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MS. BLOOMER: The meeting is called to order. We're going to try to do this. It might be a little difficult with everybody on the phone, but I think we can manage.

The first item on our agenda today is approval of the minutes from the January 29, 2010, meeting. Did we have any comments?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: I did want to make one comment. I think based on the list of committee members present -- did we have somebody join us?

MS. EVERHEART: This is Janet.

MS. BLOOMER: Good morning, Janet. This is Michelle.

MS. EVERHEART: Hi, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: And did somebody else just join?

MR. SALAZAR: Good morning, Michelle, this is J.R. Good morning, everyone.

MS. BLOOMER: Good morning, J.R. We now have everybody except for Frank. Is Frank on the line?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Well, we already called the meeting to order and we're on agenda item 2, approval of the minutes.
Ginnie, the one comment that I had is that under the committee members present, it reflects two members via conference call but down under agenda item 1 it says three participating by telephone. I didn't know if we had another member that we needed to add up at the top. I think we had anticipated three members.

MS. MAYLE: I think you're right. Yes, there were two that were unavailable. I'll change that.

MS. BLOOMER: And then, Al, I wanted to make sure that you were okay with the language added under agenda item 2, that second motion.

DR. ABESON: I'm fine with that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If there are no other comments, can I hear a motion for approval of the minutes from the January 29 meeting?

DR. ABESON: So move.

MS. BLOOMER: A second?

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R., I second.

MS. BLOOMER: And in order to facilitate, we'll just call roll call as far as approval. Dr. Abeson?

DR. ABESON: I'm in favor.

MS. BLOOMER: Michelle Bloomer, yes.

Christina Melton Crain?

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Janet Everheart?
MS. EVERHEART: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Vince Huerta?

MR. HUERTA: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Claudia Langguth?

MR. LANGGUTH: Abstain. I, unfortunately, could not attend.

MS. BLOOMER: And J.R. Salazar?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, the minutes for January 29 pass.

And did we just have somebody join us?

MR. CASTELLANOS: Yes, this is Frank Castellanos.

MS. BLOOMER: Good morning, Frank. Glad you could join us. We now have all eight members. And we just approved the minutes from the January 29 meeting, so we're moving on to agenda item number 3: Discussion and action on the department's draft 2011-2015 Strategic Plan Vision, Mission, Values, Goals, and Focus Area Statements.

And before we started, I just wanted to lay out maybe a plan of action for that discussion.

And just a reminder that the draft Strategic Plan is still in development, and as Kelly reminded me this morning, they have not yet gone out for public comment so this is sort of a pre-public comment.
opportunity to provide our thoughts and comments. At our
last meeting, all members were asked to review this draft
Strategic Plan and provide any comments they had to
Ginnie.

Al, you're the only one that provided comments,
and I think we all have those and hopefully had a chance
to review them.

What I think I'd like to do to facilitate the
discussion is maybe just walk through the mission, the
vision, the value statements, the goals and the associated
objectives under each one, and then have you, Al, give us
any comments or thoughts you had, and then, as well, any
other members add their thoughts or comments. And then at
the end we can strategize on how we want to provide our
comments to the department.

I think there's a couple of ways we could
probably provide our comments: we can either be very
specific in the comments we make; we can provide more
general or global comments such as we think it should have
a more multimodal impact or it should be more inclusive of
all modes; or the third option would be to provide some
combination thereof of general and specific comments.

I don't know if anybody has any comments or
thoughts on that before we get started.

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. Good
morning, everyone.

I'm not sure whether you've covered this or not. I talked with Mary Meyland at TxDOT who is leading up the effort for the department on the Strategic Plan, and because this is kind of an early comment opportunity for the committee, and I think it's great that you're taking this opportunity, probably the best vehicle to communicate whatever comments the committee does wish to forward at this time would be for me to capture those thoughts in a memo to Mary. I would clearly have that memo; you would have a chance to review it before I sent it, but just sort of from a technical communications standpoint, that's probably the best option for the committee at this point.

Once we're into a formal comment period on the plan itself, then I think it's entirely appropriate for the committee, under signature from Michelle, perhaps, to forward their thoughts to the commission directly.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, I think that sounds like a good idea.

If there are no other comments, let's go ahead and start working through this. Mission statement, Al, would you like to sort of highlight your comments regarding the mission statement?

DR. ABESON: Unfortunately, I don't have in
front of me all of my comments, I'd really focused on what
I called Objective 4. I'm trying to bring it up. We have
two computers in our house and we go back and forth which
sometimes works real well and sometimes not so hot. Did I
make a recommendation on that mission statement?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, and let me take a stab at
summarizing what I think your comment was. I don't know
if everybody else has a copy of the mission statement in
front of them, but I won't read it, but basically what
your comment was, I believe, was to add multimodal to the
description of the statewide transportation system. So
the mission statement says to provide a safe, efficient,
cost-effective and environmentally sensitive, and you've
added the word "multimodal" statewide transportation
system for the movement of people and goods.

DR. ABESON: I now have it in front of me too.

Yes, I just felt that what my comments were when we met
in Austin a month or so ago was that I thought that
starting with the logo, the clear focus is on highways and
roads, and yet later on in the plan there is mention of
multimodal, and I just thought it would be worth having it
right up front so that it would set the stage for some
other kinds of transportation besides roads, or I should
say in addition to roads. That's all that's about.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other comments or
concurrence, disagreement?

MR. CASTELLANOS: Just a question. This is Castellanos. Multimodal includes light rail?

DR. ABESON: In my mind it does.

MR. CASTELLANOS: Very good.

MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, I don't know -- maybe an appropriate comment or thought would be for somewhere as part of the Strategic Plan to define some of the terms of what multimodal means, because for some of us I think that means certain tools and to some of us it means all the possible tools, so that might be helpful too to lay it out for the public, as well.

MR. GLEASON: And I think probably since this is a statewide Strategic Plan, it probably has a meaning in that sense as well in terms of the kind of multimodal, what that might mean in the context of statewide initiatives

MS. BLOOMER: But I think Al makes a good point, and as we get through some of the other items, a lot of my comments relate to sort of the focus and trying to be more inclusive of all the modes and not just highway or infrastructure-intensive modes, because a lot of those performance measures, as we get down, are highway-related.

MR. GLEASON: And I think that strikes me as an example of what I would think would be a very welcome
comment at this point in the plan process because it speaks to how the plan is presented and how things are talked about, and it may be that the intent is to be as you suggest, Michelle, but perhaps the words don't reflect that yet. So I think that's an example of what I think would be a welcome comment at this point in the plan process.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then moving on to the vision statement, Al, I think your comment was to add the word "all" in front of Texas citizens.

DR. ABESON: Right, and I'm thinking primarily to emphasize the necessity for transportation for special populations, and even more important, rural parts of the state. I know that gets a lot of lip service everywhere from Washington to just about everywhere, and I think that's such a vital need that we haven't yet figured out exactly how to meet all those needs, and I just wanted to provide an emphasis there.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, I think that's a good comment, trying to meet all the various diverse needs, whether by population or by geography, is definitely a goal.

My only other comment, and this may just be semantics, Eric, is the word "citizens" and that may be because it's a state plan, but I know when we did our
regional coordination plan, we tried not to limit it to our residents due to the sort of economic development nature of transit as well, that it's not only the people who live here but the people who come to visit here.

DR. ABESON: There's another aspect of the word "citizen." It gets you into the immigration question. I don't know whether it's a capital C, a small C of the word, maybe it would just be all people in Texas, or something of that sort.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other comments on either the mission or the vision.

