

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
TELECONFERENCE

Lone Star Room  
4000 Jackson Avenue  
Austin, Texas

Thursday, June 30, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT BY TELEPHONE:

Michelle Bloomer, Chair  
J.R. Salazar, Vice Chair  
Al Abeson  
Christina Crain  
Glenn Gadbois  
Brad Underwood

STAFF:

Eric Gleason, PTN Director  
Bobby Killebrew, PTN Deputy Director  
Kelly Kirkland, PTN  
Ginnie Mayle, PTN

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call to Order	3
2. Approval of Minutes from April 13, 2011 meeting (Action)	3
3. Division Director's Report to the Committee regarding public transportation matters, including an update on items the department has been involved with and a recap of Texas Transportation Commission action regarding public transportation projects	3
4. Discussion and concurrence with the department's decision to consult with transit industry personnel to receive input related to the allocation of additional state funds due to Census impacts (Action)	16
5. Review and discussion of draft PTAC Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles	46
6. Nomination of a member of PTAC to serve on a department advisory committee, as authorized by the commission in accordance with 43 TAC '1.85, regarding transportation development credits (Action)	34
7. Public comment	64
8. Confirm date of next meeting	64
9. Adjourn (Action)	65

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MS. BLOOMER: We'll go ahead and call the  
3 meeting to order. The first item on the agenda is  
4 approval of the minutes from April 13, 2011. Are there  
5 any questions regarding the minutes? Hearing none, do I  
6 have a motion for approval?

7 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I move to approve.

8 MS. CRAIN: Christina seconds.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Since we're all on the phone this  
10 gets kind of awkward. I'll just go through the list of  
11 names to avoid people talking over each other.

12 (A roll call vote was taken - all ayes.)

13 MS. BLOOMER: The minutes are approved.

14 Moving on to item 3, Division Director's  
15 Report, Eric, we'll turn it over to you.

16 MR. GLEASON: All right. I think we sent this  
17 out to you this morning. I don't know if everyone had a  
18 chance to look at it, but we had a good morning this  
19 morning in front of the commission.

20 We had seven action items. Six of them were  
21 awarding various kinds of grant funding totaling \$63  
22 million, a combination of state and federal program grant  
23 funds. We awarded almost 3 million transportation  
24 development credits along with those to help with some  
25 capital program purchases and allow folks to continue to

1 use their local resources for operating match.

2 We also had a minute order this morning that  
3 continued to make some adjustments within the Recovery Act  
4 program. As folks finish up projects, they have residual  
5 balances and either they are allowing us to reallocate  
6 them to another sub-recipient or they are moving it to  
7 another purpose within their own program, and so every  
8 time that happens we go back to the commission and adjust  
9 those awards accordingly.

10 I will say that we've expended about 82 percent  
11 of our federal program funds from the Recovery Act  
12 program, and that compares to about 60 percent nationwide,  
13 so we're doing pretty well that way. And a lot of folks  
14 are closing out their parts of that overall effort, so I'm  
15 glad to see that.

16 So it was a good day for us at the commission.

17 In July we have three minute orders on tap for  
18 that. We're going to be awarding some funds to continue  
19 the regional coordination planning in areas of the state.  
20 We've got development credit award going to the Alamo Area  
21 Council of Governments and to the Community Action Council  
22 of South Texas, and then we have some Rural Transportation  
23 Assistance Program funds, RTAP funds, going up to TAPS up  
24 in North Texas and to Kaufman Area Rural Transportation.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Eric, can I just jump in and ask

1 one slight detail question?

2 MR. GLEASON: Sure.

3 MR. GADBOIS: How much money are you asking for  
4 for regional coordination planning?

5 MR. GLEASON: I'm looking at Kelly Kirkland who  
6 is here with us now. How much are we planning to award?

7 MR. KIRKLAND: Right now, and it's still very  
8 much in the draft stage, it's just under one million.

9 MR. GLEASON: Now, this is not for all 24  
10 regions, Glenn, it's only a portion of the total number of  
11 regions.

12 MR. KIRKLAND: Right. Many of the regions have  
13 balances remaining in this year and they're going to be  
14 allowed to carry those forward, we're going to extend  
15 those grant agreements.

16 MR. GADBOIS: Okay.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Eric, what's the average amount  
18 per agency?

19 MR. KIRKLAND: Michelle, I do not have that  
20 information. I'm sorry.

21 MR. GLEASON: We can get that out to you as  
22 soon as we look at it ourselves, no problem.

23 MR. GADBOIS: Super. Thanks.

24 MR. GLEASON: No problem. Keeping in mind it's  
25 just a recommendation at this point as well, it has to go

1 to the commission for approval.

2 The only other thing I'll mention is at the  
3 bottom of the report, the Texas Transit Leadership  
4 Seminar, this is our second seminar. We have a call for  
5 applications out right now. Again, we're trying to find  
6 and trying to have 25 individuals in leadership positions  
7 right now or aspiring to that kind of role within their  
8 agency to join us for a pretty good intensive seminar with  
9 four days now in October -- four days or three days in  
10 October, Ginnie?

11 MS. MAYLE: Three full days.

12 MR. GLEASON: Three full days in October and  
13 then two full days in January, with some in between  
14 session coaching and some self-assessment to go along with  
15 it.

16 J.R., who is on the phone with us, has  
17 participated in that, and we're hoping for another  
18 successful effort this year.

19 That's what I had on the director's report.  
20 Any questions?

21 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I was just curious  
22 on how many applications we got. Did we get more than the  
23 25 that you wanted?

24 MR. GLEASON: No, we have not, J.R. I'm  
25 beginning to shake the bushes on that one. Right now we

1 have 13. So we got excellent evaluations of last year's  
2 session. Honestly I was hoping to have more applications  
3 by now and we're all going to have to shake the bushes out  
4 there to get some folks to take advantage of the  
5 opportunity.

6 I think one of the things I'm finding is that  
7 while I really would like to see people in the general  
8 manager/transit director positions right now take the  
9 course, many of those individuals assume it's for someone  
10 else in their organization and aren't applying for that  
11 reason, so we've got to work on that.

12 MR. SALAZAR: Okay.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle. Is it  
14 possible to share who the folks are that have participated  
15 in the past and then who you have of the 13 of the 25 so  
16 we can help you maybe shake some people, at least in our  
17 region?

18 MS. BLOOMER: On the first point, you can go to  
19 our website and you'll find a listing of participants for  
20 the first seminar. In terms of helping shake the bushes,  
21 I'd be glad to talk with you about that, Michelle, with  
22 respect to some folks up in your region perhaps, and  
23 others on the committee, but it's still coming together,  
24 we get an application every other day at this point, and  
25 I've got probably six to eight folks that I've spoken with

1 personally that I've not heard back from them whether  
2 they're going to apply or not.

3 So we're making progress. I was just hoping,  
4 given the performance of last year's session, that we'd be  
5 further along.

6 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

7 MR. SALAZAR: Eric, this is J.R. Just a couple  
8 of comments. From people that I've talked to, a lot of  
9 the comments were I didn't think that I could send  
10 somebody since I was part of the initial class, and I told  
11 them no, I don't think that's necessarily the case, I  
12 think they're going to give preference to those that  
13 didn't participate or those agencies that didn't  
14 participate, but I don't think that excludes you from  
15 nominating somebody within your organization. So  
16 hopefully that will help too.

17 MR. GLEASON: Well, that's good to know. We  
18 can send something out to that effect. Thanks, J.R.

19 And J.R., I know you're with a lot of your  
20 peers today, if you could use your spare time in that  
21 session to maybe rattle some bushes, that would be great  
22 as well.

23 MR. SALAZAR: I will.

24 MR. GLEASON: Thank you.

25 MR. GADBOIS: Michelle, this is Glenn. Before

1 we move on, it's kind of a related item but not exactly.  
2 I'm feeling a little unplugged from the transit community  
3 and providers these days. My understanding is there's a  
4 meeting of the transit providers coming up in July, and so  
5 first, do we have a calendar of those meetings? And  
6 second, if we're not doing business as an advisory group,  
7 isn't it okay if we show up at those, not necessarily to  
8 spend the whole day or to track the whole thing, but to  
9 take the opportunity to meet, greet and talk to the  
10 transit providers about what they're doing and how things  
11 are going?

12 MR. GLEASON: Glenn, thanks for bringing that  
13 up. It wasn't written in our director's report but I had  
14 made a mental note to myself to bring that up. We are  
15 having on July 13 down at our Riverside complex in  
16 Building 200, we're having one of our twice yearly  
17 meetings with rural program and small urban program  
18 providers. Any and all members of the committee are more  
19 than welcome to attend that session, stay for as long as  
20 you like. Obviously you can't all sit together at a table  
21 and conduct committee business, but I don't think we need  
22 to worry about that.

