in a couple months. However, the rules
specifically state that you don't have to have your
internal compliance program in place until January 1,
2011. So that's what we're going to be doing with the
entities is working with them from now until January to
come up with their plans.

When I did this with transportation
corporations and toll equities, they had a lot of people
calling me, and we did a lot of talking on the phone about
how that should look. People faxed me things. I looked
at it, I said, Yeah, this looks good. We did a lot of
that. So there will be a lot of back-and-forth and
talking, and I'll be helping people however, whatever they
need, so we can meet this deadline. But we have some
time. It's not just that it's approved in April and, bam,
you have to have it in place.

MR. KILLEBREW: And if I may add -- this is Bobby again -- also at the operators meeting, we mentioned about sending out some packets that Suzanne had developed. And we'll be sending that out to our operators as well to give them information about the requirements and some templates and so forth. We've also offered to host conference calls, webinars, and meetings to assist in anyone who's going to need assistance.

As Suzanne pointed out yesterday, and as we saw many nods in the audience, lots of people are already doing what's here. They may not have it written down in some form or fashion. It may be verbal in their case. But they're probably already doing a lot of this. And the documentation doesn't have to be to the extent that TxDOT has done it, by any means. Suzanne even commented, she said, You know, an e-mail can even work. If you tell your employees by e-mail, that will suffice some of the recommendations.

So we got a lot of positive feedback yesterday from the operators and even some suggestions on how, amongst themselves, they can help each other to do this.

With that, Michelle, I guess we'll entertain any questions that the committee may have of Suzanne or myself.
MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

DR. ABESON: First, thank you. It's exceedingly helpful to the two of you, Bobby and Suzanne, to try to come to grips with understanding this very complex process that the State has concocted. I would hope that when you send the packets out, you would include sending packets to us. I think that might be very helpful --

MS. MANN: Okay.

DR. ABESON: -- in maintaining our continuity of understanding.

Let me ask this basic question. Not that I would ever question the federal government doing anything, but I'm trying to understand the reasoning associated with that particular provision. It just seems to me -- and maybe I should preface this by saying, is there anything we could do at this point? I mean, this is here; it's done. Is it done done, or is there still room for anything associated with that particular subsection?

MS. MANN: Section 1.8 is done done. It's finally adopted and in our rules already. The only thing you can do is not think that PTAC should comply with the whole section. So 1.8 is adopted because it's complying with the United States Sentencing Guidelines. And I think the rationale for that --
DR. ABESON: Yes, yes.

MS. MANN: -- if I can speak for the federal government -- because most people speak for the federal government; I guess I'm entitled to -- when they came out with these, it's organizations as defined as corporations and all -- it's so all-encompassing. Okay? And the term, organization, also includes governments and cities, and so it includes state and locals. So really, everybody is supposed to be doing this anyway. Most likely everybody's supposed to already be doing this whether they say they are or not, even these entities, the public transportation entities, because they are technically included in the government definition of organizations.

But -- and so I think when they came up with these, they were looking at Enron and all kinds of things, and that's why they came up with these to start with, the language.

DR. ABESON: I just find as I read it, and just for fun I leave out "or should know," just for fun. And you read it, and it says, "Appropriate care is being taken to avoid the delegation of substantial discretionary authority to individuals who the organization knows have a propensity to engage in illegal activities." Now, it just does not make sense to me. I mean, if you know it, why would you ever do it?
MS. MANN: Why would you ever, yes. Why would you ever hire that person to begin with, yes.

DR. ABESON: But since I never question federal decision making, I guess I'll have to live with it. What I would like, though, is for the minutes of whatever appropriate meeting to reflect that we really did take a hard look at this. That would satisfy me.

MS. BLOOMER: We can do that, Ginnie.

MS. MAYLE: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I just had a couple of comments and one question, or one comment and one question. I was happy to see that Eric and you, Ms. Mann, talked about helping the smaller agency. And I think you talked a little bit about that and, you know, some of the bigger, particularly the rural transit systems in the state -- the big ones, I think, are going to have not as much of a problem as some of the littler ones. And so I was glad to see that there is going to be some assistance to those smaller rural districts.

My question is, is there a summary of comments that have been made on this, or should we have that, or do we have that?

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. I'll answer that question. To date, the department has received no comments on this rulemaking.
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MR. SALAZAR: Well, that's easy then. Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

MR. HUERTA: This is Vince. I have a -- just one quick question on the -- will this -- I know that you mentioned the date of January 20, '11. Will this affect any grant that is in place with TxDOT, or thereafter?

MS. MANN: It's after.

MR. HUERTA: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: So they have about eleven months to work on this and get something in place prior to their fiscal year 2011 funds. So --

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I just have one more question. Has there been any talk with the PTCs, or the PTCs, do they think that it's going to be a problem throughout the state, or have we had that discussion with them, with regards to the compliance program?

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby again. If I can clarify what you're asking. Are the PTCs going to be monitoring this particular compliance element?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MR. KILLEBREW: We've discussed this within the department, and Suzanne and I have discussed this. So now I'm going to speak for Suzanne, and she's sitting next to me, so she may hit me. That will not be reflected in the
record, I'm sure, unless I say, Ouch.

    We discussed, though, how is the department
going to monitor this, and is the department going to be
the police on these plans or these programs that the
systems develop. And that's not the intent of the
department. The intent of the department is to see that a
good-faith effort has been made. And right now at this
very moment, Suzanne has volunteered to be the point of
contact on this, so it will not be our field staff that's
going to be charged with the responsibility of going out
there and looking for this at the rural transit districts
and urban transit districts. It's going to be centralized
into Suzanne's office, to TxDOT's Internal Compliance
Program office. We think that's where the expertise lies
within the agency.

    MS. MANN: And let me just add that we are
going to -- like we're doing with transportation
corporations now, we are going to review their initial
submission to make sure that it complies with a basic
checklist of what's required. And then after that -- and
this is -- we're still fleshing this out, of what our
involvement's going to be -- it's going to be more if
things change in the United States Sentencing Guideline,
we would let people know. That is probably never going to
happen. And then as new entities come on, we'll train
them, things like that. And then we'll do a spot-check occasionally to make sure that they still have a compliance program. But that's going to be -- it's going to be more the initial front end, to make sure that they have one to start with that they submit by next January.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. So they won't be -- the providers won't be working with their PTCs to develop the plan, nor will the PTCs be reviewing to make sure that they're implementing their internal compliance plan. That will all be through the Office of the Attorney General -- or Office of General Counsel? Sorry.

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. Actually, it's the Internal Compliance Program office. Believe it or not, we have so many offices and divisions, it's one of those other ones that are a new one.

At this point, the PTCs may be a conduit for information flow and so forth and along with the division being a conduit. Suzanne's pretty much an office of one, and she's got a lot of --

MS. MANN: And I rely on the General Counsel.

MR. KILLEBREW: Yes. She really resides in General Counsel, so she has a lot to cover, so we're going to assist her as much as possible. But at this point in time, we don't see that as an additional function for the PTC to add to their monitoring list. They may be the
collectors of the information so that the providers have an easier way to send it into the department. They may be the, you know, facilitators when we have to send information back out to the field.

To make it easier, we've also -- we've already offered to Suzanne, instead of her mailing out the packets, let us mail the packets out. We've got all the addresses; we know all the contacts. I think we can make a better dissemination of the information that way.