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Moving on to the value statements, I think, Al, you had a comment on the third one: Earn and maintain the respect and trust of Texas citizens by listening, seeking to understand and being responsive, and you've added the words "meeting the transportation needs of" our customers and stakeholders.

DR. ABESON: Right. I just think that it's a simple concept in my mind is that it is the needs of the people that should come foremost in everything that is done multimodally, and just wanted to get that emphasis included.

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. Let me just talk with you a bit about this one because, in my mind, the
value statements go to how we conduct our business as a
department, and not so much what the nature of that
business is, if I can make that distinction for you. In
my mind, the value statements are statements that it
really doesn't matter what the department is up to,
whether it's up to building rail, being multimodal or
building highways, whatever it is, it goes to how we
conduct our business, not the what of what the business
is.

    DR. ABESON: I think I understand what you're
saying and I find that a very difficult division to make.

    MR. GLEASON: Okay.

    DR. ABESON: It would seem to me that what you
do is how you get to earn and maintain the respect, et
cetera, and that that would be meeting the transportation
needs. This is tough, Eric; you're making this hard.

    (General laughter.)

    MR. GLEASON: Well, you know, it's something
that I have tried to communicate with my staff, as well,
this exact issue, and it's the business, the choices of
how we relate to people are as important, actually, if not
more, than the specifics of what we're talking about
because you may have the best idea in the world, but if
you don't go about communicating it and listening with
others about it and what-have-you, it may not happen.
And so I understand completely what you're saying about the outcome and what we do speaks volumes about things. But this goes to the heart, in my mind, of how employees of TxDOT make choices in conducting whatever business they're up to, if I can say that.

DR. ABESON: I think I understand the distinction you're trying to make, and I'm going to respectfully disagree with you.

MR. GLEASON: Okay, that's fine. That's all part of how we're conducting our business.

DR. ABESON: Yes, exactly. And I think that's very fair and really quite positive, and I have high regard for that. On the other hand, I really do think that the ultimate product is the basis on which performance indicators should be determined and whether or not, in fact, the citizens of the state have had their needs met.

MR. GLEASON: Absolutely.

MR. CASTELLANOS: It may be as simple as changing the phrase or moving the phrase from the third bullet to the top where it says TxDOT will, and putting that bullet that's in red, meeting the transportation needs of -- TxDOT will meet the transportation needs of our customers through -- and then all the bullets: honor our commitments, provide the best value, earn and
maintain, promote innovation, et cetera.

MR. GLEASON: For the members on the phone, if I can, this isn't about me and you all reaching agreement about what to put in my memo to Mary. I will put in it whatever the committee comes up with, so let's have the back and forth. But I don't want the members to think that this is about me having to agree before I put it in a memo that I sign to Mary. I just need to make sure I reflect accurately the comments of the committee.

MS. BLOOMER: And J.R., was that your comment?

MR. CASTELLANOS: This is Frank.

MS. BLOOMER: Oh, sorry, Frank.

MR. CASTELLANOS: Thanks. Okay. And I guess to me, I'm agreeing with Al in saying by moving it from one place to another, it makes it more expansive rather than reduces the meeting the transportation needs into just one bullet, makes it part of all the bullets.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. All, are you good with that suggestion?

DR. ABESON: I think that's a fine recommendation.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, I would agree as well. I think it would be beneficial to put it up there as to what the value statements apply to just to reiterate it.

If there aren't any more comments, let's move
on to Goal Number 1. And are there any comments related to Goal Number 1 and the respective objectives? There are four objectives.

I know, Al, you had a couple of comments. Would you like to summarize those for us?

DR. ABESON: On Strategy 2, just to add the words "the timely" flow of information. Well, actually, now that I read it again, I think it's there. Oh, up under example performance measure, I added the word "useful" and I don't know if that requires a great deal of explanation. I think we’ve all been exposed to government at all levels where we get volumes of information, none of it particularly useful. So I just thought it would be a good term to add there.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Any other comments?

MS. LANGGUTH: This is Claudia. I would really like to see us looking at going green as much as possible, and to use the internet and other means of communication rather than hard copy, killing trees, if we could work that into this goal because I do think it's important for us to set an example since we're one of the biggest agencies in the state of Texas.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, and I think maybe a good suggestion off of both the useful comment and the going green is maybe to suggest adding something related to
exploring multiple options based on the intended audience. I think a lot of times we put some information out and we use the same information and the same delivery method for a variety of audiences, and one particular audience may be very good on Twitter, YouTube, the internet, but there might be some information that's appropriately communicated in another fashion, and that the appropriateness of having information that's communicated, I think, gets back to the usefulness issue that Al Abeson addressed.

DR. ABESON: I would agree with that. I've used the term market segmentation from time to time to make distinction, but I don't know how you fit that here. That's the concept. Right?

MS. BLOOMER: Right, that the appropriate level of information is delivered via the most efficient mechanism for that audience.

DR. ABESON: Efficient and understandable or relevant.

MS. BLOOMER: Efficient and effective. If it's efficient but we don't understand it, then it doesn't matter.

Moving on to Objective 2, Al, you had some comments.

DR. ABESON: Well, I added "program evaluation"
only because I think that a performance management program
must have evaluation in order to be meaningful, and it may
be there but I didn't see it.

MS. BLOOMER: One comment I had under the
to sort of the more highway plus infrastructure, is the
example performance measure is on-time project design, and
I don't know if there's a better way to be more inclusive
to all the types of projects that TxDOT is involved in,
either on-time project delivery, on-time project
implementation, because some projects don't require any
design, and I think the public is more concerned about
project implementation than design.

DR. ABESON: You're proposing, Michelle, we
change the word "design" to "implementation"?

MS. BLOOMER: Well, I think that I'd like to
have a more general comment that I think it gets back to
the all-inclusive, multimodal nature that the Strategic
Plan should be, and that includes specific examples. Like
I don't think on-time project design is very inclusive. I
think it's very specific to a program or area that TxDOT
is involved in. How they want to address I think is up to
them, but, yes, I think changing the word from "design" to
"delivery" or "design" to "implementation" would meet that
basic comment.
And then I know under Strategy 3, Al, you had a comment to change the wording there.

DR. ABESON: Yes. It would be the addition of the presumption that the selection of projects would be the full range of transportation, environmental, et cetera, not just the implementation. To me, the word "encourages" left something to be desired in the fact that it was presumably voluntary, I guess, or passive is the way I would say it, and I think that we need to make it involvement of all those audiences in a more active way.

MS. BLOOMER: I don't know if anybody else has comments, but I also made that comment, that I think changing the focus from encourages, from saying TxDOT encourages this type of activity to TxDOT will do, I think is -- I don't know how to say this, but like TxDOT may, TxDOT could, TxDOT encourages is a lot different than TxDOT will, and I think the public is looking for a little bit more statements of what TxDOT will do versus what they might try to do or not do.

Any other comments there on Objective 1 or 2?

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. Do you think there's anything on what you just said to something like, you know, we can't require others to participate but we can certainly put together processes and do everything we can to get them to the table. I guess I would be
concerned from a department standpoint of a statement that seemed to imply that we will get other people involved. This may just be a split hair; I understand what you're saying.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: And I think from a TxDOT standpoint, looking at TxDOT employees and TxDOT involvement, the "will" is just fine. I think when we begin to make statements that imply others, then perhaps we don't feel quite as like we can say "will," I guess is what I'm trying to say. In the end it may not be a big deal, but I understand what you're saying.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And I understand you have no control over who does and doesn't participate.