23 Michelle, in the past, has provided a brief  
24 update for the group on what's happening in PTAC; I think  
25 J.R. is going to do that this time. But by all means,

1 more than welcome to join us for that, and I apologize for  
2 not bringing that up.

3 MR. ABESON: Is it a single day meeting?

4 MR. GLEASON: It is a single day meeting, it  
5 will start at 8:30, I believe, and it usually concludes  
6 around three o'clock as people tend to head off to get  
7 back home that day.

8 MR. GADBOIS: And Eric, so that we could see a  
9 good time to show up over there that might allow for some  
10 socializing and visiting, or hearing conversation and  
11 problem-solving, can you send us an agenda?

12 MR. GLEASON: Yes, no problem.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Thank you.

14 MS. MAYLE: And Glenn, this is Ginnie. We have  
15 a training and events calendar on our website and it  
16 shows all the upcoming events and the meetings are listed  
17 on there a couple of months out. Once we know the date, we  
18 put it on there.

19 MR. GADBOIS: Super.

20 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. Just to  
21 also note for the other members that the TxDOT semiannual  
22 meetings, there's always one in January and July, so if  
23 you can't attend the July one, you'll have another  
24 opportunity in January.

25 And then before we close out the director's

1 report, I don't really have a question, I just wanted to  
2 flag for some of the other members to maybe keep in mind  
3 when we get down to discussion on the work plan, but  
4 you'll notice, Eric, you mentioned there were seven items  
5 taken to the commission earlier today?

6 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Five to award funding, four of  
8 them to award federal funding for fiscal year 2011, and  
9 the federal fiscal year begins in October. We are in the  
10 last day of June which means we are nine months into the  
11 fiscal year of 2011. And so I know there's nothing you  
12 guys can do, but I think that's a very important item to  
13 keep in mind when we start talking about what our goals  
14 are and how we can help the transit providers in the State  
15 of Texas as far as sustainability goes. Getting your  
16 money nine months into a fiscal year makes it very  
17 difficult to provide service in a continuous and  
18 sustainable manner. So I have a lot of marks on my paper  
19 of what all the federal in the fiscal year 2011, thinking  
20 I'm glad I haven't had to wait nine months to get paid  
21 here at COG. That would make my life extremely difficult.

22 If there are no more questions on the  
23 director's report, we can move on to item number 4 which  
24 is: Discussion and concurrence with the department's  
25 decision to consult with transit industry personnel to

1 receive input related to the allocation of additional  
2 state funds due to census impacts.

3 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, actually before we  
4 leave the director's report, because that's the most  
5 flexible place to raise issues, can I raise one other  
6 item?

7 MS. BLOOMER: Sure. Glenn, right?

8 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn.

9 The commission action that you just pointed  
10 out, Michelle, also raises in my mind a suggestion that  
11 I'd like to put on the table, and that is that I think,  
12 Michelle, you and maybe one other member of the advisory  
13 group -- I'm not recommending myself, but J.R. or Al or  
14 whoever is available -- ought to ask either commission or  
15 commission assistants to sit down and meet with you and  
16 talk about how we as an advisory group can help them. As  
17 far as I understand, that level of conversation with the  
18 commission hasn't happened in a while, if ever, and given  
19 our statutory assignment to advise them, I would recommend  
20 you make some time to have that conversation.

21 MS. BLOOMER: Are there any comments or  
22 discussion?

23 MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. I think that's  
24 a good idea, and as I've said to you, Michelle, before,  
25 and we worked on some of the issues with the chairman, et

1 cetera, I'd be happy to assist with that if you think  
2 that's a good idea, Eric, if you think that's good. Just  
3 my two cents.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

5 MR. ABESON: This is Al. Is there any history  
6 of events related to Glenn's proposal?

7 MS. BLOOMER: Not to my knowledge. Eric?

8 MR. GLEASON: Well, I think not in any sort of  
9 a sustained formal fashion such as Glenn suggests, that  
10 I'm aware of. Members of the committee have spoken with  
11 members of the commission staff or the commissioners  
12 themselves from time to time, but I think the notion of  
13 sitting down where their aides and asking them how the  
14 committee can be helpful would be a useful thing for the  
15 committee to do.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think that would be a  
17 good idea to proceed with the commissioners and/or their  
18 aides. I also think it would be a good idea if maybe we  
19 did the same thing with the Texas Transit Association,  
20 sort of, Glenn, back to your point of how do we tap into  
21 the transit industry a little bit better.

22 MR. GADBOIS: That's a good idea.

23 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So we can work on that.  
24 And Eric, maybe you and I could work on how we go about  
25 doing that, is it the members calling the commissioners

1 directly or their aides, or do we work through PTN to do  
2 that.

3 I think another question I had -- sorry I'm  
4 just throwing these out there -- since I was appointed by  
5 the governor, is there any sort of feedback loop I should  
6 be doing to the governor, or other members to their  
7 elected official that appointed them.

8 MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. Michelle, I  
9 would just tell you what I do with the lieutenant  
10 governor's office. From the day I was appointed I just  
11 asked who they preferred that I report, and so I've got a  
12 specific person there that I just basically send them the  
13 agenda, tell them what's happened at the meetings, just to  
14 keep them abreast of what's going on. And so I would  
15 assume, and having worked with the governor's office  
16 before, I would assume that they would basically want the  
17 same kind of thing. So I'm sure if you called over there  
18 they could tell you this is the person to get the  
19 information to.

20 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, the same with the  
21 speaker's office, they have a transportation staff person  
22 in the speaker's office, I sat down and talked with them,  
23 we figured out how they wanted to be dealt with, and it's  
24 as much as Christina described she does with the  
25 lieutenant governor's office.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. That' good to know because  
2 I don't know that we have something similar with the  
3 governor's office.

4 MR. GADBOIS: Well, they will have  
5 transportation policy staff.

6 MS. CRAIN: Yes, they'll have somebody.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And then, Michelle, back to the  
8 commissioners, I just want to suggest, as I think  
9 Christina did, it sounds like both Christina and I still  
10 have pretty good relations with commission and commission  
11 staff. Generally speaking, not on this advisory committee  
12 but on other things, it's simply a matter of calling over  
13 and asking them, and generally they can corral a couple or  
14 three or four aides to be in the same meeting, and so it  
15 would be one sort of sit-down meeting to talk with all of  
16 them at the same time. I don't think you'll get  
17 commissioners to do that, but certainly their assistants  
18 you can.

19 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, I'd be more than  
20 willing to help set something up for you and any other  
21 members of the committee. I obviously would think you all  
22 would happen at one time, and we can work with commission  
23 aides. Clearly, the commissioners aren't going to get  
24 together in groups because they can't, but the aides  
25 certainly.

1 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is Brad Underwood. I just  
2 wanted to let you know I am now joining the meeting. I  
3 apologize for my tardiness; I had a meeting that ran late.

4 MS. BLOOMER: That's okay. We're glad to have  
5 you onboard. And Brad, I think just for your benefit  
6 we're finishing up item 3 on the agenda.

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: Perfect. Thank you.

8 MS. BLOOMER: So we'll go ahead, based on the  
9 recommendations of the committee, and proceed with setting  
10 up some time to sit down with the commissioners or their  
11 assistants, the Texas Transit Institute, and then I'll  
12 start on my end doing some feedback with the governor who  
13 appointed me. I think that's very helpful for me.

14 Anything else for discussion under item 3,  
15 Division Director's Report? And maybe one thing, usually  
16 we have this item on the end of the agenda, this time I  
17 asked Eric to move it up to the top because I thought it  
18 would be helpful prior to our discussion on this strategic  
19 plan guiding principles item further on, but let me know  
20 if you agree or disagree, either on the phone or shoot me  
21 an email, but it probably would help get some of the  
22 administrative stuff out of the way first.

23 If there are no other questions, we'll move on  
24 to item 4, and I'm not going to repeat that title but I'll  
25 just turn it over to you, Eric.

1 MR. GLEASON: Thank you. I will say sometimes  
2 these agenda titles are lengthy like this because this is  
3 the language that our general counsel approves.

4 What item 4 is all about is, as we've talked  
5 about in the past and now that the legislative session is  
6 over, there are additional funds included in the  
7 department's budget for public transportation grants,  
8 there are additional funds to help us deal with the  
9 projected impacts of the 2010 census.

10 If you'll recall, the department sponsored some  
11 research that the Texas Transportation Institute and UT  
12 San Antonio and the state demographer's office  
13 collaborated on to try and anticipate the impacts of the  
14 2010 census, and having done that, we calculated an  
15 estimate of funds needed to essentially hold current  
16 recipients of state grant funding, if you will, harmless  
17 from the impacts of the census.