So we're going to assist where we can. The final authority will reside [inaudible] office.

MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Bobby. And that was really my question. I didn't ask it very well. But what we've found with our providers is, since we're a fairly large organization, if multiple people send them things, they tend to call us anyway to ask us about a hybrid electric project that our air-quality team sent out.

So I just wanted to make sure they weren't the leading e-mails that Suzanne was sending them because they didn't recognize that name or -- okay.

MR. KILLEBREW: That was our fear as well. And that's why we volunteered, is that they're used to seeing our faces around the state, so we want to make sure that they still have that point of contact that they can lean on when necessary.
MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. KILLEBREW: Good point.

MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle, and I just would like to reiterate Al's request that I think it would be helpful, too, for those of us that are in the region, either as providers or in contact with providers, is if when this information does goes out, if you could just cc all the PTAC members. That way we'll be in a position that if we can get a call, we can facilitate that as well or direct them to the appropriate TxDOT staff for direction.

Any other discussion, questions?

MR. CASTELLANOS: Just a comment. This is Frank Castellanos. I just wanted to let you know that I joined the conference call about 20 minutes ago, and I've been absent from these meetings for awhile, but I'm glad to be back. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Welcome, Frank.

MR. CASTELLANOS: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Any comments or questions on the item before us?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: No? Okay. Then we'll go ahead and call for the -- uh-oh. It's been awhile. I can't remember. Did we have a motion? No. So I'll call for
the motion.

MR. SALAZAR: I move to approve the internal ethics compliance program.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Do we have a second?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Christina, second.

MS. BLOOMER: Second from Christina. Okay.

And then we'll do all those in favor. Vince?

MR. HUERTA: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Al?

DR. ABESON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Christina?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Frank?

MR. CASTELLANOS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, yes. All right.

Item passes.

Moving on to Agenda Item 4, Discussion and possible action on the department's Draft 2011 through 2015 Strategic Plan Vision, Mission, Values, Goals, and Focus Area Statements. And I believe this is going to be Kelly Kirkland.

MR. GLEASON: Good morning. This is Eric Gleason, Director of the Public Transportation Division.
I just want to -- before we leave the last item, I want the committee to be assured that we will help in whatever ways needed to make implementation of the rules as easy and seamless as we possibly can. Our public transportation coordinator, we've not yet sat down and talked with him too much about implementing, but we will do that. We talked yesterday about trying to get real simple, straightforward examples out on our website that people can look at. So we will do whatever we need to do to make this happen, and we'll be as supportive as we can be in implementing this.

MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Eric.

Kelly?

MR. KIRKLAND: Good morning, members. My name is Kelly Kirkland. I'm Planning Director for the Public Transportation Division. I'm speaking to you this morning about the TxDOT Strategic Plan Process. This is the fiscal year 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. And I think you all have received a copy of the draft plan, dated December 18, as well as an outline for this presentation today.

If y'all don't have any objections, I'd like to just go through the outline, and if y'all have any questions, if we could hold those to the end, because I might be able to answer the questions through the presentation.
Some background, of course. Strategic plans are required of all state agencies by statute. State agencies are required to have a strategic plan that covers at least four state fiscal years, and it's required to be updated every two years. The plan that as before you is still in draft format. Although parts of it have been adopted by the commission, it's still in draft format.

One thing I'd like to talk about is what differentiates Strategic Plan from the Texas Transportation Plan. Texas Transportation Plan is something that's required under the federal planning regulations and statutes and is at least a 20-year document and describes what the department's going to be doing. In a nutshell, I'd like to say the Strategic Plan describes how the department is going to do its business, in contrast with the state transportation plan.

The structure as it's been developed has been from a general to more specific. Again, the commission adopted some direct statements back in September, including a mission statement, a vision statement, and values statements. And all those are on the second page of the document that Ginnie sent out. That's the draft strategic plan.

The balance of the strategic plan, elements include goals. There were six goals adopted by the
commission in September. There are a number of objections for each of those goals, three or four, depending upon which one you're looking at, developed over the process, which I'm going to describe later, from September through December; a number of strategies, one to four per objective. And the strategies have been developed in the time frame September through December. Performance measures. Those are still under development. There are example performance measures listed in the plan, and then there are targets for the performance measures.

The TxDOT process is being spearheaded by the -- another new office. Bobby mentioned the Internal Compliance. There's another new TxDOT office called the Strategic Planning and Performance Management Office. The director for that office is Mary Mayland. She's formerly TxDOT's district engineer in the Tyler District, and before that the district engineer in El Paso. And they have a consultant help out with that. That's with Cambridge Systematics.

The SPPM office looked at the statutory requirements and also at what they were hearing during the legislative sessions for the 81st Legislature, and particularly what was talked about in the department's Sunset bill, House Bill 300, and similar legislation. Although that bill did not pass, the department has taken
on the task of adopting all of the legislative
requirements, that is, the things that don't require
specific statutory authorization, which the department
does not have yet. But everything that the department can
do that the Legislature was recommending the department is
attempting to do and put that into place.

In addition, they looked at the 2030 Commission
Report. You know that was a commission that was formed
about two years ago, I think, and had input,
participation, and membership from all over the state.
And they went out and had public hearings around the state
and got public feedback and input on how the department is
doing its business and how it should be doing its
business.

And in addition to that, the commission has
been talking about the strategic plan at each of its
monthly workshops over the past several months. Those
monthly workshops are held on the Wednesday prior to the
standard or regular commission meeting. So there was one
held this past Wednesday. I wasn't able to attend that
one because, of course, we had our semiannual operators
meeting on that day.

The Strategic Planning and Performance
Management Office organized a regional comment process
which began in late September and early October. There
was a meeting held at each of the four regions around the state, a north, a south, east and west, so there was a meeting at Lubbock and Fort Worth and San Antonio and Houston. And additionally, there was a fifth meeting held here in Austin. Participants at those meetings and those work groups were mostly TxDOT staff, although there was some participation from MPOs. And Eric sent out a note to transit operators, and we had some transit operators participate in those meetings as well.

After those meetings, there was an additional work group that was formed, and I had the honor to participate in that and further develop some of the objectives strategies that are part of this plan.

Next steps, of course, this plan is continuing to be revised and amended and worked on, still in draft format. The objective is to have a draft adoption of the complete plan in the near future. I don't think that I have an exact date on that. That's not scheduled at the commission yet. It probably wouldn't be any sooner than their March meeting, though, if I were to make a guess. And at that point, it would be out officially for public comment. The public comments would be received, very similar to the rulemaking process, of course, and the commission would be in a position to make suggestions and then adopt the final strategic plan.
So I just want to see if y'all had questions about this, about the process or the plan or anything I've talked about.

DR. ABESON: This is Al. What is going to the commission in March?

MR. KIRKLAND: Well, we don't have a date. March is --

DR. ABESON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. KIRKLAND: That is my guesstimate as to when the commission might take action as formally adopting a draft strategic plan. Now, that's not on their schedule yet.

DR. ABESON: But the plan -- the materials we received --

MR. KIRKLAND: Yes, sir.

DR. ABESON: -- is not the draft plan. There's a whole lot more to come. Right?

MR. KIRKLAND: Well, there's additional development added to what you see before you, including work on the performance measures and targets for those measures.

MR. GLEASON: Let me just jump in, if I can. This is Eric. Dr. Abeson --

DR. ABESON: I'm Al.