MR. GLEASON: We can invite but obviously we can't require.

MS. BLOOMER: Right, invite, welcome, encourage.

MR. GLEASON: To me, it goes to the heart of when we're first beginning to think about making a decision about anything. Are we thinking at that very earliest moment how to design a decision-making process that is as inclusive as it needs to be and can be?

MS. BLOOMER: Right. And anybody please jump in. Under Objective 3, Strategy 1, I think in line with
the previous comments, and maybe it just goes in support of it, but it says "and maintain the safe transportation infrastructure." I think to be much broader, something about multimodal, and maybe it's infrastructure in the largest sense of not just a building, a park-and-ride lot, a highway, but that's initially how I read it is infrastructure, and a lot of what we do on the transit side isn't necessarily infrastructure. There's human capital and knowledge and institutional knowledge, and I think we want to harness that as well.

Objective 4 is enhance workforce recruitment, with the example performance measure is employee retention rate. Maybe just a suggestion or a thought would be, I'm thinking there might be another performance measure that might a little bit more applicable than retention rate. It's one thing to retain employees; it's another thing to retain good employees, and so if the performance measure focused on the retention of quality employees --

MR. GLEASON: Well, actually, I think, Michelle, bearing in mind that these are presented as examples, if you will, and not necessarily performance measures that have been selected. I think if you look at Strategy 1 and the language, that gets to what you're saying, and really what you're talking about, maybe the example isn't quite the performance measure you need to
measure Strategy 1, because it talks about a highly skilled workforce. And so, you know, the performance measures need to, as accurately as possible, measure the strategy.

MS. BLOOMER: And maybe the suggestion is instead of having an example performance measure right below the objective is that there could be an example performance measure related to each strategy.

MR. GLEASON: Below the strategy statement, if you will.

MS. BLOOMER: Right.

MR. GLEASON: Okay, that's kind of an organizational thing, but yes, I can see that.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other comments before I move on to Goal 2?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: And Goal 2 is: "Facilitate the development and exchange of comprehensive multimodal funding strategies with transportation program and project partners."

The only comment I really had, Eric, was I thought maybe, and this is sort of a detailed question, that they may or may not be interested in, but it seemed to me that Objective 2 might be a little bit more appropriate first because it's to assess and document the
needs and available revenues and then explore all available financing options.

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: We'll move on. I understand people might have other items they need to do. If you could just either put us on mute or step out of the office, that would be appreciated, because you might not want us to hear what you're talking about.

Let's see. Were there any other comments related to Goal 2?

DR. ABESON: Just a change of wording under Strategy 1, Objective 2. I don't know if it requires lots of discussion. I'm just trying to be more active than passive.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think that might be a good general overall or overarching comment, being more active than passive.

Goal 3: "Maintain the existing Texas transportation system." Any comments on Objective 1, 2 or 3?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: I'll go ahead and start. One of these comments, Eric, sort of just along the lines of what we've said previously, but I'm not sure. The first objective there is: "Develop optimal asset management.
programs to protect existing infrastructure investments."

And again, maybe that's just my limited understanding of the definition of infrastructure, but I thought in order to take a broader approach, it might be better to separate those two words and put "investments" first, that we should as a state be trying to better manage all of our investments, whether those are infrastructure or not.

And I think if we talked about the example performance measures being moved down under each strategy, that will address the comment that I had for the next one because it's basically percent of lane miles, and my comment there was to sort of broaden the focus. Again, it has a highway focus versus aviation, freight, transit, or any of the other areas where TxDOT is involved in transportation.

MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. I have had similar thoughts that you're obviously having when you see the word "infrastructure" and, you know, I think the obvious conclusion is that word is referring to those things the department does on the highway side of its activities and not so much referring to what it does on the non-highway products, if you will. And so I think we could try and add language.

The other thought I've had is to just simply use in my own mind and my own thinking, and when I provide
comments or when we develop performance measures for these things, to treat infrastructure more broadly.

And an example here, what we've talked about is if we think of the fleet investment that at the state level we have and close to 2,000 members of the fleet between the rural and the small urban systems around the state; if we think about as infrastructure and develop measures around the quality of that investment that that's one sort of approach I've sort of thought through in my head, you know, not so much necessarily trying to change the language of the objectives to have more words in them but to simply broaden the concept of what infrastructure means through the strategies and through performance measures.

MS. BLOOMER: I think that's probably a good strategy, and I was also thinking maybe we add infrastructure to the list of terms that might be useful to be identified up front, or another strategy might be to even broaden it a little bit more by referring to resources instead of infrastructure, because resources would be both your physical and building, because I think even in your example you're saying the fleet which I obviously think is an item that would be infrastructure, but going beyond that, the human capital. I mean, TxDOT has spent a lot of time and money bringing along staff and
offering training that we might want to think about expanding infrastructure or resources to be inclusive of that sort of resources as well.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: On Objective 2 and 3, I think I basically had the same comment, trying to bring an inclusive or much broader focus. It seems every, again, highway focused.

Any other comments on Objective 2 or 3?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Moving on to Goal 4: "Promote congestion relief strategies." Any comments related to Goal 4 or the associated objectives? Is anybody else out there?

(General talking and laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, just checking.

Eric, I guess a question I had in just reading it again this morning, and I understand that congestion relief is an important strategy, but I was sort of torn between congestion relief versus mobility, and what's the true goal of Texas as far as TxDOT. Is it to provide mobility, and I think one way of doing that is to help reduce congestion, but I think reducing congestion and mobility are really two different things. Because you can reduce congestion for somebody but unless you're on the
road, that's not really a benefit to you; whereas, mobility is a much broader focus.

MR. GLEASON: Well, two things. I think it's important -- congestion relief, in my mind, is very different than the current department goal of congestion reduction, so I think even that represents a significant step.

I think, Michelle, you're asking a broader question that I think is very important, and if the committee thinks it is, that needs to be entered into the discussion, and that is this notion of mobility and whether or not that is an important and broad enough concept. Is it recognized in this draft to the extent it should be as one of the goals of the department? And I think that's an important conversation for the committee to have.

DR. ABESON: This is Al. I would add here that I was really trying, in doing the new objective -- and I'm not sure if I've numbered this right, I had great difficulty organizing this -- but the idea of ensuring the availability of a sufficient workforce really is not what I have in mind. What I have in mind is ensuring the availability of mobility, and I was trying to figure out how could I get that in there in a way that would relate to what's already there which is why it is located where
I've put it, or where I hope I've put it, and why I've said what I've said, because I think the ultimate goal has to be mobility, not merely getting people to jobs.

MS. BLOOMER: Right. Any other comments on a goal being mobility, enhance mobility?

DR. ABESON: I'm certainly supportive of that.

MR. GLEASON: Let me ask a question of the committee. To what extent do you think the goal of connectivity gets at the mobility goal?

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, I think, and this is just how I look at it, but mobility is more of the overarching umbrella and I think connectivity would be sort of a strategy within that, as well as congestion relief would be a strategy within that, but I see sort of what TxDOT's role and my role as planner at the MPO is to improve mobility, and we do that through multiple ways, regional coordination, congestion management, ITS, TDM, and all that, but ultimately our goal is to move people where they want to go. And I think that overarching vision is missing, or at least I don't see it in the strategic plan.