18 And the kinds of impacts we're anticipating on  
19 the rural program side, while the whole state is growing  
20 in population pretty much everywhere, there are areas of  
21 the state that are growing more quickly than others, and  
22 because of that, they'll end up getting a larger share of  
23 the available funding based on their proportional share of  
24 the state's population. And so there will be some  
25 movement within the rural program among the rural agency

1 providers based on the relative rate of population growth  
2 in each of their service areas. And so some of the  
3 funding we identified is to basically hold folks harmless  
4 from the negative impact of that adjustment.

5 On the urban side, the impact is much greater  
6 where we expect as many as five new urbanized areas to be  
7 identified by the census, and one existing one to move  
8 from small urban up to a larger urban category, so a net  
9 increase of four urban area providers, and without any  
10 additional state funding available for those folks,  
11 obviously four more people at the table would mean that  
12 everyone else would have to give up a little bit of what  
13 they've got. And so we tried to forecast how much that  
14 would be, and those funds are in our budget.

15 We have to do some rulemaking, we have to take  
16 a look at the Administrative Code as it's currently  
17 written in order for us to actually target those  
18 additional funds to those systems that need it. And so we  
19 are going to be embarking on a rulemaking effort which the  
20 committee will be advising the commission on, and as a  
21 part of that, what I wanted to do was to bring together a  
22 group of small urban and rural program providers, possibly  
23 three from each area, and work with them as a group to get  
24 their input on whatever proposed modifications to the  
25 Administrative Code the department would bring to PTAC for

1 your review.

2           And if you recall, the rulemaking process, the  
3 first step is to come up with a set of proposed rules that  
4 then goes to the commission for their approval as proposed  
5 rules. There is then a public comment period, and then  
6 the rules come back for final approval, and PTAC is  
7 engaged in both of those processes.

8           And so what I'm looking for is some concurrence  
9 from a process standpoint on the part of the committee to  
10 have the department go off and form this sounding board,  
11 if you will, of both rural and small urban program  
12 provides to help us put together an initial proposal, if  
13 you will, of how to modify the Administrative Code that  
14 then PTAC could look at, knowing that it represented  
15 hopefully a pretty good consensus among the provider  
16 community, that the committee could then look at and say  
17 this is what we think of it, we like this, we don't like  
18 that, but based their recommendation based on that.

19           So I'm just looking for some concurrence from  
20 the committee on this. I think that strengthens the  
21 overall process to have you onboard with that idea so that  
22 when I come to you with it there's that structure within  
23 which it's coming to you.

24           MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Eric, I've got  
25 some questions before I could even respond to your

1 question.

2           The first is do we have a fairly clear  
3 understanding of the systems to hold harmless, since hold  
4 harmless is a complicated factor. Because some systems  
5 were moving down a little bit with caps and some were  
6 moving up a little bit with caps, do we have some sort of  
7 assessment of what hold harmless actually means in context  
8 of the overall trends in funding movement?

9           MR. GLEASON: Yes, and what we did, Glenn, with  
10 that, when you get into the details of the allocation  
11 formula there is a mechanism in the formula that does  
12 limit the amount any system's amount from one year to the  
13 next can go down, and that is they can't do down any more  
14 than 10 percent.

15           MR. GADBOIS: Or up.

16           MR. GLEASON: No. There isn't one on the  
17 upside, it's just on the downside.

18           And so in the scheme of things that can  
19 complicate the kind of assessment we're trying to make.  
20 What we did, if I understand this correctly -- and Kelly  
21 is right here -- is we took the information that we got  
22 from the research, they created a 2010 data file of  
23 population for us by county, and we basically, looking at  
24 just the needs side of the formula, identified the impact  
25 of the change in population.

1           And given that it's just an estimate, it was  
2 the best information that we had at the time, but that  
3 allowed us to kind of get our arms around how big the  
4 issue might be.

5           MR. GADBOIS: And so we could see that to get  
6 our minds around how big you think the issue is.

7           And then the next question is what are the  
8 items that you think are needing or subject to  
9 Administrative Code change?

10          MR. GLEASON: The way the Administrative Code  
11 is currently structured, one of the elements very early up  
12 front says that the state funding gets split 65 percent  
13 going to the rural program, 35 percent going to the state  
14 urban program. That split is basically the reverse of  
15 what we need from an impact standpoint. So we have to  
16 kind of work our way through a modification that literally  
17 allows us to separate out this extra money we have for  
18 census impacts, we have to separate it out from the  
19 formula and write Administrative Code language that allows  
20 us, in my view, to work with the industry and put it where  
21 it needs to go.

22          That's far easier for me to say than to write  
23 code around that, but that's the general effect of what  
24 we're trying to do.

25          MR. GADBOIS: Believe me, I understand.

1                   And then one question, when you call a focus  
2 group of urban and rural providers to give the department  
3 advice for the development of rules that we ultimately  
4 will have to comment on, can somebody from the advisory  
5 group, the PTAC be in that meeting?

6                   MR. GLEASON: Absolutely. I don't have any  
7 issue with that at all. You could also decide as a  
8 committee that one of the members of the group should be a  
9 committee member.

10                   My whole intention of this is to allow us to  
11 bring to you a product that represents some level of  
12 consensus within the industry about how to tackle this  
13 issue. While at the same time allowing you as a committee  
14 to be a bit at arm's length as well to make the judgments  
15 that you need to make.

16                   MR. GADBOIS: Right. And it would be helpful  
17 for us in advance to know what the hard issues are and  
18 start wrapping ourselves around strategic implications of  
19 those rather than having to do that all in one fell swoop  
20 as we're engaged in the administrative rule change  
21 process.

22                   MR. GLEASON: Okay. That's a good comment.

23                   MR. ABESON: This is Al. I have a question as  
24 well. Eric, how do you propose to initiate the process  
25 with the group that will be coming together? Is it one

1 where the floor is totally open to ideas or will the  
2 department be presenting several proposals based on some  
3 principles? What the content process going to be like?

4 MR. GLEASON: Well, Al, my view of this is it's  
5 a pretty practical exercise, if you will. I think we have  
6 a very focused objective, we have about \$3.2 million in  
7 our grant funding budget for the next biennium to help us  
8 address the impacts of the census. And by practical and  
9 focused, what our approach will be this is the current  
10 Administrative Code and we need to look at that  
11 Administrative Code and look at revisions to it in a way  
12 that allows us to target these funds to where they need to  
13 go, keeping in mind that when we do this effort we won't  
14 know the exact outcome of the census. If we wait for the  
15 exact outcome, we won't have time to make the adjustment  
16 in the rules we need to make before it's time to award the  
17 next set of state funding.

18 The census has to make its final determinations  
19 of urbanized areas no later than April of 2012, and we  
20 typically award state funds for the next fiscal year in  
21 June of every year, just like we did today, we awarded  
22 fiscal year 2012 state funding. So in June of next year  
23 we'll be in a position to award fiscal year 2013 state  
24 funding, and in April we will have gotten from the census  
25 their final determination of urbanized areas. So we're

1 going to have to, in a very practical matter, I think,  
2 come up with some language in the Administrative Code that  
3 will allow us once we know the actual results of those  
4 determinations to, in a transparent and objective way,  
5 figure out how much money needs to go where.

6           So I don't view this as an exercise where we're  
7 really sitting back and thinking really big picture about  
8 something and what's the best thing to do. I think we  
9 have a very targeted focus for the effort. I know that  
10 the rural and small urban providers are very much in tune  
11 with this issue, we've been talking to them about it for  
12 about 18 months now, and I think it's actually going to  
13 end up being a pretty focused effort. And I think the  
14 hardest part about this whole thing is going to be writing  
15 the administrative rule language. I don't think reaching  
16 a conclusion with everyone about what's the right thing to  
17 do is going to be that hard.

18           MR. ABESON: That's good. So the only  
19 principle that would govern the conversation would be the  
20 language that says hold harmless. Is that correct? In  
21 other words, are there other principles that could be used  
22 to guide that discussion that could, in fact, contribute  
23 to big picture outcomes later on?

24           MR. GLEASON: Al, let me just take that under  
25 advisement. I think that's a good question, and maybe

1 after we've talked about the principles today, it may be  
2 more clear at the end of that whether or not there are some  
3 other things to consider. But let me just take that under  
4 advisement as a good comment to think about.

5 MR. ABESON: Okay, absolutely.

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: Eric, this is Brad Underwood.  
7 I have a quick question. Maybe I'm jumping too far ahead  
8 here, but I assume under this hold harmless deal that  
9 you're talking about we'll be looking, kind of addressing  
10 the needs of Galveston. Is that correct, or is that too  
11 far ahead?

12 MR. GLEASON: You know, Galveston is going to  
13 be an issue, could be an issue. And the thing with  
14 Galveston, for the rest of the committee, is Galveston is  
15 currently classified as an urbanized area under the 2000  
16 census, and I think most everyone believes that the 2010  
17 census count will not find enough people in Galveston for  
18 it to continue to be an urbanized area, and if that's the  
19 case, then it would come into the rural program. And we  
20 did run some scenarios as a part of our process that allow  
21 us to understand the potential impact of that. So yes,  
22 this effort will need to address that.