MR. GLEASON: Al. All right. The strategic
plan is not a plan in the traditional sense in that it will generate a lot of additional information around specific projects and things like that. It is a plan that is focused on these items you see here, mission, vision, values, goals, strategies, objectives, and measuring the department's progress toward those things. So to that extent, I don't envision it as a big document with lots of information in it.

So when you say that there's going to be a lot more to come, I'm not sure from a quantify and volume standpoint, if you will, there is a lot more to come. But it is still a draft document, and to that extent there is still a lot more discussion on it to come, if I can.

And before we go to much further, the issue of when this plan would go to the commission as a draft, to be adopted as a draft and then presumably public comment before final, the other -- Kelly mentioned that the department is moving ahead on many of the Sunset recommendations. And another one of those was to have a firm come in and do a management and organizational review of the department. And that effort's proceeding concurrently with this, and it's the desire of the commission to bring those two efforts together and act at the same time.

So this -- the schedule of this is somewhat
dependent on the schedule of the Grant Thornton work, which is the organization I meant, for review work. They're trying to get those -- as you can understand, it would make a lot of sense.

DR. ABESON: Yes. It sure would.

MR. GLEASON: It would be hard to do a management organizational review if you're in the middle of changing your goals and mission and all that.

DR. ABESON: Right.

MR. GLEASON: So they're attempting to kind of get those in sync. So whether it's March of April, it's the spring, late spring time frame, I can tell you. I think March is probably going to be too soon, is my guess.

DR. ABESON: That's helpful. Thank you very much. When I read the draft -- and unfortunately I left it behind -- I have a bias towards public transit, which I presume is why I'm sitting here. So that led me to look at things like use of the words, "bus," the words, "van." I also was looking for the words, "coordination." I didn't see those. Help me understand at what point they will be in there, presuming they'll be there.

MR. GLEASON: If I can, this is Eric. I would think if the committee -- without judging your conclusions --

DR. ABESON: Well, feel free.
MR. GLEASON: -- when I -- I tend to look for those things myself when I look at these plans. What the -- the place for that kind of specificity, if you will, I believe, would be as we move from objectives and strategies. So when you look at this document and you begin to think about places where you might want to elevate the visibility of public transportation, then I would steer you toward the objectives and strategy parts of what you're looking at.

What I can tell you, having been here just over four years myself and having come from the Pacific Northwest to Texas, this -- the language in this plan, well, perhaps still falling short of being as explicit about public transportation as you may like to see, does represent some movement to embrace multi-modal solutions, which in previous transportation strategic plans were not as evident. So there is -- the department is hearing, has heard, and is attempting to reflect the desire of stakeholders to see the department become more multi-modal. And it is in that general direction I think we will find places for the work that we do.

Now, one of the things, one of the activities that is going to occur within the department following adoption of this plan is each division within the department is going to be responsible for taking a look at
its body of work and for developing its own sets of strategies and measures, performance measures, if you will, that will communicate how each division's work will be done and measured in a way that will relate to supporting the department achieving the strategies and the goals in this plan.

DR. ABESON: This is Al. So the document that the commission will sign off on will or will not have performance measures that do reflect rather specific public transportation accomplishments?

MR. GLEASON: What I know, Al, is that the plan will have performance measures in it. And at some perhaps general level I would expect those measures to reflect in some fashion public transportation's contribution toward a multi-modal approach to moving people and goods.

The specificity I can't speak to, because I've not really seen yet what is being contemplated in that regard. I do know, though, that a more specific level, my division, Public Transportation Division, will be held accountable within the department and to the public to a more specific set of measures that we will embark on developing once the plan is adopted. So -- and while it may be a division business plan, I'm certainly willing to share as we move along that course, share that information with the committee and get feedback from the committee on
those measures we're thinking about.

So, yes. I think you'll see some measures in the strategic plan that will speak to public transportation. They may be very broad, would be my expectation, but that the intent within the department is to go further into each division and get something a little more specific.

DR. ABESON: Good. Well, I certainly would encourage as much specificity as possible in getting the whole department --

MR. GLEASON: Now, having said that, this is the committee's opportunity, in this next several-month time frame --

DR. ABESON: Ah.

MR. GLEASON: -- to weigh in on this plan, which is why we've got it before you today, and to provide some comments to the commission and to the department on what you're talking about.

DR. ABESON: Okay. So potentially --

MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir.

DR. ABESON: -- the committee could focus on suggested additions, revisions, or whatever, to the plan before it goes to the commission.

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely. Yes, sir. And what I would suggest to the committee, if I could, I think if
you look at the structure of the mission, the vision, the values, the goals, objectives, strategies, I think as this thing is moving along, I think the most opportunity for flexibility and for the committee to introduce ideas similar to what you're talking about is probably down in the goals, objectives, strategies. And at this point in the process, I honestly couldn't tell you to what extent you might be able to influence the vision and the values and the -- you know how these things go.

DR. ABESON: Absolutely.

MR. GLEASON: You know, it's -- they kind of move along, and as you move along certain things become a little more solid.

DR. ABESON: Well, mission and values, I mean, that's -- Chevrolet -- well, it used to be Chevrolet, American apple pie and a baseball. Right? But I think we could probably live with that.

MR. GLEASON: But I would clearly encourage the committee to look at the goals and the objectives and the strategies.

DR. ABESON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. And Eric and I had talked about, there's a couple of things we as the committee can do. We can look at the draft plan, the big picture, and decide that we want to make comments on
that. And we can either do that here in a meeting, we can form a subcommittee to address that. I understand there's a fairly quick turnaround time that if we wanted to get our comments in, or not only, I guess, not knowing when it's going to commission, March or April, but we probably want to spend a little bit of time preparing those comments and making sure that we're okay them. And we can either allow them to go directly to the commissioner, bring them back informally to this committee.

We can do that and/or we can spend some of our time thinking about the next step, a division business plan and a PTAC, maybe, work plan as to what we would like to do to take these more broad and general goals and strategies and bring some detail to them. And so I guess that's an item for discussion. What others -- do you feel that we'd like to make comments on the strategic plan as it is?

DR. ABESON: Well, I would. This is Al. I certainly would like that opportunity, with the committee, though, not by myself.

MR. GLEASON: I think, if I can, Michelle -- this is Eric -- clarify, the time that -- the period you're in right now is the department is still developing a draft to -- recommendation to the commission, which their first action will be to adopt it as a draft. And it
would then enter into some period of time for formal
public review and comment. And clearly, in that formal
time frame, there's a role for this committee. But we are
before that.

And so to a certain extent, it's perhaps not a little -- it's not as structured, if you will, of a
comment period time frame for us. But I think it's an important time frame for this committee to weigh in
during, if you have some specific ideas about some things you'd like to see.

DR. ABESON: This is Al. Would it be helpful to you and Kelly if, as you develop your drafts that would
further embellish the plan, to share those with the committee, so that we could react to what you've done,
potentially supporting and potentially questioning? And I don't know if that's a legitimate part of the process or not.

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think there may be some timing things that don't quite work with that, you know, for example, I'm not -- we've not yet received the administration direction at the division level with a time frame to go do this. We're starting to work on it. I suspect that from a timing standpoint, the effort is going to be first and foremost on this draft, and then the division work will follow that. So it's not necessarily
something I see coming together concurrently.