MR. GLEASON: Okay

MS. BLOOMER: Just a comment that gets back to a little bit more of the details, but Objective 2 under Goal 4, again, the example performance measure -- even in that example it specifically says congested highway
segments, and just to encourage TxDOT to think more broadly and maybe it's just congested segments, because there are quite a few congested rail segments, and so to continue to keep being inclusive, even an example, because I think when we give examples and we're limiting it, it tends to limit people's range of possibilities when thinking about it.

MR. GLEASON: So if I can paraphrase, in terms of readying a draft document for formal public discussion, I'm hearing sort of an organizational suggestion about where the examples appear and also a suggestion that perhaps more than simply one would be helpful. Is that a fair statement?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, I think so.

MR. GLEASON: Because keep in mind, you guys are seeing this before it goes formally public, but I can see the value of that, absolutely.

MR. CASTELLANOS: This is Frank again. I'm thinking that the discussion over the broader issues and the overarching issues, I think those are valuable too because they not be specific objectives but maybe could be, as we're struggling to try to see where we articulate those, maybe an expansion of maybe the vision or the mission to include some of the concepts that we're talking about.
MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Frank, good comment.

Second to last goal, number 5, "Enhance system connectivity," I know, Al, you had some comments here, you've added a strategy, I think, under Objective 1.

DR. ABESON: Yes. Actually, I had great difficulty trying to figure out where to put this, but it does fit under Objective -- I labeled it 4 because there were three ahead of it, so what I'm talking about is Strategy 4 which, as I mentioned, speaks to ensuring the availability of sufficient maybe the word is mobility options related to getting people to work for Texas industries. Texas industries appeared earlier, so I was just trying to piggyback on that language.

And the example performance measure, you've read all this so you know what it is, and I feel so strongly that the department is investing heavily in trying to increase coordination around the state, and some regions have really moved forward on it, and I think that historically, regional coordinated efforts have not succeeded in the United States. It's been around for a long time and it's gotten lots of new impetus thanks to SAFETEA-LU, and I presume that's going to continue, and I would just like to see that really stressed as something that could contribute significantly to mobility for Texas.

MS. BLOOMER: And we might be able to address
that as well as part of the focus mobility versus specific items.

And then I've turned the page, Al, on Objective 2, and you've added some example performance measures that I think helps get to the regional coordination and the mobility initiative.

DR. ABESON: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: And I think I would agree, although I'm not sure that that's the place for those to be incorporated, but I guess that gets back to the infrastructure versus the resources. I don't know that I would call the regional coordination effort infrastructure, but I would definitely consider it a resource that TxDOT has spent significant time and money developing and should continue to nurture and manage that resource.

MR. SALAZAR: Michelle, this is J.R. I have a question for Eric. Under the Objective 2, Strategy 2, "Develop a process to prioritize regional and statewide connectivity improvements," that strategy there, Eric. Can you elaborate just briefly on that?

MR. GLEASON: I'm not sure I can, J.R. When I look at this objective and these strategies, I want to make sure that what gets communicated is more than just completing the state highway network. I think we need to
make sure that the kinds of connections that we provide or that you all provide with funds that we administer, that we're building toward something, some kind of a notion of a network, if you will, with connections and service levels and things like that that is included in the concept of enhancing system connectivity.

so I didn't really answer your question, J.R., but when I look at this goal and I look at the objectives and strategies, that's one of my interests is to make sure this doesn't somehow get interpreted as just completing the state highway system.

MR. KIRKLAND: And J.R., this is Kelly Kirkland, if I could add also. Again for the record, this is Kelly Kirkland, director of planning for the Public Transportation Division. A lot of that strategy wording is about the process and that addresses one of the major emphases that the commission has had recently on accountability and transparency. I think there's been a lot of discussion about how the department has selected projects in the past and this helps address an emphasis on making that process at all levels more transparent.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay, that's fair enough.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other comments on Goal 5?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Moving on to Goal 6:
"Enhanced safety for all Texas transportation system users." Any comments regarding either the goal or the four objectives?

DR. ABESON: Just again, you have it in red under Strategy 3, Objective 1. I propose to add "with emphasis on older adults and people with disabilities" only because the company is going to be facing lots more of both of these categories of people and we haven't done terribly well for those folks yet, and we've got more coming, so we need to do some special attention for these individuals, in my mind.

MS. BLOOMER: I would completely agree with you there. And I think that gets back to just the overarching picture, I think, again, back to your comment of all Texans, specific populations, as well as geographic differences. And again, that Objective 1 is very highway specific, the example performance measure: "Number of fatalities per 100,000,000 miles traveled." Strategy 3: "Assess the roadway system to enhance the safety of multimodal interfaces." I think that just gets back to reinforcing that it should be a multimodal, all population mobility goal or plan. That's just my two cents. Anybody else want to throw their two cents in?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, do you think you have
enough information or direction to take a stab at a
letter?

MR. GLEASON: Yes, with some help, obviously.
I think what we can do is we'll draft something up that we
think reflects the conversation and then we will throw it
out there to you all for comment, and we'll probably go
back and forth maybe a couple of times with that before we
send it on.

I'm kind of hearing, as well, in terms of the
way this thing might look is we might identify some
themes, if you will, that have been kind of running
throughout this whole conversation, and some of the things
I've listed down are this notion of truly multimodal,
inclusiveness, infrastructure versus resources, some
organizational things around use of more active language
versus passive language, the organizational issue of what
are the example performance measures and how many of them
are given, and then the general concept of elevating and
making much more apparent that the goal or objective of
mobility.

So I would probably suggest that what you'll
see when we get it out to you will be an attempt to
capture some themes that are generally running throughout
the more specific comments that follow, and then we'll
probably go ahead and try and I don't know whether we'll
do an annotated or a modified version of what you have here to reflect it or not, but it will be something much more specific.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And what do you anticipate the timeline being for submitting our comments?

MR. GLEASON: For me sending something over to Mary Meyland?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: I'm going to say a couple of weeks. The only reason I say that is we're tied up in a state management review next week with the FTA that will be taking a lot of people's time in sort of a predictable and unpredictable fashion, so I'm thinking that we're probably a couple of weeks out from having something I can send over to Mary.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

DR. ABESON: This is Al. Can I suggest, Eric, that perhaps you take a crack at a glossary as well? Some of the terms that you just used when we talked about mobility, for one, infrastructure for another, I think might be helpful not only now but down the road as something that could be an important appendix to the plan itself.

MR. GLEASON: Well, what I can do, Al, is I think I'll add the notion of the glossary as kind of an
overarching comment, and maybe identify a handful of terms that are good examples of why we might need one and send that along at this point rather than trying to actually take a crack at it.

DR. ABESON: Okay, that's fine.

MR. CASTELLANOS: Eric, I know that there was a comment, I don't know if it was Claudia about green.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, it was Claudia, about going green.

MR. CASTELLANOS: I would encourage that concept not to be lost among the overarching issues.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you for reminding us, J.R.

MR. GLEASON: That was Frank.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, if there's no further discussion item 3, we'll move on to item 4.

MR. KIRKLAND: Michelle, this is Kelly again.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes.

MR. KIRKLAND: Before we move on from this, I wanted to mention there's another planning effort that's getting started here in TxDOT and that's on a vision or rewrite of the Texas Transportation Plan, the 20-year, 20-plus-year planning document required in state and federal statute.

We've gone a little long with the prior one.
It was actually developed in 1994, but we have a consultant onboard and they're going to be conducting, with TxDOT, some public involvement process. There's going to be a series of two public meetings statewide. The first one is going to be the first half of May and the second is going to be the first half of August.