23 MR. UNDERWOOD: As far as from a rural provider  
24 and other rural providers, I know that we're concerned  
25 about Galveston being part of the rural program. I mean,

1 it would make a huge significant in our funding levels, I  
2 guess.

3 MR. GLEASON: And I think what the Census  
4 Bureau would say that they just count people, and I guess  
5 my expectation has always been somewhere along the way  
6 that something will happen perhaps at the federal level  
7 with respect to Galveston where they will retain their  
8 urbanized area status. I mean, I don't have any basis for  
9 that other than I just think that that's something that  
10 could possibly happen.

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. BLOOMER: Are there any other questions for  
13 Eric, or comments?

14 MR. ABESON: I'd just like to offer a  
15 commendation on the idea of bringing together the folks  
16 who are actually going to have to work with the money  
17 that's available. I think it's a great way to go.

18 MR. GLEASON: Appreciate it.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And Al, I agree with you. I like  
20 the process for the most part, Eric. I would like to pool  
21 my fellow PTAC members to see if somebody wants to be  
22 engaged in that conversation so that we can have heads-up  
23 in advance of rulemaking on what their finding some of the  
24 issues are coming out of that focus group.

25 Also, Eric, we should come back to the question

1 Al raises towards the end of this, because I actually  
2 think that that's a strong question, is hold harmless the  
3 only principle we need guiding that process.

4 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. Glenn, I  
5 think to your question, are you recommending that one of  
6 the existing small urban or rural members also be a PTAC  
7 member, or are you suggesting that there be an additional  
8 person solely to represent PTAC?

9 MR. GADBOIS: I'm hoping that somebody from  
10 PTAC will say I'm interested enough in this topic to where  
11 I'll attend that or those focus group discussions and  
12 relay back to the rest of us at our next meeting or  
13 whenever kind of what the issues/concerns were, that  
14 everybody is comfortable with the decision.

15 You know, if in fact Eric is right and  
16 everybody is comfortable with the decision and there  
17 aren't any hard spots except how you write the rule, then  
18 that helps greatly. Right? If there are concerns or  
19 discussion that we ought to know about along the way, it  
20 would be helpful to have those in advance of the more  
21 formal rulemaking process.

22 MS. BLOOMER: Right, and I agree with you. I  
23 guess what I'm asking is we currently have a rural transit  
24 provider on PTAC and a small urban on PTAC. If one of  
25 those individuals were to serve on the committee

1 representing one of the three slots for small urban and  
2 rural.

3 MR. GADBOIS: That would work for me.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Then I guess, Eric, that  
5 really gets back to you for selecting the three small  
6 urban and the three rural. Again, I also think it's a  
7 very good idea of going out to the industry and asking  
8 them how they would like to make that hard decision of  
9 splitting up the money.

10 Just one thing I think we have to be careful of  
11 is when selecting those three representatives that it's a  
12 broad representation and that they're able to look at it  
13 from a regional or a statewide standpoint and not just  
14 from their system's standpoint. But I think if we can do  
15 that, I think it would be good.

16 I would also like to think it's a great idea  
17 because PTAC really helped move forward and get the  
18 additional \$3 million, so I feel like we did a lot of the  
19 hard work but ask them to do the really hard work of how  
20 to divide it amongst themselves, but I would be interested  
21 in what their thoughts are of how to do that moving  
22 forward. And then I guess we'll leave it up to the PTN  
23 staff to figure out how to actually put that in rulemaking  
24 language.

25 MR. UNDERWOOD: Michelle, this is Brad

1 Underwood. I think it's an excellent idea and any time  
2 you're going to get rural providers involved in helping  
3 them decide on how they're going to split up those funds,  
4 you're going to have more buy-in, more understanding,  
5 people are going to be more with the program. And if  
6 we're talking about having a PTAC member involved in that  
7 committee, J.R. Salazar -- I don't want to put him on the  
8 spot -- but has a vast understanding of the funding  
9 formulas, the amount of money to be distributed, kind of  
10 knows where this all came from, and to me, he would be an  
11 excellent representative for this group.

12 MR. GLEASON: And since nobody can see each  
13 other at this meeting.

14 MR. SALAZAR: I tell you what, thank you, Brad,  
15 I really owe you one.

16 (General laughter.)

17 MR. GADBOIS: I thought Brad was going to  
18 volunteer himself and then he volunteered you.

19 MR. SALAZAR: That's kind of what I thought,  
20 too.

21 Actually, two things. One is I agree with all  
22 the comments that are being said. I think that we need to  
23 get buy-in from the communities that we serve, and so I'm  
24 fine with that, and if we're looking for a rural member,  
25 then I'm fine with serving on that as well.

1 I will say, kind of getting off track of what  
2 we're talking about, Eric, and filling all the seats for  
3 PTAC, I do think that we need to think about the areas of  
4 Texas, because I think we have the Dallas area -- and I  
5 guess what I'm trying to say is I'm the farthest west and  
6 I'm in Central Texas, and so when we come to a point of  
7 maybe having more PTAC members or committees or that kind  
8 of thing, I think we need to be aware that we need  
9 representation from that area.

10 MR. GLEASON: Yes. Thank you, J.R.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Good point, J.R.

12 MR. SALAZAR: Nothing against the Dallas  
13 person.

14 MS. BLOOMER: I guess it depends on how the  
15 rest of the state looks at the regions, but you have  
16 myself, Christina, Al who are physically located in the  
17 DFW area, and then Brad is not too far off, we can reach  
18 him in an hour, and you're not that far west, J.R.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And Austin ain't that far south.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Well, it's further, but there's  
21 even further south and further west, and so I think  
22 perception would go a long way as far as buy-in amongst  
23 not just the three rural or small urban providers that are  
24 serving on that working group but for the entire small  
25 urban and rural folks if there's much more broad

1 representation.

2 MR. GADBOIS: Although that isn't just an Eric  
3 thing.

4 MR. SALAZAR: I agree with that.

5 MR. GADBOIS: Each one of you have gotten  
6 appointed by somebody and that somebody probably still has  
7 appointments to make.

8 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, do we know which  
9 appointees are left?

10 MR. GLEASON: I believe we do, yes. We need an  
11 urban provider and I'm thinking we need a general public  
12 or a user. Glenn, you're a general public?

13 MR. GADBOIS: Yes. I think we had this  
14 conversation last time. As I remember it, Eric, the  
15 lieutenant governor has two or three appointments they  
16 need to make.

17 MR. GLEASON: Yes. They have two: they need  
18 an urban provider and they need a user, I believe.

19 Christina, you're a general public member, if  
20 I'm not mistaken.

21 MS. CRAIN: Right. But they still have those  
22 two they need to make?

23 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

24 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is Brad. I believe I sit  
25 as the urban representative for the lieutenant governor.

1 Correct?

2 MR. GLEASON: You were appointed by the  
3 speaker.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm sorry. You're right. I  
5 apologize.

6 MS. CRAIN: So Eric, say that again, because  
7 I'll email the person over there that I correspond with  
8 just to make sure that somebody is on top of that.

9 MR. GLEASON: You know what, Christina, I'm  
10 going to have Ginnie double check when we get back to the  
11 office. I'm sure one of them is an urban area provider.  
12 Let me put it this way: there's a provider position --  
13 let me speak about this accurately. There are three  
14 provider positions on the committee: we have J.R. who is  
15 rural, we have Brad who is a combination of small urban  
16 and rural, and so in my way of thinking and our way of  
17 thinking, to provide balance, we need an urban provider.  
18 But the only requirement is that they be a provider as far  
19 as the Legislative Code goes.

20 And then let us double check on the second one  
21 to make sure we've got that right. And then we still have  
22 one more I think needs to come from the speaker. I'm  
23 pretty sure that's right.

24 And then, Al, I think your term is coming up in  
25 September.

1 MR. ABESON: Right.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, maybe what I'm hearing  
3 from the committee is if we can figure out which positions  
4 we have vacant and who is to appoint them, maybe we can  
5 take a more active role. Because I think you've sort of  
6 been given direction to just continue on as is, and maybe  
7 what we can do from a member perspective is get in touch  
8 with the lieutenant governor and the speaker and possibly  
9 with potential individuals they might want to consider.  
10 Because I know when the governor's office called me they  
11 were looking for suggestions for other appointees that  
12 they could make, so maybe we could help them out a little  
13 by suggesting folks either to them or having folks get in  
14 contact with them that may be interested in getting  
15 appointed.

16 MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, I think we probably  
17 need to try to circle back to the agenda.

18 MS. BLOOMER: We're back.

19 So I think, if I'm hearing the committee  
20 correctly, so I think we've had discussion and generally I  
21 think there's concurrence. Do I have a motion for the  
22 department to move out to consult with the transit  
23 industry?