MS. BLOOMER: Any thoughts, comments, questions?

MR. HUERTA: This is Vince. I would just -- I think the idea is good of developing a committee so that we can follow up on Al's comments, suggestions.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: One of the things today that we weren't sure about was what level of detail to actually present to the committee, recognizing that, with a topic like this, some people have had a chance to look through it in quite a bit of detail; others may not have at all.

So if there are questions that any committee members have of us at this point on anything at any level of specificity, goals objectives, strategies, that's fine. I mean, our intention today was not to not talk about those things, but we didn't want to necessarily spend 40 minutes going through each of them at a level of detail.

DR. ABESON: Well, as I read it, I found the performance measures so broad that I couldn't find -- I really couldn't find where is public transportation within these performance measures. And I don't recall well enough the goals and objectives; I'm sure I'd find them fine.

But again, the whole plan is so global and so
broad that you could probably put anything you wanted in and keep anything you wanted out and still be okay. So even starting with the logo, I mean, the logo suggests roads as opposed to public transportation, perhaps, as part of what this effort should be.

So my -- if you have more information or more specificity on performance measures, from my perspective, that would be a great place for us to begin looking at things.

MR. GLEASON: I don't right now, Al.

DR. ABESON: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: What you have in front of you is what we have --

DR. ABESON: Yes. Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- to share with the committee.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So I have two members recommending that we form a subcommittee. Is that something we can do informally? Do we have to take formal action and --

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think we have a planning subcommittee established already. And under this, this can be -- this is identified as an action item today, so one possible course of action for the committee would be to refer this to the planning subcommittee. And then I would imagine that the subcommittee could then -- if
others wanted to join that subcommittee's conversation, that would be fine.

I don't think we want to necessarily form a new formal subcommittee, but I think we could -- with our existing structure, you know, the full committee could say, We're going to ask -- task the planning subcommittee over the next time frame to put together something to bring back to the full committee.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: And that would be a reasonable course of action.

MS. BLOOMER: And, Ginnie, this is Michelle. Do I chair the planning? Which one do I chair?

MS. MAYLE: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MS. MAYLE: But you have only four members on the subcommittee, unless --

MS. BLOOMER: I think we only have -- we have three.

DR. ABESON: Could the whole committee do the task?

MS. BLOOMER: The whole committee could do the task too.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, absolutely.

MS. BLOOMER: So we can do that. Now, would
that -- since that would be the whole committee, we would have a quorum? Would you -- we'd just have a conference call?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MS. MAYLE: It would have to be posted as a --

MS. BLOOMER: Posted as a meeting?

MR. GLEASON: Yes. We have some notification requirements.

MS. BLOOMER: Why don't we do this. Trying to work within the system, since it will have to be posted, is if everybody can -- if everybody is okay with tasking the entire committee to take a look at it and come up with some comments that we'd like to submit to the commission before the draft plan is taken out to the public and then the final plan adopted. Is that right? If you have particular comments and questions, if you could get those to Ginnie, say, in three weeks?

DR. ABESON: How many?

MS. BLOOMER: Three weeks?

DR. ABESON: Three?

MS. BLOOMER: And then if we could have just a conference call, say, the following week?

MR. GLEASON: Till the end of February.

MS. BLOOMER: The end of February? And
whatever we need to do -- then what we can do is consolidate all those comments and then discuss them and prioritize them on a conference call.

MR. GLEASON: We could take what we have, turn around and do a document, and get it out to all of you before the conference call. We could talk about the conference call.

MS. BLOOMER: Does that sound doable?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: Sounds good.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then, Ginnie, we can work together to put together a schedule, because if we're going to have the meeting the end of February, you're probably going to need that more than one week before to put it all together and then get it back out to everybody, because we'll need to have time to have it and review it in advance of the conference call. So we'll get a schedule out sometime next week to all the PTAC members of what we're going to do to address that. Okay?

MR. GLEASON: And what I will do is check with our planning folks on this time frame and make sure that it works with theirs as well.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then just to clarify, we have this opportunity, and then once it does go out for public comment, we can always make comment through the formal comment process as well.
MR. GLEASON: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any other comments, questions, issues, concerns related to Item 4?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Oh, there was action.

MS. MAYLE: No, that's only if you want to take --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think at this point, we'll postpone action until maybe the next, the conference call.

Okay, then. Moving onto Item 5, Update 5, Update from the Planning and Policy Technical Subcommittee and the Program Management Technical Subcommittee regarding work program topics. Okay. I guess, Ginnie, remind me. I'm on the Chair of the Planning and Policy Technical Subcommittee? The subcommittee has not met since our October conference call.

One thing I did want to talk about just a little bit on this item and see if anybody has gotten feedback is the letter did go out from Eric to all the transit providers regarding the non-urbanized area formula program or Section 5311, Discretionary Cap. That was the Tier I item on our subcommittee's work plan. To date, I don't think we've heard either way, positive/negative, from any of the providers in response to that letter.
I did attend the TxDOT semiannual meeting and just gave a brief PTAC update and asked people to, you know, please let us know if they liked it, if they hated it, if they really didn't care one way or the other, and didn't hear anything.

I have heard from one provider in our region that did acknowledge receiving the letter, did acknowledge reading the letter, understanding the letter, and the only comment I got back was, you know, they appreciate PTAC's effort, but they thought it was too much of a good thing maybe. More federal and state money is always good, but they don't have the local match.

So one thing, Eric, you and I had talked about is I still have five other transit providers in my region to poll to see if they received the letter, read it, understood it, if they're happy, not happy. But to date, you haven't received any feedback?

MR. GLEASON: No.

MS. BLOOMER: And we didn't get any on Wednesday. So I don't know, maybe as providers, J.R. can tell us if you liked it or not.

MR. SALAZAR: Well, this is J.R. For the record, yes, I did like the letter. But I was a little surprised, too, in speaking with Michelle before the meeting started that we had not received any comment
personally or through the division, that there was no
comments one way or another. And I told Michelle that,
especially with the fact that anytime you do this you have
those that gain and those that lose, and in particular
those that lost I figured we'd hear from them. And so to
not hear anything, it was somewhat -- I was really
confused by that. To try to understand the pulse of the
providers in the state, and for no comment, it was a
little strange for me. But --

MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. Maybe
we'll hear when the 2010 funds are actually released, and
it will become more real in the dollar amount? I don't
know, but again, I'm stumped as to why we didn't hear
anything. I also opened it up to everybody at the
semiannual meeting to talk with either Vince, myself, or
J.R., who was at the meeting, if they had any issues or
concerns or areas of assistance they needed. And again,
didn't hear from anybody.

So it's kind of hard, if we're the group
responsible for advising the commission on what the issues
and concerns of the transit providers are if we, you know,
aren't hearing from them. And I do think it is a very
huge positive step to be going to the semiannual meetings
to try to put a face to PTAC. I think that will be very
beneficial.
And I did want to just mention it to the other PTAC members that if you happen to be in Austin, what they are, there's -- twice a year TxDOT holds -- hence the semiannual -- provider meetings. All the providers in the state are invited to come down to Austin for one day, January, and then again in July. And there's a range of topics that are covered.