And in advance of each of those rounds of public hearings, there are going to be specific meetings with stakeholders and we're going to be talking with you all and with other public transportation providers and users about who should be attending those meetings. We have asked the consultant to provide us with some information about what kind of input they'd like to see from the stakeholders and we'll get that out when we start talking about who should be attending those stakeholder meetings. I just wanted to give you all a heads up on that.

DR. ABESON: When will that plan be submitted to the governor?

MR. KIRKLAND: Well, the due line that we have right now is that the final draft will be done August 31, 2010, and it will go to the commission for their review after that, with the idea of having the commission approval before the next legislative session begins in January.
DR. ABESON: And what is the relationship between that plan the Strategic Plan we just talked about?

MR. KIRKLAND: Well, I don't have all the answers to that, but part of it is the Strategic Plan is a five-year document and it talks about the overarching goals, objectives, things the department wants to do and how we want to do those things. The state Transportation Plan is going to be closer to the actual work that's being done.

Now, it's not going to be lists of projects but it could talk about priorities. It might say, you know, here's a list of priority corridors around the state, or here's a list of priority projects in a very general sense, but not in terms of like adding lanes to this road or that sort of thing.

DR. ABESON: That's helpful. I guess one further thing, it appears to me that the origination of what would be in the 20-year plan would be in the five-year plan. Does that make sense?

MR. KIRKLAND: It does. And it's built into the scope of work that the consultants have is including to look at this Strategic Plan. Even though the Strategic Plan is under development now, and I realize that it's difficult to have two planning processes going on semi-simultaneously, but there are some other reasons behind
that, of course, and part of that is getting the
information prepared in a very timely fashion.

    DR. ABESON: Thank you.
    MR. KIRKLAND: You're welcome.
    MS. BLOOMER: Thanks, Kelly and Al. I think,
    Al, your comments sort of transition us into the next item
    which is the PTAC workshop discussion, and maybe one thing
    we might want to consider requesting a little bit more
    information about is how the different planning processes
    feed into each other, how the statewide planning process
    feeds into the Strategic Plan and how that feeds into the
    metropolitan transportation plan which each MPO is
    required to do, and the regional coordination plan, and
    how all those things are sort of related and supportive of
    each other.

    So item 4, Ginnie, maybe before we get into
    some of the details, do we have a date for the PTAC
    workshop?

    MS. MAYLE: This is Ginnie. I sent out an
    email to the committee and asked if April 7 was a good
    date, and I heard from five of you, so I do have a quorum
    on the 7th, but we would like, if possible, for every
    member to attend. So since you're all on the phone, could
    you check your calendars and see if April 7 works for you?

    MS. CRAIN: Ginnie, this is Christina. I can
be there.

MS. MAYLE: You can? Okay.

MR. CASTELLANOS: This is Frank. I can be there as well. Is this the one that's going to be in the Dallas area?

MS. MAYLE: Yes.

MR. CASTELLANOS: Yes, I can be there.

MS. LANGGUTH: This is Claudia, and I can be there.

DR. ABESON: And Al can too.

MS. BLOOMER: Since it will be in Arlington, I'll be here.

MR. GLEASON: You'd better be, Michelle.

DR. ABESON: You have the key. Right?

MS. BLOOMER: Right. I have the key to the building.

(General laughter.)

MR. GLEASON: Let's see. I've got Christina, Frank, Claudia, Al, myself. J.R., Vince or Janet?

MR. HUERTA: Vince, it's a go for me; Vince is good.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MS. EVERHEART: This is Janet. I had responded yes as well.

MS. BLOOMER: Great. Let's see. Who are we
missing? Did I hear J.R. say yes? Have we lost J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: I'm sorry. I was talking with my mute on; I will be there. My apologies, I had my mute on.

MR. GLEASON: How long had that been going on, J.R.?

(General laughter.)

MR. SALAZAR: My question was do we have any idea on the new appointment. Are we still waiting on that?

MR. GLEASON: We are still awaiting the final appointment to the committee. I had an opportunity yesterday at the commission meeting to speak with Zeke Reyna, who is in Speaker Strauss's office, and asked him to see what he could do to maybe push that through before this workshop. I impressed on him the importance of it and our desire to have a full committee there because of some of the really critical issues that the committee is responsible for, and he promised to see what he could do.

MR. SALAZAR: Good.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think then if everybody is available on the 7th and we have the possibility of getting our ninth member, let's go ahead and pen for April 7. And if for some reason the newest member isn't able to join us, I do know what TTI had put together for the last one was fairly informative -- just the information.
itself -- because I wasn't able to attend it. But I went through the materials afterward, and I would be happy to sit down with the new member and sort of walk through that if any other members would like to join me as well in the event we can't get the ninth member in advance of the workshop.

But now that we have a date, a location and a general time, let's go ahead and talk about the actual content.

MS. MAYLE: Michelle, this is Ginnie. Did you confirm that we have a meeting room available to us?

MS. BLOOMER: We have a meeting room. It's not a preferred, but I will continue to check to see if something gets canceled. But we will have a meeting room.
The current meeting room I have is not within my building; it's in another building, but it's of sufficient size to accommodate all of us. I was just hoping to be over in the Center Port II building with all the resources we have over here, but we do have a location.

MS. MAYLE: Okay.

DR. ABESON: And is the ten o'clock start time going to hold? The reason I ask is we should have a full, full day, and I don't know if people are going to be driving in that morning or coming in the evening before, but if we could start earlier, I think it may be a good
MS. MAYLE: Al, this is Ginnie. That was just to allow travel time.

DR. ABESON: Yes, that's what I thought, and that's fine, if that needs to be. That's fine.

MS. BLOOMER: And Ginnie, is April 7 a Friday?

MS. MAYLE: It's a Wednesday.

MS BLOOMER: And Al, let's -- if we can try to stay flexible on the time and hold that entire day and then based on what the agenda starts to shape out will help determine whether or not we need to bump it up to 9:30 or maybe we work through lunch or try to stay a little bit later.

DR. ABESON: Okay, that sounds fine.

MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. I think people can begin making their plans as well and that will help us understand when the earliest possibility we could start the meeting that day, and I think the notion of working through lunch is clearly something we can look at.

Michelle, I'm assuming the room is such that Linda is going to have PowerPoint presentations, things like that. So is it large enough?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes, we have all those capabilities.

MR. GLEASON: Well, I'm thinking size more than
anything just so we've got room to kind of spread out a
bit and maybe flip charts for notes and stuff.

MS. MAYLE: And also, we'll need to accommodate
the public because this will have to be a public meeting.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, that's a good point.

MS. BLOOMER: When we get off this conference
call, I'll confirm I have a room -- I'm about 99.999
percent sure I did, and I'll make sure that it can
accommodate us, TxDOT staff, the public and that there's
room to sort of maneuver with flip charts and presentation
and all that. But again, I'll continue to see if we can
get a larger room, like our council room or our executive
boardroom that would definitely meet all those
requirements.

And then what I'll also do for members is I'll
go ahead and email out like the location and hotels that
are close to the Council of Governments. There are some
within walking distance so if you just want to fly in, and
once you get here you wouldn't need a rental car, so I can
do that as well after the conference call.

MS. MAYLE: That would be great. Thanks,

Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Ginnie, you had mailed out an
agenda.
MS. MAYLE: I did. I sent out a draft agenda.