24 MR. ABESON: This is Al. I would make that  
25 motion.

1 MS. BLOOMER: A second?

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is Brad. I would second  
3 that with Glenn's recommendation about having a member of  
4 PTAC join that committee.

5 MS. BLOOMER: Al, do you accept the friendly  
6 amendment?

7 MR. ABESON: Sure.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And then we'll go ahead,  
9 and all those in favor.

10 (A roll call vote was taken - all ayes.)

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Moving on to item number 5  
12 on the agenda.

13 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, can I suggest to you  
14 that we flip 5 and 6 at this point. 5 I think is a fairly  
15 substantive conversation, 6 I'm hoping we can get through  
16 it pretty quickly and then we can spend the rest of the  
17 time on 5.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. If there are no  
19 objections, we'll move to item 6: Nomination of a member  
20 of PTAC to serve on the department advisory committee  
21 related to transportation development credits.

22 MR. GLEASON: At today's commission meeting the  
23 commission approved direction to the department to form a  
24 formal rulemaking advisory committee to assist the  
25 department in looking at the current rules for

1 transportation development credits, and that minute order  
2 that they approved establishes a seven-member rulemaking  
3 advisory committee, and one of the members of that  
4 committee is someone from PTAC.

5 The general background for this effort is that  
6 there is an interest in trying to understand how the  
7 department can sort of maximize the benefit, if you will,  
8 of having transportation development credits.  
9 Transportation development credits generally get earned or  
10 accumulate because of toll road investment. It's the  
11 combination of the investment itself and some ongoing  
12 expenses associated with that.

13 And so right now the last time I had a number  
14 from anyone, the department had about 1.7 billion -- with  
15 a B -- transportation development credits, and those can  
16 be used, development credits can be used to draw down  
17 federal program funding from the Highway Program and from  
18 the Transit Program. And we have used them quite  
19 extensively in the past for public transportation  
20 purposes, as you know, and there is an interest generally  
21 in the department of expanding that use and exploring ways  
22 that they can use those development credits to draw down  
23 Federal Highway Program funding.

24 So this is going to be a very important effort,  
25 a comprehensive effort to look at the current rules.

1 Clearly public transportation has an interest, and so the  
2 committee is on the rulemaking advisory committee because  
3 PTAC has a person there, and there is also a slot for an  
4 individual from a metropolitan transit authority, so one  
5 of the large metros in the state will also have a position  
6 on the rulemaking advisory committee.

7 I don't have a time frame for the effort for  
8 the committee today. I spoke with John Barton, assistant  
9 executive director, and he envisions an effort that might  
10 involve, he said, three four-hour meetings of the advisory  
11 committee, so that gives you a sense of the level of that.

12 Now, I don't know if it's going to be three or four, but  
13 I think the idea is to bring the group together for long  
14 periods of time when they do get together so they can  
15 accomplish a lot of work.

16 So it doesn't seem as though it's going to be a  
17 lot of work stretched over a lot of different meetings,  
18 but rather work that's trying to be done in some fairly  
19 focused meetings. What I don't know is how long the  
20 department is envisioning to take to get to proposed rules  
21 and then the three or four months you need to add to that  
22 for the rulemaking process itself.

23 There is a general recognition by the people  
24 who have been involved in this conversation so far that  
25 there is a need to preserve the historical use of

1 development credits for the public transportation program  
2 and I think there's an opportunity as a part of this  
3 conversation to explore expanding the application of  
4 development credits to public transportation in other  
5 areas of the state.

6 So with that, I will turn it back over to the  
7 committee and I would like to leave the meeting today with  
8 an action by the committee of nominating someone.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle. Can you  
10 share with us who the other five representatives are?

11 MR. GLEASON: The areas that are called out --  
12 and I don't have the minute order in front of me but Bobby  
13 does, so here it is. This is verbatim from the exhibit on  
14 the adopted minute order: three members, each one  
15 appointed by the three metropolitan planning organizations  
16 with the largest local balances of transportation  
17 development credits, and so a local balance refers to the  
18 areas that are actually generating the development credits  
19 to begin with, so the Dallas-Fort Worth area, Houston,  
20 Austin, those would be your three; one member appointed by  
21 the Public Transportation Advisory Committee; one member  
22 appointed by a non-transportation management area MPO; one  
23 member appointed by a metropolitan transit -- it says  
24 provider, the intention is a metropolitan transit  
25 authority, a large metro; and then finally, one member

1 appointed by a city that partners with the state on  
2 transportation projects. That's the membership.

3 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is Brad Underwood. Can I  
4 say something really quick? This to me is a huge, huge  
5 thing for the simple fact of rural and small urban  
6 providers rely heavily on TDCs for matching their capital  
7 projects, such as buses, and I don't know if I speak for  
8 everyone but this is one of the single issues this year  
9 that could be just absolutely monumental for public  
10 transportation.

11 I think we need to be very serious about who we  
12 nominate for this and really someone who has a little bit  
13 of experience and understands the whole combination of  
14 working of TDCs. It's kind of a complicated issue until  
15 you really kind of wrap your head around it, and to me,  
16 this is huge for public transportation providers because  
17 without them it would be very difficult for us to get our  
18 capital projects funded. And so this is something we need  
19 to take very seriously.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Brad, this is Michelle. I  
21 completely agree. I think it's very important, based on  
22 the existing use of TDCs. I also think it is extremely  
23 important on future and additional uses of TDCs. So not  
24 only sort of protecting how TDCs have been used  
25 traditionally which I think is the general consensus that

1 has been floated so far, but I also think it's extremely  
2 important for the small urban and rural providers, as well  
3 as regional coordination to think of the opportunities  
4 going forward with that 75 percent generated by the  
5 regions, that we don't lose out on any opportunities for  
6 those funneled to either the highway side or the large  
7 metropolitan transit authorities because a highway project  
8 or a large MTA could disappear 1.7 billion in TDC credits  
9 fairly quickly.

10 So I would agree, I think it's a very important  
11 topic.

12 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn, and I'll just urge  
13 that as somebody who worked on the legislation allowing  
14 these to be used in the first place and then worked with  
15 transit providers across the state this has been one of  
16 those key little pieces that once transit providers were  
17 able to start using development credits that really solved  
18 a lot of problems. And so for those on PTAC who don't  
19 understand that or this is an esoteric issue, trust us,  
20 this is probably one of the more important issues we'll  
21 deal with this year.

22 MR. ABESON: This is Al. I think, as I  
23 understand it, we have three members of the committee who  
24 are very, very closely involved in providing  
25 transportation: we have J.R., we have Michelle, and we

1 have Brad. And I think that the experience, knowledge and  
2 personal commentary that any of these three people can  
3 provide to this committee would be vital, so I would  
4 propose consideration of those three people as the  
5 potential representatives of this committee on that  
6 committee.

7 MR. GADBOIS: And Al, I want to suggest a  
8 slightly different take, not to exclude what you've said  
9 or the people that that applies to for consideration, but  
10 given the list that Eric read, there are going to be a  
11 number of transportation providers on there that use toll  
12 credits now and have an interest in them. What I would  
13 suggest is particularly unique to PTAC and that PTAC can  
14 contribute to that conversation is what Michelle  
15 suggested, we need to see if we can't find somebody in  
16 there that's able to participate actively in the  
17 conversation about how to use toll credits into the future  
18 in a very productive, if not innovative, way. And that  
19 can be our important contribution.

20 MR. ABESON: I guess I understand what you're  
21 saying in terms of the contribution the individuals can  
22 make, but I feel very comfortable that Brad and Michelle  
23 and J.R. could, in fact, make that contribution from the  
24 very real perspective of day-to-day doing it.

25 MS. BLOOMER: And Glenn, this is Michelle.

1 Just to sort of tack onto what you were saying, I  
2 understand there will be three MPO representatives, one  
3 from Austin, DFW and Houston, and I can't speak for Austin  
4 and Houston and I don't know who the DFW rep will be, but  
5 back to my concern earlier is if you take all the  
6 priorities -- and we're looking specifically at DFW -- my  
7 concern from a PTAC standpoint would be that  
8 transportation, and specifically small urban and rural  
9 transportation, doesn't always rise to the top.

10 So I think even though we have representatives  
11 and there will be an MTA representative -- and I'm not  
12 sure how I feel about that either -- I would agree with Al  
13 that I think we need somebody who has some experience  
14 actually using the funding and then who can further think  
15 outside the box of how we've traditionally used it to how  
16 if we could just get a little crumb of the 1.7 billion how  
17 we could be very strategic in using that to meet our  
18 ultimate goal.

19 Eric, can you tell us again how much time were  
20 you talking about previously? You mentioned focus  
21 meetings, a couple of actual meetings or conference calls?