And, Ginnie, maybe we can send out the agenda to the PTAC members so they can see what some of those items were. There were some very good issues presented. Eric covered sort of the funding situation, and Bobby did as well. Linda Cherrington, from TTI, went over the Census 2010 and what could potentially happen as a result of that, which as we know, population is very important in determining how much money the state gets and thus how much money the providers get. So that was very beneficial. And I think if we could bring that back to our next PTAC meeting or maybe involve that in the workshop, which hopefully we'll talk about a little bit later, I thought that was a very good presentation that Linda did.

Hopefully, in a couple months, we'll have a little bit more detail and not so much uncertainty, because right now there's a lot of unknowns as to how the census is going to determine tracks and block routes, et
cetera, which she has a best guess, but at this point, until we know and the census publishes their information, it's really just a guess. But a lot of providers are sort of anxiously anticipating the census, which is good, because the last one we were all caught off guard, I think. So --

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, if I might. I just -- for clarification, we're on Agenda Item 5.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: Update from the subcommittees. And I just want to make sure some of this, I think we can talk about under the Director's Report, Number 6, but I want to make sure that if there's a report from the other subcommittee, we deal with that and then move on to 6, if we could, please.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any questions on the Planning and Policy Technical Subcommittee or anything the other members would like to sure? Like I said, we haven't met. I think our next item on the list is Transportation Development Credits. That should be fun.

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: No? Ginnie, if I'm correct, I think Claudia Langguth is the chair of the other committee, the Program Management and Technical subcommittee? Unfortunately, she is not able to join us.
If there's another subcommittee member that would like to give an update?

DR. ABESON: I'm on that committee, and as far as I know, we haven't met.

MR. HUERTA: I'm also on that committee. I believe the last time -- and maybe you can help me, Cheryl -- I believe it was November? I think some of what had generally been discussed was just evaluating that 5310 and how it's affecting. I think we were discussing numbers about shifting the program and the way the money is distributed to the different areas would affect certain areas and benefit others.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. Just for clarification, on the Planning and Policy Technical Subcommittee, I know that, Michelle, you're the chair of that, and I'm on that committee as well. And Janet Everheart is on that committee. But we're looking for our fourth member. Is that correct?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. And I think --

MR. GLEASON: Yes. Let me -- this is Eric -- provide a very quick -- I was going to do this under the Director's Report. The committee is a committee of nine members. There are currently eight. We have -- the department has been working closely with the governor, the
lieutenant governor, and the speaker's staff to get the final appointment. The speaker is going to make the final appointment, as I understand it. That's how they decide. And I know that they have requested the department for some names of potential committee members, and we are in the process of sending those over to them. I think we're trying to get a hold of one potential nominee before we submit that person's name. We want to make sure they're interested in serving.

And so I'm very hopeful that in the near future we will have a ninth member and have a full committee. And at that point, we could maybe revisit our subcommittee assignments.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And, Eric, you can bring me in if I get too far out on this one, but --

MR. GLEASON: That's all right.

MS. BLOOMER: -- since this is the item -- is this a good place, since we initially set up the subcommittees when there were eleven members, and it seemed to make more sense, instead of having all eleven participate in a discussion, that we would have four or five. And maybe we can talk about this next time when we have the ninth member. But do we still want to continue with the subcommittees being nine members versus eleven members? And maybe one of the issues was flexibility. I
guess if we have less than a quorum, we don't have to post it, if we were -- so that might be one item that plays into that.

But I know on our last subcommittee conference call, we had a difficult time because there were only three of us. It's kind of hard to bounce an idea around and get different points of view when there's three or four of you versus, say, nine of you. So maybe we can think about that, and at our next meeting, when we add the ninth person, we can discuss whether or not we want to combine all our work tasks and focus on those as a committee one at a time or how we want to go about that.

MR. GLEASON: If I may, why don't we close Agenda 5, open Agenda Item 6, and get into the Director's Report. One of the things in the Director's Report is the possibility of a PTAC workshop --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- to talk about PTAC roles and responsibilities. And that could be an excellent to review the subcommittee structure and talk about how the committee would like to do that. So if we can move into --

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- Agenda Item 6.

MS. BLOOMER: So if there are no further
comments or updates on Item 5, we'll move into Item 6, the
Division Director's Report.

MR. GLEASON: You all got a copy of the report.

I'll just touch briefly on the topics here and then
mention a few other things, the semiannual meeting that we
had this week.

Most of you have probably heard that -- the
possibility of a second stimulus package, second jobs
legislation coming out of Washington. And so in
anticipation of that, we are already beginning
conversations. From the department's standpoint, the
rural program providers are the ones that we are most
focused on in any sort of stimulus package effort here in
the state.

The way the transit money comes down through
the formula is it comes down as either 5307 funds, which
are the urban area funds, or 5311, which are the non-urban
area funds. The department is the designated recipient
for the non-urban funds, 5311 funds. And within the urban
area designation, there's a small urban group that is
areas between 50- and 200,000. And in Texas, the governor
has basically -- to not probably use the correct word, but
the -- he has -- we have in Texas a governor's
proportionate group, which is, at the moment, comprised of
30 small urban cities around Texas.
And the governor allocates -- based on allocations that come from the federal government, would allocate funds to each of those 30 small urban areas, and then they become the designated recipient, as far as the FTA is concerned, for administration and grant management purposes for those funds.

So we don't -- the department, while technically at the federal level we are a recipient of those funds, the way the process works is those funds get allocated directly to the small urban areas, and they become -- they have a direct relationship with FTA for the use of those funds. And the reasons that's significant with the recovery legislation is that the department focuses almost all of its attention on the non-urban side when it comes to transit.

And so we have begun the conversation with the rural program, the non-urban rural program providers about if this funding does become available, what is it that they would like to do with it. And we've encouraged them to start thinking about specific projects.

First time, it was roughly 50 million that came through. We're thinking if the current version of the legislation in the House holds, it should be around 45 million that would come through. We are required by law to take 15 percent of that and set it aside for city bus
purposes. So all of that, we're assuming, will come on
down the same way it came down before, and we'll be in a
situation to have to make some very quick decisions on how
to spend it here in Texas.

But great process the time before. The rural
community really, I think, came together in a very
collaborative and cooperative way and helped make
decisions on how to spend this money for the best value in
Texas. So I'm looking forward to that again.

We have -- we are in receipt of 40 total
proposals following our coordinated call request for
proposals. Again, the coordinated call is something the
department began for the first time with last federal
fiscal year's programs, where historically the department
had been responsible for administering a handful of
different federal programs, federal grant programs, that
projects are competitively selected for, and historically
we had been issuing single, independent and separate call
for projects for each of those programs at different times
of the year.

So there was an inner-city bus competitive
call. There's a competitive call now for JARC, New
Freedom funds, and things like that. And historically, we
would have done those things separate from each other.
Last year for the first time we put them all into one
package. We gave everyone five or six months to put
together their project proposals for any of those
programs, and this then is the second year of having done
that.

Proposals were due on the 21st of December, and
we got 40. You have a summary of sort of which programs
were asked for and how much or how often people asked for
them. And again, dependent on when federal apportionments
come down and become available for these programs --
because we don't have those yet -- we'll be able to move
ahead and be in a position to make awards most likely
beginning with the May Transportation Commission.

So we have talked -- or Michelle and I have
talked about the possibility of organizing a workshop with
PTAC to talk about roles and responsibilities with a fair
number of new members to the committee, hoping to get one
more. And so the concept of a workshop to kind of go over
those basics, talk about subcommittees, how the committee
wants to get its work done. We're very open to and
we're -- you know, we'll be glad to move ahead on that as
soon as we have a ninth member, I think.