MS. BLOOMER: And then I apologize to the members, and Ginnie might not have had a chance -- but this morning I put a supplemental information to the agenda that you had emailed out. I sent out sort of a summary from the December 2005 PTAC workshop, and I don't know if any of the current members were on the committee back in 2005. I know I wasn't. But I thought that might be a good starting point for discussion.

Now, to my understanding, that workshop was specific to the committee's goal of updating the funding formula, but in looking through that material and sort of the agenda that was put together by TTI, who facilitated the workshop, I thought there were large sections that were very applicable to what might be helpful to us as members now.

I didn't know if there were any other comments on sort of what you would like out of the workshop, what information you would like to come away with knowing after the workshop.

MS. CRAIN: Michelle, this is Christina. In other commissions and boards I've sat on when we've done a workshop, I found that a legal segment was kind of helpful. Maybe the general counsel could come in or someone from that office to kind of go through, especially...
for those of us who are newer, the rulemaking procedures, kind of open records training, how the advisory committee differs in open records -- not open records but open meetings, how we differ as a committee versus a commission or board, and what we can and can't do if we have to fill out disclosure forms with the state, all the legal kind of ramifications and procedural things that our committee does and kind of run us through that.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

DR. ABESON: I would like to propose adding, as well, some discussion of how the division is organized in terms of the various -- a table of organization, if you will, including the regions and the responsibilities and functions of each of the offices would be helpful to me.

MS. BLOOMER: Al, are you talking about the entire department?

DR. ABESON: No. I'm talking about the division, but also the division within the department, where it sits and how all that goes down.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So it might help to have a very general overview of TxDOT as an agency but to really drill down and provide detail on how the Public Transportation Division relates within itself --

DR. ABESON: Yes, that's exactly what I had in mind.
MS. BLOOMER: -- within itself and then within
the agency.

DR. ABESON: Right, exactly.

MR. GLEASON: Got it.

DR. ABESON: I would also propose that -- and I
did get a chance to look at what you sent earlier,
Michelle, I thought it was helpful -- just some
unstructured time that might be for an open discussion.
At the last meeting in Austin, J.R. and Vince both
surfaced issues that weren't on the agenda but were
important, and I would hope we could allow some time for
that.

MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, I think you'll have to
provide us some guidance. We need that sort of
unstructured time to discuss ideas and throw out topics
and be strategic, but you'll need to make sure that we can
still do that within, like Christina said, our legal
requirements, and the workshop. I guess we'll all be
there and it will be a quorum; it's considered an open
meeting.

MR. GLEASON: Yes, it is.

MS. BLOOMER: And so every item we want to
discuss will have to be on the agenda in some form or
fashion?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.
MS. BLOOMER: So we'll need to be very careful. I think we'll probably need two agendas: the one that is posted officially and then a more detailed one.

MR. GLEASON: Kind of an annotated one?

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. Generally when we have meetings of the Council of Governments, we have what we call an external agenda which is the one we share with everybody, and then there's the internal agenda for those of us that are sort of facilitating and running the meeting so we know the key points that we're going to talk about. And we probably need to finalize the internal one to ensure that the posted one or formal one is general enough to allow us to discuss all the items we identify in any potential offshoot from that.

MR. GLEASON: I think that's a fine suggestion. Al, because it is a formal meeting of the committee and because we need to provide the public with a reasonable enough description of what the topics to be discussed are so they can make the decision on whether to attend or not, what we have generally thought of as this, as you suggest, a sort of unstructured time, the general approach is under the topic of when I'm providing a report to the committee on what's going on from our standpoint and things like that, that that's an opportunity for the committee to have a conversation with me about things that
are of interest or importance to them.

What we can't do, then, is with one of those topics the committee can't then take that topic at that meeting and do something with it as a committee, but there's certainly room to have kind of a Q and A with me or an opportunity to identify something of interest to be discussed at a future meeting. But the committee couldn't just take something that came up during that conversation and do anything with it or get into too much of a conversation amongst themselves about it during that meeting.

DR. ABESON: I think that would meet my needs, and I do understand the limitation.

MS. BLOOMER: We have two comments for addition. Are there any other comments as far as content you'd like to see? Currently, what's been rolling around in my head is sort of an overview of the federal funding process, and then the state level, and then kind of TxDOT and then PTN, and maybe that's something we can do in the morning. And then what I'd like to sort of do, with all that information and sort of that base level of understanding among all members, is start to talk about what do we want to do as PTAC in this year and start really working on our work plan.

And I think we sort of started that with our
subcommittee work but have a little bit more discussion
about what those issues are. Do we want to continue the
subcommittees, or now that we're eight, soon to be nine,
continue to work as a group of nine, and how do we really
move forward in reaching some milestones and goals that
we've set for ourselves? And I think, J.R., you and Vince
had asked that one of those items to be added was the
medical transportation program.

    MR. SALAZAR: Right.

    MS. BLOOMER: Now, Eric, if we put on the
agenda discussion of PTAC work plans, does that allow us
the ability to talk about what those items are, like the
issue related to NTP?

    MR. GLEASON: I think it would allow us to talk
about them with the purpose of clarifying exactly what the
issue was and what the committee's interest was in it.
What we couldn't do is move beyond that and start talking
about ideas, solutions, options, things like that. I
think as long as we keep it to trying to best define the
interests of the committee and the topic, we're fine.

    DR. ABESON: Don't forget we mentioned,
Michelle, the dovetailing of these plans.

    MR. GLEASON: The Strategic Plan and the Texas
Transportation Plan?

    DR. ABESON: Yes.
MS. BLOOMER: Right. Okay.

DR. ABESON: In your proposed agenda, is there someplace there is some presentation on estimated transportation needs for the state? Am I making myself clear? I'm not sure I am.

MS. BLOOMER: Yes. And I think, Al, one of the items under possible Session 2, Public Transit in Texas, is to get to the needs, what are the needs, and how does PTN best go about determining what those needs are, because you need to know what the needs are before you can work on meeting the needs.

DR. ABESON: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: And Ginnie or Eric, has Linda Cherrington been confirmed to assist facilitating?

MR. GLEASON: Linda is confirmed to attend to do the presentations related to formula and the 2010 Census work. We've not talked to her about facilitating the meeting, if that's what you meant, Michelle.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, I misunderstood then. So she's going to the 2010 Census presentation and the formula funding history discussion?

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

DR. ABESON: And the several statutes as well.

MR. GLEASON: Well, let me talk a little bit. Michelle, when you kind of rolled in the federal funding
thing, I want to make sure I understand. In my mind, one version of that is actually in the context of explaining the Public Transportation Division and its responsibilities. We could identify those federal programs for which we are responsible for administering. Is that what you had in mind? Or were you talking more generally about all the conversation in D.C. about authorization and things like that?

MS. BLOOMER: I think the authorization in D.C. sort of starts at the federal level. I think every PTAC member needs to have a general understanding of how public transportation funding works and I think we need to start very generally at the federal level, that there is authorization called SAFETEA-LU and this is how the state gets their money, and then as we get further down to the state and to PTN, we would be adding more and more detail as we go.

MR. GLEASON: Well, I think we can look at that. I am beginning to get anxious about how full our day is becoming, but I'm willing to kind of try to take a crack at a very streamlined version of that, Michelle. Because I had really, at least in my mind, and perhaps I'm off base on this one, the two presentations from Linda, I think, are extremely critical for the committee as a whole to hear and have a chance to work through.
And I think we can work with some of the additional topics that have been suggested. If the committee is comfortable with us continuing to have a focus and an emphasis on those two morning presentations to make sure we get enough for them in, then I'm fine.