22 MR. GLEASON: Well, please bear in mind I think  
23 this is still coming together. When I asked John Barton  
24 what kind of a commitment does being on this committee  
25 represent, he said that people should think about three

1 four-hour meetings. So I think without pinning anybody  
2 down to that exact schedule, I think what it tells you is  
3 they're going to try and focus the meetings with longer  
4 meetings to get more done, and respecting the  
5 geographically diverse membership of the committee when it  
6 comes together, not try and require a lot of meetings to  
7 get the work done but rather try and do it in a smaller  
8 number but each one will be a little longer. That's all I  
9 know right now.

10 MR. GADBOIS: So Michelle and Al, I get the  
11 point that you're making about making sure that small  
12 urban and/or rural is well plugged into the discussion and  
13 PTAC may be the only place that that would happen, the  
14 only way that would happen. So here's what would help me  
15 feel more comfortable is if whoever from PTAC agrees to do  
16 this they add to the work plan not just the three  
17 meetings, four hours, but they're committing to a separate  
18 meeting with some other key people who have the ability to  
19 think creatively about this, particularly Morris and  
20 Krusee. And I'm happy to help make the arrangement on  
21 that meeting if that's what needs to happen, but I really  
22 do think we need to have some creativity in this  
23 discussion about the use of development credits and the  
24 people that were named thus far will be there representing  
25 their specific, I suspect -- we don't know who they are so

1 I'm not sure about this -- I suspect will be there  
2 representing a particular interest.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And Glenn, back to your  
4 point, I think the PTAC representative will be  
5 representing all of PTAC as well as all small urban and  
6 rural transit provides in the State of Texas.

7 MR. GADBOIS: I just want to make sure whoever  
8 is doing it is going to agree that they'll also, at the  
9 right time in the process, get a sit-down with some of the  
10 smartest minds on transportation who understand  
11 development credits intimately from a big picture  
12 perspective, who think creatively about how --

13 MS. BLOOMER: Did we lose Glenn?

14 MR. GADBOIS: No. Glenn is here. Can you not  
15 hear me?

16 MR. GLEASON: We lost your thought.

17 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R., and I agree with  
18 all the comments that Glenn is saying and Brad is saying,  
19 and I can't think of anybody better than Michelle, if  
20 she's willing to accept that nomination, then I guess I'm  
21 going to make the nomination that we have Michelle  
22 Bloomer, our chairperson, on that committee.

23 MR. ABESON: I think there's a nice logic in  
24 that recommendation, J.R. In addition to the fact that  
25 she serves as the chair of the committee, she obviously

1 has exactly what I'm looking for in terms of the  
2 sophisticated day-to-day or as the rubber meets the road  
3 knowledge of the potential use, big picture use of  
4 transportation credits. So I would clearly support your  
5 suggestion.

6 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. If I can  
7 suggest to the committee, I think that North Central Texas  
8 COG is already going to have a member on the rulemaking  
9 advisory committee, and I think it could prove awkward for  
10 the advisory committee to have two staff people from the  
11 Council of Governments on there. I'm just thinking that  
12 might be a little awkward. So I would ask the committee  
13 to consider that.

14 I think Michelle would be a great voice and a  
15 great advocate, I just think there's some practical issues  
16 with it.

17 MS. BLOOMER: Two thoughts. Prior to this I  
18 did speak with Michael Morris in the event this happened,  
19 and he didn't seem to think there would be a conflict.

20 My other concern is, back to my original point,  
21 I do transit here in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, and  
22 transit is great, but when you put it up against highways,  
23 toll roads, TDM, ITS and a lot of other things, it's not  
24 always the highest thing on the list. So I understand  
25 having two people from the DFW MPO area might seem like

1       there's double representation, I'm not sure that would be  
2       the case. But I don't have an issue either way as long as  
3       our PTAC representative can clearly sort of stand our  
4       ground as far as small urban and rural goes, and I don't  
5       want the DFW region or any other region or highway side to  
6       sort of overshadow transit and relegate us to something  
7       other than where we should be which is an equal partner to  
8       any other mode in the state.

9               MR. ABESON: I would add this thought, that as  
10       the chair of PTAC, Michelle doesn't bring her agency to  
11       bear on what we do on behalf of the state, and I think  
12       that very same representation would the presentation as to  
13       why -- that and the other things we've said about her  
14       qualities and knowledge is why Michelle would be effective  
15       and logical on this particular committee. So I feel very  
16       comfortable in supporting J.R.'s suggestion once again.

17              MR. GADBOIS: Al, I completely agree with you,  
18       and Michelle, you've got my added instruction.

19              MS. BLOOMER: Okay, Glenn. Sorry, I'm having a  
20       hard time on the phone.

21              MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. I completely  
22       concur with Al and J.R.'s nomination of you if you're  
23       willing to serve, and just ask that you add to the  
24       workload the meeting to make sure you're thinking as  
25       strategically about opportunities as possible. If you

1 need me to help loop Krusee into that conversation, I  
2 will.

3 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any other  
4 thoughts or questions?

5 MR. ABESON: This is an action item, is it not,  
6 Michelle?

7 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. I just thought before I  
8 proceeded. Then we have a motion and a second to  
9 volunteer myself -- thank you, guys -- for the  
10 transportation development credit rulemaking. We'll just  
11 go down the list.

12 (A roll call vote was taken - all ayes.)

13 MS. BLOOMER: With the added note that per your  
14 request, Glenn, make sure I work with all members of PTAC  
15 as well as some of the other smartest minds on this issue  
16 in the state.

17 MR. GADBOIS: Thanks.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Now going backwards to item 5:  
19 Review and discussion of the draft PTAC strategic plan and  
20 guiding principles. Eric, do you want to introduce the  
21 item?

22 MR. GLEASON: I will. And I think what we're  
23 looking at is a set of guiding principles. The  
24 conversation generally we've had in the past I think began  
25 around a strategic plan and pursuing a strategic plan.

1 When we got together in April for the workshop, the  
2 conversation was about is there work the committee can do  
3 around perhaps a set of principles that it could adopt to  
4 help guide its efforts, and at least in my view, not  
5 necessarily take on the burden of producing a strategic  
6 plan.

7           So we went away from the workshop in April with  
8 the direction to try and pull together what we thought  
9 some example principles, guiding principles might look  
10 like. We sent those out to you last week and so I think  
11 today what we want to do is kind of talk about the notion  
12 of guiding principles, whether this idea is looking like  
13 it could be useful for the committee. The examples we've  
14 provided you with really were nothing more than just  
15 examples to try and get the committee thinking about this  
16 approach and trying to see if you could imagine how a set  
17 of principles like this might help in your work on items  
18 as they come before you.

19           This is just a discussion item today, and what  
20 I could suggest to the committee is we could go a couple  
21 of different directions on this. We had hoped, I think,  
22 to get these out to you earlier than we did, and I think  
23 at the workshop we may have talked about getting them out  
24 to you earlier enough so that you could get individual  
25 comments back to us so that when we got together today for

1 the meeting we could have a revised set of principles  
2 reflecting those comments. The time frame didn't allow us  
3 to do that, we didn't get them out until late last week.

4 So today's conversation can simply be  
5 individual members reacting to what we have here and we  
6 can take notes and go back and put something together that  
7 reflects those comments. The committee could try and  
8 orchestrate sort of a committee discussion of these  
9 things, but it is not an action item, and so we can  
10 proceed today any way you want.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think what I'd like to  
12 do, it's not an action item, we could just go ahead and  
13 open it up for general discussion or reaction from the  
14 committee members, and if somebody wants to start.

15 MR. ABESON: This is Al. I spent quite a bit  
16 of time with these trying to clean up language that made  
17 sense to me, but more important than that was what was  
18 missing for me was a clear statement as to what the  
19 purpose of these guiding principles were.

20 As you said, Eric, I had no idea how we were  
21 going to proceed, so it may be that my comments are not  
22 going to be very useful, but I see this as material that  
23 would serve the current committee and future members of  
24 the committee hopefully over time to guide into the future  
25 back to the big picture that we talked about at our

1 meeting in Arlington as well as earlier today.

2           And so I'm uncertain first of the specific  
3 language that would define what the purpose of the guiding  
4 principles was, and then I played with some language and  
5 I've shared that with Michelle late yesterday. And then I  
6 went through and did kind of fairly heavy editing or  
7 rewriting of some of them and still was lacking in kind of  
8 a feeling of comprehensiveness. For example, nowhere is  
9 there reference to personnel, personnel recruitment,  
10 personnel retention, personnel training, which I think  
11 there should be a principle about the quality, the  
12 quantity of the people that we are investing in or should  
13 be investing in to lead the operation of these transit  
14 systems around the state.

15           So I guess in conclusion, I'm a bit confused  
16 myself as to if these principles are ones, as stated and  
17 as revised by me, at least, to get us to the goal that we  
18 talked about in Arlington, and I'm not sure those comments  
19 are terribly helpful.