Coming at the commission, February commission
meeting, this lists four awards. We'll actually have a
fifth. We do expect to get federal apportionments for
2010 federal funding up to the amount of the current
continuing resolution for about five months of the fiscal year. We will actually get amounts from the FTA. We're expecting them next week. And once we get those, those partial year amounts, we will go ahead and award whatever share of the formula program we can.

For those new members of the committee, the administrative code directs the department to take the first 20.1 million of the non-urban area funding as it comes down and award that through a formula that looks at population, land area, and performance measures. And so this is very similar to last year where we received five months of apportionments initially, and so we will go ahead and award however much of those that we can.

We will also, in that minute order, when people see that minute order, we will -- it will have -- it has an exhibit. The exhibit lists all the rural programs, 38 of them, that will get portions of these funds. It will have two columns. First column that they will see will have the amount we're able to give them now. The second column will show the total that they will get once we have full apportionment and are able to award the 20.1 million by formula. So we won't have to go back to the commission for that second half.

We will -- on a different program, the 5310 program, we'll go ahead and make a -- what will be a
partial award, based on the apportionment there. And then we have three transportation development credits -- well, we have two transportation development credit awards to make and a final minute order that will be -- well, I'm looking in here. Okay. We have two transportation development credits. I actually think we have another minute order item, don't we? Okay. There's one on here that's not listed. There is an award for -- a JARC award with -- does that have TDC, Cheryl, to it? Okay.

And then the proposed rule changes. Well, this is formal adoption for the rules -- right, Bobby? -- in March? So the internal compliance rules that you all commented on earlier are scheduled for formal adoption in March. So anyways --

MR. KILLEBREW: This is Bobby. You have this listed under February commission action that --

MR. GLEASON: It's March.

MR. KILLEBREW: That is actually a March action by the commission. It slid a month, because --


MR. KILLEBREW: So that will not be at the February commission meeting unless there's a change that I don't know about.

MR. GLEASON: No, it hasn't. No, it's March.
So I apologize for the confusion. And then generally as we move into the spring, it's a busier -- it's a busy time of year for us at the commission. So we'll have lots of stuff happening the next several months, assuming we get awards.

MS. BLOOMER: The FOTTA thing didn't make it.

MR. GLEASON: Oh, okay. Also, each year the department awards what is known as the Friend of Texas Transit Award, or we call it the FOTTA.

MS. BLOOMER: It's on mine.

MR. GLEASON: Was it on the e-mail version?

DR. ABESON: What was the acronym?

MR. GLEASON: Friend of Texas Transit Award, F-O-T-T-A.

MS. BLOOMER: FOTTA.

MR. GLEASON: FOTTA.

DR. ABESON: FOTTA.

MR. GLEASON: The department has done -- has made that award for quite some time. If you go down to the Greer Building and just before you go into the large hearing room, on your left on the wall is a plaque that shows all of the previous recipients of this award. Last year the department awarded it to now-Secretary of State Hope Andrade for her work as a commissioner on public transportation issues. It can go to any member of the
public. It can go to a program provider. Can't go to any of us on TxDOT staff.

MS. BLOOMER: J.R.'s a recipient.

MR. GLEASON: J.R. is a former recipient of it. Janet Everheart is a former recipient of it. I'm going through the current PTAC membership list in my head.

And so we will be sending out shortly an announcement looking for nominations. We will make the award at the upcoming Texas Transit Association Conference in Corpus Christi in April.

MS. MAYLE: And I need a volunteer to sit on the --

MR. GLEASON: And we typically have a selection committee help us go through the nominations, and we would like one member of this committee to participate.

You want them to send like an e-mail of interest to you?

MS. MAYLE: Sure.

MR. GLEASON: It's not an action item today on your agenda. So if you're interested in serving on this committee, why don't you just send Ginnie an e-mail. If we have to choose, we will. And in the past, it's been four, five or six names typically come in with a brief description, so we generally just kind of go around and talk about the information we've received and make a
decision that way. The committee will make a
recommendation to me, and I'll make the final decision on
who makes the -- who gets the award.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. This is Michelle. I
just -- I did it last year; I served as the PTAC
representative. I think Donna Halstead volunteered me.
But it took -- there was about seven, I believe,
nominations.

You just -- you simply have to read them and
then they give you a little scoring sheet that you can
rank, I believe. It took about an hour and a half, two
hours at the very most, and it was a rewarding experience,
so if you're interested, please just e-mail Ginnie, and I
guess we can discuss it at the next -- we don't have to
action.

MR. GLEASON: I guess someone else e-mailed
Ginnie for you to be on the committee list, J.R. So you
have that option.

MS. BLOOMER: I guess so.

MR. GLEASON: The one thing I did want to
mention, as Michelle noted earlier, we did have one of our
two business meetings that we have each year with our
rural and smaller providers. And, you know, a number of
topics came up. And Michelle and I were talking during
the meeting that some of these topics might be relevant
for this committee to here. And you were beginning to go
down that road with talking about the census stuff, so if
you wanted to repick that conversation up now --

MS. BLOOMER: I did. Actually --

MR. GLEASON: -- you could.

MS. BLOOMER: -- if it's okay with the
committee, what I'd like to do is maybe just start up at
the top with the ARRA and move our way down the list --

MR. GLEASON: Sure.

MS. BLOOMER: -- to see if there are any
questions or comments related to that. But before we did
that, Eric, at the semiannual you had -- or somebody from
your staff had presented sort of the results of a survey,
because you had conducted a survey of all the rural
providers as to what they thought they might want to spend
their --

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: -- ARRA II funds on. Thought
that might be beneficial for the subcommittee, I mean the
committee.

MR. GLEASON: I can -- give a quick summary now
of what we heard back? I can provide a summary. We can
also send out --

MS. BLOOMER: Send it, okay.

MR. GLEASON: -- some of the things out to the
committee. We basically sent a quick questionnaire to all 38 rural program providers, and asking them three questions on their potential uses of more ARRA funds, were they to become available. We heard back from 25. And we had a question on how they might use operating funds if we awarded funds for operating. We had a question on how they might use capital funds. And then we also asked the question about potential use of these funds for projects of statewide significance.

And 20 of the 25 provided some information back to us on how they would use operating funds, with most of those responses being that they would be used to either maintain some portion of their current service or to help offset what we've seen recently with a bit of a rise in fuel prices.

Just I think about 24 percent of the folks that responded on operating said they would use it for marketing purposes. These are one-time funds, and so I was actually pleasantly surprised to see people thinking about using these funds to do something which they probably can't afford to do as a part of their normal operating budget.

On the capital side, all 25 respondents provided us information on how they would use the money for capital. 41 percent of them said they'd use it for a
fleet. We've made tremendous progress over the past two
or three years on replacing a large share of our aging and
over-utilized fleet here in Texas. I wasn't sure how much
more there was to go. But apparently there are a number
of our folks who still have some relatively significant
investments that they would like to make in fleet.

The next largest category was in IT equipment.
I think something like 32 percent of the folks were
interested in some sort of an IT investment. And again,
that's encouraging. We had a fair number of folks the
first time around upgrade or purchase for the first
time -- most of it was purchased for the first time --
automated dispatching, scheduling, mobile data terminals,
vehicle tracking systems. And I think this time we're
seeing some more new purchasing and, I think, maybe a lot
of folks are thinking about upgrading what they already
have.