But I'm beginning to hear enough other ideas where I'm getting kind of worried that our workshop might turn into a series of 15- and 30-minute presentations, none of which will have enough time to talk about substantively, and I was really hoping to be able to spend as much time as we could on the formula and the census. So I just kind of need to hear from folks whether that's still a good assumption on our part or whether we want to change the workshop to be more topics and not as much depth.

MS. LANGGUTH: Eric, I would certainly agree with let's just focus on the critical issues.

MR. GLEASON: Well, I didn't mean to say the others aren't critical, but it just has been my assumption coming into this that the formula and the census and its potential implications on that really was this was a great opportunity to really engage the committee in that issue outside of a rulemaking process so they could really digest it in anticipation of something.

MS. BLOOMER: And Eric -- sorry, Al, go ahead.
DR. ABESON: I was just going to say that, Eric, I think from my perspective if, as you describe the work of the division, you could talk a bit about the federal statutes and drive some of that work, I think that would do it.

MR. GLEASON: That's fine. I just want to kind of check in. We can kind of do a real streamlined version of that.

DR. ABESON: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: Okay, all right.

MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, let me just add I completely agree, and I would like to have maybe the afternoon or the lunchtime to focus on the issue and the critical issues and the presentations, but I think we definitely -- and I've always envisioned it more of a less item-specific except in the afternoon, like developing the work plan.

But I think we really need to set a base level and a common level of understanding among all the members so they think if we start talking about the 2010 Census and how changing census blocks and groups and X and Y changes funding, without everybody understanding the importance of the census and how it relates to our funding from a state and a federal level, then we sort of miss a huge chunk of that discussion because we don't all have
the same level of understanding to build upon.

MR. GLEASON: I understand, Michelle, and some of that's actually in Linda's presentation, but we will take a look at it from the standpoint of an introduction and overview to how federal funds and in what programs come down to Texas and sort of start people there, and then swing into a description of the division and where it sits with the department, and kind of have a general one-on-one session that way.

And then Linda actually does, in her census presentation, begin with sort of how general changes and population and things affect federal funding for Texas in general, and then she takes it down to the more specific issues around how these changes with our current formula, what are some of the potential impacts.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And maybe some more of the detail could just be items that are included as material but aren't necessarily hit on at that detail level during the day, and hopefully we would be able to have something in advance of the workshop to sort of look through and maybe answer some of those broader questions like what is 5310, what is 5311, what's JARC, what's New Freedom, to cover some of that detail and then we don't have to take time during the workshop to explain that Job Access Reverse Commute Program is called JARC; it's Section 5316;
you can use it for capital operating/planning, 50/50, and all that kind of stuff. We can cover that up front and then if anybody has questions about the material that's been provided, they can always ask as part of that discussion.

MR. GLEASON: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: Michelle, this is J.R. I know one of the things that I believe someone mentioned at the last meeting was the Coordinated Call and so if we want to handle that that way, I'm okay with that as well.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

MR. SALAZAR: And I believe somebody had the comment about they wanted to see who all submitted proposals. I'm not sure who made that comment. Do you remember that?

MS. BLOOMER: I think that might have been Al.

DR. ABESON: I don't think so.

MR. GLEASON: Actually, Michelle, I think it was you.

MS. BLOOMER: It might have been me.

MR. GLEASON: I think it was you, Michelle.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: It might have been me. But that might be a good example of starting at a really big picture. TxDOT has all these funding programs that they
administer on behalf of the federal government; one way they administer their programs is through the coordinated call. There's also a couple of other ways that PTN has chosen to do it and then provide the detail of the Coordinated Call, maybe an example of the notice, the packet, a list of projects that have been funded in the past, where we wouldn't necessarily have to cover that in detail at the workshop but that the members would have that information.

And Eric, sort of what I'm envisioning is that what would happen is we'd have this binder of information which we would use at the workshop but then, say, my term expires the end of September -- you're going to get a brand new member, that that's something that either one member could pass on to another member or PTN could make another binder and it's sort of, You're welcome to PTAC; here's your member binder. Hopefully it answers a lot of questions you have, but if not, please let us know.

We have a lot of our Policy Committee members that come to their first meeting and we're throwing around acronyms and we're talking about very complex financing things and they're just sitting there, eyes glazed over, and if we can avoid that and sort of get people up to speed quicker, I think that will benefit PTAC's work plan.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.
DR. ABESON: Well, will this presentation include the transportation credits?

MR. GLEASON: The transportation development credits?

DR. ABESON: Yes.

MR. GLEASON: Well, we could refer to them generally but we weren't -- no, I don't have any plans at the moment to do a separate presentation on transportation development credits. But that's why we're having this conversation is to decide what topics for this workshop on April 7 the committee wants to hear about.

DR. ABESON: Well, I would defer to my colleagues on the committee as to the importance of understanding of that program and whether that should be on the agenda or not.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Eric, how would you like to do this? I have, obviously, some ideas and we've heard some ideas today. Would you like to go ahead and take a stab at putting together sort of a draft internal agenda, would you like me to do that and get member feedback, or how would you like to proceed? I know if we're doing this April 7, time's a-ticking. And I know you're busy next week so I'd be happy to take a stab at putting something together.

MR. GLEASON: Well, let me suggest this,
Michelle. I'll talk with Ginnie and what I would like to do is maybe something back and forth between you and us to come up with an initial draft and then we'll send it out to the committee for their lookover, and we'll try and turn that around pretty quickly.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, that will be good. Are there any other comments from the committee regarding the workshop?

MR. HUERTA: Michelle, this is Vince. I just want to plug in and dovetail into what you were talking about in terms of the committees that we have. I know that at least the one I was involved in, we talked a lot about the 5310. I think it was myself, Claudia, Al and I think it was Kerry who was still on PTAC at the time. We had a lot of interesting discussions and various good ideas, but we haven't met in a while, so certainly if there does need to be some action involved in that, I think it would be important to include it in this next upcoming meeting so that we can move forward on those ideas and maybe set some timelines.

MR. GLEASON: And Vince, that was one of the notions -- the afternoon on the draft agenda you have is talking about whether or not the notion of subcommittees works and what the work program ought to look like, and transportation development credits, 5310 Program, were all
pieces of work that were identified as issues that these subcommittees were going to work on, and I just think this whole concept is a relatively new idea and we may not have gotten out of the starting blocks on it as quickly or as efficiently as we wanted to. And so with some of the changeover in the committee, we wanted to revisit it and try and figure out what the best way to get work done on some key issues of importance to the committee and the department would be.

MR. HUERTA: Okay. I guess I was just suggesting to make sure we keep it in there. I know that you all are going to be going back and forth, I just wanted to plug that in. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And so, Eric, you're saying we could address the 5310 issue as part of our work plan discussion later in the afternoon.

MR. GLEASON: Well, we could talk about it as an important task to be worked on. If the committee is desirous of a more substantive conversation on the 5310 Program at the workshop, that would be a different thing.

MR. HUERTA: I think what I'm suggesting is that the committees, if we are going to move forward, whether they're different topics of whatever it may be, that we just kind of, I guess, develop those at that point in time.
MR. GLEASON: I see it as an opportunity maybe to check in on those topics that a year ago, or maybe a little more than a year ago, were identified as important to the committee to work on. This workshop would give us a chance in the afternoon to revisit those topics, to reconsider them, maybe clarify what we meant by them or what the committee was interested in, and really focusing on let's pick one or two of these things to really focus on moving forward in the near term. That would be one possible outcome for that item on the agenda.