20           MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Al, for kicking it  
21 off.

22           Just to tack onto that, I think my biggest  
23 question I had, Eric, I think the guiding principles lay  
24 out the how we're going to try to do something. What I'm  
25 sort of missing and I think Al was hitting on is the what,

1 what are we trying to accomplish as a state as far as  
2 public transportation is concerned, and why. I mean, why  
3 do we think it's important, why does TxDOT and the  
4 legislature spend \$30-some million a year, what are we  
5 trying to accomplish? Are we trying to accomplish service  
6 coverage across the entire state, or are we trying to  
7 leverage the limited amount of resources we have to  
8 provide the most number of trips? Because I'm not sure  
9 that those two goals are the same.

10 MR. GADBOIS: And Michelle, are you done?

11 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. Go ahead. Sorry.

12 MR. GADBOIS: I guess my sense in looking  
13 through these is kind of what Al reflects and definitely  
14 what you reflect. I'm a rather tangible person, and would  
15 rather focus on work plan and getting that started quickly  
16 than spending the next six months to a year talking about  
17 principles and refining those. Although Al's statements  
18 helped me to understand why those might be useful to have.

19 As a consequence, my response was a different  
20 direction than Al's so I'll just throw that out on the  
21 table for consideration as well. I would suggest with  
22 some refinement to principles that we could come up fairly  
23 quickly with principles we can agree to broadly to guide  
24 us, but that our focus ought to be on, even if it's kind  
25 of an incremental approach, ought to be focused on a work

1 plan, what is it that we could do over the next six months  
2 that would make PTAC relevant and helpful to some of the  
3 major challenges that are facing public transportation.

4 And so I would like to propose that we think  
5 about a much more specific action-oriented process than  
6 what's being proposed by these general principles.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn, this is Michelle. I know  
8 I agree with what you're saying. Before we can have an  
9 action-oriented plan -- which I definitely think we  
10 need -- I also think we need to sort of answer those  
11 questions about what we're trying to do and why we're  
12 trying to do it, and then the action-oriented plan gets to  
13 the how, and the time frame in which we're going to do it,  
14 six months, a year, would get to the when.

15 MR. GADBOIS: And I'll agree with that, but  
16 what could we do to get -- that's action -- what could we  
17 do to get to the what and the why.

18 MS. BLOOMER: I think maybe what we can start  
19 to do, and I think one of the questions is how much time  
20 do we want to spend on putting the planning piece  
21 together, but I think if we don't know where we're trying  
22 to get to, it's going to be hard to figure out what we're  
23 going to do to get us there, so maybe we take the next  
24 couple of meetings or months.

25 And Eric, we're such a small committee, it's

1 kind of hard to break us up into a subcommittee. Could  
2 two or three members sort of work together to try to  
3 narrow down or answer the question of the what and the why  
4 and then we can share that with the larger committee at a  
5 meeting in about a month or two, and then starting putting  
6 together the how, the actual work plan steps?

7 MR. GLEASON: We've done subcommittees before  
8 and the committee can create subcommittees to pursue work.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Is there a way we could do it  
10 where it's less formal than a subcommittee so we don't  
11 have to have an agenda that's published?

12 MR. GLEASON: I think we can make that work, I  
13 think that's fine. We will try and make it as informal as  
14 we can, for sure.

15 I do think that the committee has to take --  
16 and unfortunately it's not on your agenda today so we're  
17 going to have to work around that -- but I think the  
18 committee probably does need to take action to form a  
19 subcommittee, and that's not on your agenda today. And so  
20 that's a formal action that can be out there, but in the  
21 spirit of trying to move this along, I think we can  
22 probably be responsive.

23 I think the way to do this, guys, is if each of  
24 you continue to express your ideas and interests to us as  
25 individuals, then we can assemble those as staff and

1 continue to sort of produce a product that we can send out  
2 to you as individuals and you can comment on it and we can  
3 make progress that way. Sorry to be so bureaucratic about  
4 it but I think that's probably how we have to do it.

5 Bobby has got a suggestion.

6 MR. KILLIBREW: Good afternoon. This is Bobby  
7 Killebrew for the record.

8 Another suggestion the department can do, we  
9 can work informally with a small portion of the total  
10 committee, and then as the department we can respond back  
11 to PTAC at its next regular meeting with a report from the  
12 department. And that will still allow us to have direct  
13 committee action on this item.

14 MR. GADBOIS: So the department forms a  
15 drafting committee through the department?

16 MR. KILLIBREW: We don't actually form  
17 anything. We just work informally with a couple of PTAC  
18 representatives to further shake this out, and then at  
19 your next meeting we come back with a more drafted item  
20 that the whole committee can look at and take action on if  
21 they want to.

22 MS. BLOOMER: I think that's a good  
23 recommendation, sort of where I was going, Bobby. And I  
24 think what I'm looking for is something that helps us  
25 address the questions of the who, what, where, when, why,

1       how and how much. And we know how much money the state  
2       spends every year for public transportation, I guess I'm  
3       just looking for the what and the why and then what sort  
4       of targeted action-oriented stuff we can take to get to  
5       your point, Glenn, to help move the state in that  
6       direction.

7                        So we probably need to give the department some  
8       guidance on who would like to participate in that informal  
9       discussion with them to put a little bit more to this.

10                      MR. ABESON: This is Al. I would volunteer to  
11       help with what we have been calling the guiding principles  
12       piece. In terms of the work plan, I would defer to others  
13       who are actually delivering services.

14                      MS. BLOOMER: Go ahead. Sorry.

15                      MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. I was going to  
16       volunteer Al and myself to work on that since we're the  
17       ones kind of jumping in and showing interest.

18                      MS. BLOOMER: I think that would be good to  
19       help us answer the big questions and then we can all sort  
20       of add some of the specific items when we come back next  
21       time.

22                      Is there anybody else that would like to  
23       participate?

24                      MR. GLEASON: I think we probably need to leave  
25       it at two.

1 MS. BLOOMER: Two, okay.

2 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, if I could before we  
3 leave this topic, I need to kind of check in with the  
4 committee on something. When we talked about this at the  
5 workshop I think the conversation was around we've  
6 identified items for the committee work program, we've  
7 talked about working on development credits, we've talked  
8 about looking at the 5310 program, we know we've got work  
9 on the formula coming up, there's interest in working on  
10 coordination.

11 And I thought that the idea behind the  
12 principles was to try and pull together a set of  
13 statements, if you will, that represented the various  
14 interests or the set of interests that the committee has  
15 in advancing public transportation in the state, so that  
16 when we are looking at transportation development credits,  
17 for example, we can ask ourselves how is it that  
18 development credits can be used, you know, for example,  
19 with principle 1, to help enable strong, viable public  
20 transportation systems, or number 5, how can they help us  
21 adequately maintain and expand critical transit assets.

22 So what we're doing is not necessarily trying  
23 to capture a vision, if you will, or an end state or a  
24 general statement of where we're going with public  
25 transportation as much as can we capture the interests

1 that the committee has and get those into some statements,  
2 some principles, if you will, that whenever a topic is in  
3 front of the committee from their work program these  
4 principles can be on the table and the committee can be  
5 going back and forth, depending on the topic, and using  
6 the principles to help shape their recommendations on the  
7 topic.

8 So that's where we were trying to go with this  
9 piece and I thought that was the sense of the committee  
10 from the workshop.

11 MR. ABESON: Eric, this is Al. Let me read to  
12 you some language that I wrote yesterday, because what you  
13 just said is very consistent with my own thinking in  
14 anticipation of what we were doing.

15 MR. GLEASON: Okay, good.

16 MR. ABESON: See if this works for you  
17 conceptually. In order to fulfill its mission, the PTAC  
18 has adopted the following guiding principles. The members  
19 of PTAC feel that these principles establish the  
20 foundation for the work of the committee and should be  
21 reflected in all recommendations brought forward for  
22 consideration by the commission, department, and as  
23 appropriate, the legislature.

24 Does that do it for you?

25 MR. GLEASON: That does it for me, but I'll

1 leave it up to the committee. I think, Al, what you said  
2 there is totally consistent, and you said it much better  
3 than I did, with what I was trying to go for.

4 MR. ABESON: How about the rest of the  
5 committee, and Michelle, does that reflect the intention  
6 of this document?

7 MR. UNDERWOOD: This is Brad Underwood. You  
8 made perfect sense, Al, you summed it up, it was good.

9 MS. CRAIN: I agree. This is Christina.

10 MR. ABESON: I'm not hearing from our chair.

11 MS. BLOOMER: I was waiting for everybody else  
12 to have their comments.

13 Al, I think that goes a long way. I think the  
14 one thing I'm still feeling is missing is, I guess my  
15 concern is I would not disagree with any of those six  
16 principles listed there, I think those are all things that  
17 you could get anybody to say yes, I'm for that. I guess  
18 my concern is knowing that we have very limited resources,  
19 how do we prioritize amongst those principles, and if we  
20 have to make a choice between 1 and 6, how do we do that?  
21 Do we have something to go back to look at that helps us  
22 go okay, well, I believe sustainable and livable  
23 communities are a good idea. Nobody is going to say I  
24 think they're a bad idea -- at least I don't think they'd  
25 say it in public.