And, you know, when we talked about that kind
of a project before, while we recognized those investments
didn't necessarily generate a lot of jobs, I think the
offsetting benefit which was compelling was the long-term
benefit to the industry in terms of efficiency and all
those good things that come with being able to better
coordinate your resources. And so we're very much in
favor of those kinds of investments.
From a facilities standpoint, I think just under 20 percent of the folks said that they might have a facility use for the funds. Again, you know, we may have picked up most of what might be brand-new project construction folks are ready to do the first time around. And it may be that this time around, while there may be a couple of those new ones left over, it maybe be -- and what we've been encouraging people to think about is an opportunity to renovate and operate existing facilities and to really try and give some thought to doing that. So that's what we've heard back from folks.

On the question about projects of statewide significance, examples that we put out for folks to react to was some kind of investment in emergency response, not necessarily planning as much as capacity.

The example I give folks that we've heard anecdotally anyways is some of our providers are part of a formal evacuation plan for people with disabilities. And when you pull up to a location where you have any number of people you need to evacuate and your vehicle has two wheelchair tie-downs on it, you know, you end up making a lot of trips back and forth, because you can only take folks with wheelchairs two at a time. So one of the ideas that's out there anecdotally is why don't we make an investment in some vehicles that are specially equipped
with more tie-downs for use in emergency purposes. So that's an example of something that could represent that kind of investment.

We talked about a statewide -- you know, the 511 system, you know, regional maintenance centers, regional training centers. And, you know, we got some interesting feedback and quite a bit of interest in a regional training center.

And I think we probably need to spend some time talking amongst ourselves about what that is and what that means, and I don't really know, on most of any of these statewide investments, whether we're actually at a point where we could use stimulus funding, because you need to be ready to move pretty quickly with that. But I did -- I think it was interesting getting that kind of feedback, and there's a fair amount of interest in some of those things that we may pursue independent of a jobs push. So that's rather long, but that's what we heard back from people.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any comments or questions on that item?

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. The only comment I had is, you know, I think Eric was being very kind the other day when he said he -- and today as well, that you received quite a few responses. I think the e-mail was
sent out that he wanted all rural transit systems to respond. And to only have 25 respond out of 38 puzzles me. But again, I can't speak for everybody in the state, but just to comment.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If there are no more comments or questions, coordinated call request for proposals, are there any comments or questions related to that?

DR. ABESON: This is Al. My question is, what differences did you note from year one to year two?

MR. GLEASON: Differences in kinds of projects being submitted?

DR. ABESON: Kinds of projects, quality of proposals, greater use in single projects of sources -- of multiple sources, coordination, if you will.

MR. GLEASON: Now, I've not had a chance yet to look at all the proposals specifically, and we're still sort of -- but generally speaking, we are seeing -- Cheryl, correct me if I'm wrong -- we are seeing more project proposals that are making use of more sources of funding. So that second example, it does seem as though people are beginning to create project proposals and relying on more than one source of funds. So in my mind that was positive.

DR. ABESON: Absolutely.
MR. GLEASON: From the quality of proposals' standpoint, what I will tell you without trying to judge what we got this time around is we have made a pretty big investment in time and money, if you will, in training and just sheer staff effort to get out over the last several years to address what is an important issue, and that is trying to level the playing field, if you will, among all of our potential applicants, the area around -- just the sheer skill around filling out a project application, because some agencies are better equipped to do that than others. And we don't want to disadvantage those that may not have the number of staff people or whatever to do that.

So we've spent quite a bit of time. We hold forums, just as we go out with a call, we went around the state, and I think this year we held ten different forums where we invite -- we go out closer to the proposers. They come in and we talk, we spend four, five, six hours with them talking about how to do it, what's in it, da da da da. We've had formal training programs in grant writing, grant proposal writing, and things like that, so we really have tried to kind of get at that quality-of-proposal issue.

DR. ABESON: And as far as you know, is it -- are you seeing results?
MR. GLEASON: We are seeing an improvement, I think is a fair statement. And it's looking a lot better. I mean, there are still folks out there that need help. And, you know, it's an interesting position for us to be in, because we have to remain objective as well. So we can't write the proposals for them. So we try and get there earlier enough up front and give them some general skills and point them in some directions they can go to get some resources if they need it.

DR. ABESON: Good.

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. I just had one, I guess, comment, or maybe just a request. One thing, as PTAC, we're trying to determine what the needs are of the state and the providers. I think it would be very helpful if we could get a little bit more detail, like a summary of the programs and the projects that were received. We received eleven or 19 requested JARC funds, who submitted them, what type of project were they proposing, how much did they ask for, capital, operating, planning. And we can compare that. I think that would go to Dr. -- or sorry -- Al's question of from year one to year two. I don't think we ever got that level of detail for year one, but I think that might help us get a little bit better sense of what the providers are asking for and maybe what some of their needs are is if when that
information -- I understand you're probably still reviewing and preparing it, but if we could see a little bit more information as -- detail on -- I think that would be beneficial.

MR. GLEASON: Let me -- this is Eric. Let me see if I can clarify. What the committee is interested in is not commenting on the proposals or evaluating the proposals received --

MS. BLOOMER: No.

MR. GLEASON: -- but using the proposals as a source of information for trying to understand what people are trying to do --

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: -- and where their needs are generally.

MS. BLOOMER: Correct.

MR. GLEASON: What I will need to do is go back and talk to my folks, where we are in that process and when I great time to do that will be. But that makes sense to me.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any comments or questions from the phone?

MS. MELTON CRAIN: No.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: I had something I wanted to bring
up and, you know, I was looking on the agenda and not really sure where the best place to bring it up. But I did want to talk about one thing that Eric talks about statewide significance with public transportation. And one thing that I think we need mention is the medical transportation program and the fact that the contracts that are in place throughout the state do expire at the end of August, if I'm correct. I think that's correct. They expire in August, and they have the right to either extend those contracts for one year to 18 months. And I guess what I'm trying to say is if those contracts do expire in August and all the transportation providers throughout the state lose what they currently have in place now with regards to the medical transportation program, there are a lot of systems that are going to be hurting for match on the federal side. And so I do think it's important that we bring that up, that if the current providers that are in place now go away, I do think that the state of Texas is taking a step backwards. And so I just wanted to make that comment.

And I do think that there's a lot of interest in this and throughout the state. And one of the reasons why maybe there wasn't as much comment on the discretionary monies is because of what's going on, again, with the Medicaid throughout the state, and so maybe
that's why there wasn't as much comment on that. But I
did want to make sure that I brought that up.

MR. GLEASON: One of the things we can look at
doing -- this is Eric -- when we pull this workshop
together, is a portion of that time can be spent and set
aside for talking about issues of interest to the
committee and where we can talk about them more completely
so we can kind of establish a better understanding of what
the committee's interested in looking at and talking about
how important those things are and when we might bring
that kind of information back to you.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So thank you, Eric, for
segueing into the PTAC workshop. I did just want to have
a little bit of discussion, if we could, on that to get
what your thoughts were.

I've heard from a couple members, and I thought
it might be beneficial. It's been quite a while since
there's been the PTAC orientation or workshop. I thought
it would be helpful since, gosh, I think I'm going on my
tenth year at the Council of Governments, and I'm still --
every once in a while something comes across my desk that
I'm not sure what that acronym stands for or how the
funding works.