MS. BLOOMER: Vince, does that get to your question?

MR. HUERTA: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other discussion on the PTAC workshop? If you think of anything later, feel free to call me or shoot me an email. If not, we'll move on to item 5, Division Director's Report.

MR. GLEASON: We didn't send you anything out for this. I just wanted to take the opportunity with everyone on the phone to kind of recap what's been going on here recently.

At our last meeting we talked a little bit about the possibility for a second stimulus package coming from D.C. None of the discussion you've been reading about in the paper about a jobs bill and things like
that -- none of that has any additional stimulus money in it, and so even though the general thought is that the Senate will pick something up in the near future more specifically related to stimulus funding, that's not the focus of the discussion right now.

We have gone ahead on the rural side of the program and have gotten out to our rural program providers a request for projects just so that in the event that something does pop out of D.C. that we'll be prepared to move ahead fairly quickly with that. But not a lot of new information on that right now.

We talked a little bit about the leadership development program that we are working in partnership with Texas Transit Association. TTI, Texas Transportation Institute, is helping as well, and actually working through TTI through an interagency contract, we're moving ahead to engage the Eno Foundation out of Washington, D.C., to design and conduct a leadership seminar this fall. So we're making a lot of progress there.

I know that the Transit Association is discussing how to move a mentoring program forward, and then we also recently met with Betty Gilmore from the University of Texas Center for Public Policy Dispute Resolution about some customized training for transit leaders on conflict resolution, collaboration and building
consensus, and that was a very positive meeting that we had with her on that. So that's where we are on leadership efforts.

Yesterday was a busy day for us in front of the commission, we had five minute orders that passed. I'll mention two of them as especially significant. The Federal Transit Administration did finally release apportionments for the partial annual authorization that Congress has given on the Fiscal Year 2010 budget.

We got about five months' worth of annual funding for our 5310 and 5311 programs, along with other federal programs, but yesterday at the commission we were awarded on the 5310 Program side for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities -- we did award essentially five-twelfths of a year's worth of funding, and then on the 5311 we did push just over $12 million through the formula, given what we've received from an apportionment standpoint.

And also significantly in this case, because the department has a very reasonable expectation of getting additional apportionments for our federal programs, that the commission did, in fact, on the 5311 side approve an eventual allocation of the $20.1 million that's called for in the Administrative Code. So what that means, in a nutshell, is that when the additional
apportionments come down on the rural program side, that
we do not need to go back to the commission to further
allocate those funds under the formula to the sub-
recipients; we can just amend their grant agreements to
reflect the additional amount.

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: So the minute order was currently
to award now the five-twelfths, and then once we have the
remaining seven-twelfths, you don't have to go back to the
commission up to the $21 million.

MR. GLEASON: Up to the $20.1 million, that's
correct.

MS. BLOOMER: And then so does that mean once
you have the final apportionment, you will have to go back
to the commission to award the total amount based on the
letter you had sent out to the rural providers?

MR. GLEASON: Any amount over $20.1 million
will take additional commission action, yes. And I would
propose as soon as we get all of that and have the ability
to do that, we will go to the commission and do that, as
the letter said.

MR. SALAZAR: Eric, this is J.R. I just have
one question. You still have not received any comments on
that letter or any conversation whatsoever?
MR. GLEASON: That's correct. Honestly, actually, I did have a conversation with Jeff Heckler at the Transit Association, the acting director at the moment, or the interim director, and he had received one comment from one of the association members with some questions about that and what the department's intent was to do with the balance of the program funding, and so I provided Jeff with a copy of that November 17 letter and he was going to speak with that individual about that.

MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle. So the question was really not regarding the bulk of the money above the cap, but the remaining, like the 3 percent that remained, commission discretionary. Do I understand that correctly?

MR. GLEASON: The question we got was framed from the standpoint, I think, whether the department had, I think, gotten all the money that it might expect to get in an annual appropriation and that the department was not moving out on allocating those funds as quickly as it might. I think there was some general misunderstanding of how much money the department had actually received to distribute and what our intentions were in terms of how to proceed. So I'm hoping that that person has got everything now that they need and that they understand.
what the approach will be.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

MR. GLEASON: There were three other minute orders. Two of them awarded some transportation development credits, one of them to the Greater Southeast Management District in Houston to do some livability type improvements in that area of Houston -- pedestrian connection improvements, transit center, things to improve access to public transportation.

And then finally, we moved the lead responsibility for our Job Access Reverse Commute Program award from the Golden Crescent Workforce Solutions group to Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission, the provider there, to go ahead and implement that grant. Workforce had informed us that they would no longer be able to lead that effort and so we transferred it over to Golden Crescent.

So that's what happened yesterday. The commission also approved proposed rules for grant sanctions which is something that the committee commented on a while ago, I think, and we sent you information on that. So we're into rulemaking on the grant sanctions thing.

March, the internal compliance and ethics rules
are final at that point, final on those. I'm kind of looking at Bobby -- those of you who can't see this -- looking at Bobby Killebrew here to make sure I get that straight. I have a hard time keeping track of those things.

And then we're pretty quiet the next couple of months on the funding side. We're still evaluating our Coordinated Call proposals. It's not clear when we'll get the balance of the federal apportionment, so we're kind of entering a time frame on that in the next couple of months that we're a little uncertain about. That's it for my report.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. This is Michelle. Eric, at our last meeting we talked about a member volunteering to serve on the 2009 Friend of Texas Transit Award selection committee. Did you get a volunteer?

MS. MAYLE: This is Ginnie. No, we did not.

MS. BLOOMER: Would somebody like to volunteer or be volunteered?

MR. GLEASON: For those of you who might have missed that discussion, each year the department awards a Friend of Texas Transit Award to an individual who has made a significant contribution to public transportation in Texas, and we are in the nomination process right now. We're soliciting nominations, and those are due back to
us when, Ginnie?

    MS. MAYLE: March 19.

    MR. GLEASON: March 19, and we have
traditionally formed a small committee of folks to review
those nominations and make a recommendation to me, and we
would like a member from PTAC to help us with that. There
are a number of former recipients of this award on this
committee: J.R. and Janet have both received this award
in the past.

    MR. SALAZAR: And Michelle, you did it last
year?

    MS. BLOOMER: I did it last year; I'd be happy
to do it this year if nobody wants to take up that
opportunity. It's about an hour, at the most, I think.

    MR. GLEASON: Yes. We would scan in and
forward to you the nominations and an evaluation form. It
wouldn't require any travel; you could do it at your
office.

    MS. BLOOMER: Going once, going twice.

    MR. SALAZAR: Michelle, I think you'd be good
at it.

    MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I guess I volunteered
myself, I walked right into that.

    MR. GLEASON: J.R., that's a dangerous
precedent, buddy. If you're going to start volunteering
others. Uh-oh, here we go.

MS. BLOOMER: You'd better be at every future PTAC meeting.

MR. GLEASON: Exactly.

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: Any public comment? No?

confirm date of the next meeting. I think, Ginnie, we agreed April 7.

MS. MAYLE: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: With probably a no-later-than-ten o'clock start time, potentially maybe a 9:00 or 9:30, depending on travel and agenda.

MS. MAYLE: Sounds right.

MS. BLOOMER: Any other items to cover, Ginnie, Eric, or the committee, before I call for adjournment?

MR. GLEASON: I think we're good.

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I don't think we have to vote, so we'll just go ahead and adjourn. Thank you all for participating and sticking with us.

(Whereupon, at 11:44 a.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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