1           My concern is should we be trying to buy  
2 recycled paper and build LED buildings and do a lot of the  
3 initiative under sustainable, livable communities when we  
4 have basic needs and functions that we can't yet meet.  
5 And so I'm coming at it from experience because with our  
6 regional coordination plan we had it very broad and  
7 general, we thought that was great because everything  
8 could be then linked back to our plan and derived from it,  
9 but what we've found is that is true and what it's done is  
10 it's made it very difficult for us to prioritize and be  
11 strategic about what we're actually doing in sort of a  
12 systematic matter, because everything gets put into that  
13 bucket as yes, it meets it.

14           MR. ABESON: But in the final analysis, you did  
15 have to make decisions using that plan, and so you said  
16 well -- I presume you did this -- if we do this activity,  
17 we support this initiative over that one, it's because we  
18 think, one, it will stimulate more activity, two, it will  
19 achieve success more quickly, three, it will in total have  
20 greater impact. I mean, if you have the principles then  
21 you can apply them to each decision with some kind of an  
22 assessment as to the outcome that will be achieved. Isn't  
23 that right?

24           MS. BLOOMER: Right.

25           MR. ABESON: I think you can do that to some

1 degree with what -- not all the language we were given by  
2 the state, but for example, to use your example,  
3 sustainable, livable communities, I added to that to  
4 recognize and incorporate appropriate provisions for  
5 public transportation. So I wouldn't include that without  
6 something about transportation in it.

7           Maybe I'm beating this too much here on the  
8 phone. What I would prefer is that if the committee is  
9 comfortable with having Glenn and I go forward, I would  
10 share what I've done with Glenn, and perhaps, Michelle,  
11 you could add your comments, and anybody else could do the  
12 same and let us go to work on a draft with whoever Eric  
13 would like us to work with from his office, and get the  
14 ball rolling.

15           MR. GADBOIS: Before we kick it off, Al -- this  
16 is Glenn -- let me just ask you another question that will  
17 help clarify for me and maybe give other people a chance  
18 to make sure they're in agreement on.

19           Actually, I like the language that you  
20 proposed, I'm a little more comfortable with the broad  
21 principle statements given your conversation about them  
22 thus far, but here's still the question I have so help me  
23 understand how it works.

24           When we're looking at the 5310 program, for  
25 example, we're going to agree to all these principles, I

1 agree with Michelle, everybody is going to agree to these  
2 principles broadly. How does enabling strong, viable  
3 public transportation system get us to make a decision on  
4 what's successful in a 5310 program?

5 MR. ABESON: Well, one way I would respond to  
6 that would be to say -- again, I have to use the words  
7 I've got here, but I have establish and sustain effective,  
8 strong public transportation systems that meet the needs  
9 of all Texans that use public transportation. I would  
10 operationalize the word "effective" for one thing. I  
11 would operationalize the word "sustain." What do those  
12 words mean in terms of what should the 5310 program demand  
13 over time in terms of will it in fact sustain over time  
14 meeting whatever standard we establish, and the same for  
15 effective.

16 I would guess that there are some 5310 programs  
17 out there that are a whole lot better than some others.  
18 Some would meet our test for effective and some wouldn't.

19 So that would be a basis on which one could make  
20 decisions as to what should the 5310 program look like for  
21 the entire state.

22 MR. GADBOIS: Hang on just a second because I  
23 want to finish this and check with the rest of the group.

24 So if the rest of the group, Al, agrees then what I'm  
25 hoping we will get to is that next step that you just

1       decribed, not necessarily for 5310, but add to these the  
2       additional layer of how these principles can apply to help  
3       us do our business, our work plan. And if we're going to  
4       do that as an outcome and everybody agrees that's what we  
5       should be doing, then I'm happy to participate in that.

6               MR. ABESON: That was going to be my hope. The  
7       last thing I want to do, particularly at this point in my  
8       life, is do stuff that's meaningless, so I hope that it  
9       really does have the capability of enabling the committee,  
10      as I said earlier, over time to establish priorities and  
11      to evaluate activity in relation to those priorities.

12              MR. GADBOIS: Okay. Is the rest of the  
13      committee comfortable with us helping the department to  
14      draft that?

15              MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. Yes.

16              MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Yes. I think  
17      you two definitely have some very passionate interest in  
18      this, so we will leave it to you.

19              What I would like to ask is if we can sort of  
20      get something back out to the committee say by mid August,  
21      if not sooner.

22              MR. ABESON: This is Al. Eric, who would you  
23      like us to liaison with in your office?

24              MR. GLEASON: Kelly Kirkland will be the  
25      contact. I'll be pretty engaged in this as well, folks.

1 Kelly and I kind of tag-teamed on this.

2 MR. ABESON: How about we start, later today I  
3 will forward to you, Glenn, and to Kelly and to you, Eric,  
4 what I drafted yesterday, and everybody can go at it. Or  
5 I could send that to the whole committee for that matter.  
6 What's the preference?

7 MR. GLEASON: Let's keep it within the working  
8 group for now, and let's plan on, as we talked earlier,  
9 trying to bring this thing along significantly and then  
10 get it in front of the full committee in a more formal  
11 way.

12 MR. ABESON: Okay.

13 MR. GADBOIS: Okay. And can I suggest a  
14 deadline? We're shooting our work to be done by the end  
15 of July.

16 MR. ABESON: Sounds good to me.

17 MR. GLEASON: If I can just complicate that a  
18 bit, Glenn. I'm going to be out of the office the last  
19 two weeks of July, so I might be more helpful to this  
20 process if the deadline were the end of the first week or  
21 second week in August.

22 MR. GADBOIS: End of first week of August. How  
23 about that?

24 MR. ABESON: Well, I'm going to be done with it  
25 by the end of August because then I'm taking off. I'm out

1 by the end of July and I'm taking off, so I'd like to be  
2 done by the end of July.

3 MR. GADBOIS: Al, you and I will get our work  
4 done by July and then it goes to the department and they  
5 can get their work done when Eric gets back.

6 MR. ABESON: And we'll just let Eric go on his  
7 vacation guilty as hell.

8 (General laughter.)

9 MR. GADBOIS: Bottom line is this is a  
10 department thing, so you can deal with it when you can  
11 deal with it.

12 MS. BLOOMER: I think that sounds like a great  
13 schedule with some concrete time frames. And then Ginnie,  
14 maybe we can start thinking about our next meeting no  
15 later than the end of August so we can wrap this up before  
16 Al leaves us.

17 MR. GLEASON: Ginnie just walked back in the  
18 room, she had to leave to make a phone call, but I think  
19 she heard all of that, Michelle. And we will start  
20 looking at a date out there toward the end of August, if  
21 not then, then very early September to get this back in  
22 front of the committee.

23 And I had begun drafting some discussion pieces  
24 for each of these principles, sort of my thinking of how  
25 they might come into plan in some of the committee's work,

1 and I will share those with Glenn and Al and I'll flip  
2 those to them pretty quickly, and so that will help them  
3 sort of think through the next step as well.

4 MR. ABESON: And could I have Kelly's email  
5 address?

6 MR. KIRKLAND: Yes. It's kelly.kirkland.

7 MR. ABESON: K-E-L-L-Y?

8 MR. KIRKLAND: That's correct. @txdot.gov.

9 MR. ABESON: Thank you.

10 MR. KIRKLAND: You're welcome.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Are there any other items  
12 for discussion on item 5? IF not, we'll move on to item  
13 7, public comment. Ginnie, do we have anybody signed up  
14 for public comment?

15 MS. MAYLE: No, we don't.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. We'll move on to item 8,  
17 confirm date for next meeting which we'll do at a future  
18 time, I guess, via email?

19 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. So no action is needed  
21 there.

22 And then the final item is adjournment of the  
23 meeting, and I need a motion, a second and all in favor.

24 MR. GADBOIS: Glenn so moves.

25 MS. BLOOMER: Second?

1 MS. CRAIN: Christina seconds.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And we can just all in favor say  
3 aye.

4 (A chorus of ayes.)

5 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you all.

6 (Whereupon, at 2:40 p.m., the meeting was  
7 concluded.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: Public Transportation Advisory Committee  
LOCATION: Austin, Texas  
DATE: June 30, 2011

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 66, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Transportation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Transcriber) 7/14/2011  
(Date)

On the Record Reporting  
3307 Northland, Suite 315  
Austin, Texas 78731