And so I thought it would be very helpful for
our new members and even some of us that have been in the
industry for a while and/or on PTAC for a while, to sort
of just get together and have a discussion about what the
Texas Department of Transportation does, what the
division's role is, how we play a role in that, go over
some of the basic funding programs, how the funding comes
from the federal government, how the state funding adds to
that, and then like you said, maybe work on a PTAC work
plan for the coming year so we sort of have a vision of
where we're going.

I can't remember who put up the slide. It
might have been Suzanne, when she was -- if you don't know
where you're going, how do you get there and how do you
know when you're there is sort of how I feel. So I think
that might be helpful. But I wanted to get your thoughts
and feedback on that and sort of timing-wise, we're
waiting for our ninth member, but when you think sooner
rather than later or when would be good and what are some
topics you would like to see covered as part of that.

MS. MELTON CRAIN: This is Christina. I think
it would be extremely helpful personally. I think it's
very timely and, you know, probably if we think we're
going to get the ninth member pretty quickly here, maybe
wait until we get that person and then plan something.
And I think the overview you've just indicated is a great
starting point. I think, you know, that would be extremely beneficial to me. And I guess it never hurts to go back over it for members who have even been on a while, especially if there have been changes to how funding works and that sort of thing. So that's just my two cents.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Christina. Anybody --

DR. ABESON: This is Al. I'll just add two more cents in saying that I think it's an incredibly good idea and do hope that it happens sooner rather than later.

MR. CASTELLANOS: This is Frank. I'd second that or third it.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: What I would offer -- this is Eric. What I would offer, Michelle, is that people can go home and think about this, send us any further thoughts they might have on it. We'll work aggressively to get something set up, and keep our fingers crossed the speaker's office -- speaker acts relatively quickly in this. And with the sooner rather than later in mind, we'll try and set something up.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. This is Michelle. I may need a followup. We were planning on a conference call later in February to talk about the 2010 -- sorry, 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. Would that be something we could
combine with the workshop? We could do them both at the
end of February?

One thing I would ask is that, if and when we
do have the PTAC workshop, if PTAC members could actually
come to Austin. I think it would be very beneficial if we
could all be in the same place and really get down to the
nuts and bolts.

MR. GLEASON: The only thought I would have on
that is if we do get a ninth member in this near-term time
frame that that kind of a -- might be difficult from a
scheduling standpoint for them to drop everything and get
to Austin by the end of the month. It just depends on
when we here from the speaker. And if we heard the third
week in February, I mean, it might be difficult to get
that person here.

So I would like to -- I think we should go
ahead and plan on the conference call on the strategic
plan. Recognize if we have the conference call, people
can do that from where they are. And then my guess is
that the workshop will likely be more in the March time
frame. That would just be my guess, as soon as we can
really do that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And this is Michelle. And
I guess maybe what we could do then, instead of similar to
the strategic plan discussion, if we could work on sort of
hammering out a broad agenda or outline of what the workshop might look like and what topics might be covered. And that way we could just have that as an item for discussion at the conference call, that people could provide feedback if there were other areas that -- of interest that they would want covered, we could do that as well.

MR. GLEASON: And the first part of March is going to be a very busy time for us. The FTA is doing a state management review of the Texas programs first week in March. So we're going to be kind of looking for that and recovering from that. But we will look for a time frame in March.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: Assuming we get -- you know, and we'll have to talk about it. If nothing is forthcoming from the speaker, I think we'll want to move ahead on that, not let this wait too long over something we can't control.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MS. MAYLE: And the third week is spring break.

MS. BLOOMER: Not during the week of spring break, okay, in case anybody has plans. We can talk about that.

Any item on -- questions or discussion on the
Friends of Transit? If not, moving on to the upcoming commission meeting minutes. Are there any other followup questions regarding any of those? Bobby mentioned that the rules will actually be going in March. I did have a question on the TDCs, and I just wanted to clarify.

Cheryl, I believe we had a conversation following the last meeting that you -- providers -- let me see if I can phrase this correctly. TDCs, or transportation development credits, a provider can request TDCs to match their federal 5307 funds that they get directly from FTA.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Because I wanted to make sure I understood that, because I had a provider tell me I'm wrong, and I wanted to make sure, before I send them to you with their request. And all they have to do is submit a letter requesting the funds. Okay. Great. That's good news.

Any other items -- oh, sorry -- for Eric regarding the Division Director's Report?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: No? Okay. We'll move on to Item 7, Public Comment. We have a member of the public here today, Mr. Lyle Nelson, representing CARTS. Mr. Nelson?

MR. NELSON: Thank y'all. I'm Lyle Nelson, the
Chief Operations Officer with CARTS. I wanted to follow up on J.R.'s comment. The Medicaid issue is an extremely important issue to the rural providers especially out there, as J.R. mentioned, it's a source of local match. And in the context of the transitions that we're going through right now, the message from the rural trans providers, as well as the smaller urban trans providers, is that we are a solution-based program throughout the state. No whine, only solutions.

The fact that the infrastructure's been built up over so many years, it would be a shame to see, as we transition -- especially with the information that Linda provided us, that we transition and forget about customer service. And that's where I want this committee to kind of focus, on the customer service aspect as we continue to comply with the bureaucratic and statutory rules.

Very quick, very sweet. I'm done.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. NELSON: Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you.

Any other public comments or comments?

MR. HUERTA: Can I just make a comment?

MS. BLOOMER: Uh-huh.

MR. HUERTA: This is Vince. In regard to what Lyle and J.R. mentioned, we were part of a phone call
yesterday that -- I don't know how many of the providers were on there, but I know there was a number of them that the TTA had hosted. And there was a high level of concern for some of the providers in the area that the MTP program really is a pretty big match for a lot of the systems and the impact it will have on some of these -- you know, the frequency of trips, just the service they're providing in general. So I certainly think that it is a high level of importance item for us to consider and maybe even on our own, us as providers do some research hopefully by the time that we put this workshop together and really can bring something solid to the table and how it will impact particularly the smaller agencies that really do make, you know, only a couple a trips a day, and really rely on that match from the MTP.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think that would be good. And maybe we can -- you can also take it up as part of a subcommittee discussion, I believe. It would probably be Claudia's subcommittee, but we can talk about it at the PTAC workshop.

And then I just wanted to add one thing I've also related to MTP, a different issue, and maybe we can talk about it either in your subcommittee or at the PTAC workshop, related to, yes, it's a source of local match, but then it -- when it becomes -- I guess it's included in
all the system data that's submitted. It brings down the
 efficiency of the system. I don't know if this is true or
 not. It's just anecdotal as well. But maybe looking at
 that as, well, bringing back more information for the
 committee to look at that issue as well.

 I don't have any other items except for confirm
date of next meeting, and I think, Ginnie, we're looking
at the end of February for a conference call to talk about
the strategic plan and then review a draft outline and
discuss the PTAC workshop for March.

 Okay. Are there any other items for the end of
February agenda either here in Austin or on the phone?
(No response.)

 MS. BLOOMER: No? Okay. Being no further
items, we can adjourn. I don't have to ask for a first,second? Hereby declare we're adjourned.
(Whereupon, at 11:46 a.m., the meeting was
concluded.)
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