

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TELECONFERENCE MEETING

Lone Star Room
4000 Jackson Avenue
Austin, Texas

Thursday, September 8, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT BY TELEPHONE:

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

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 of June 30, 2011 meeting	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. Review and adopt PTAC Strategic Plan/ Guiding Principles	24
5. Public comment (no commenters)	
6. Confirm date of next meeting	39
7. Adjourn	41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle Bloomer. I call the meeting to order.

The first item is approval of the minutes from the June 30, 2011 meeting. Is there any discussion on the item?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: If not, do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

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

MS. BLOOMER: And a second?

MR. GADBOIS: I second.

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, J.R. and Glenn. To make this easy, we're just going to go down the list.

J.R.?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Christina?

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Al?

MR. ABESON: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: And Michelle, yes. The minutes are approved.

Moving on to agenda item 3, the division

1 director's report, Eric, I'll turn it over to you.

2 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. We didn't send out
3 a written report for this meeting. I do apologize for
4 that. I've not been in the office very much, and Ginnie
5 did try and get my attention to do it, but I didn't
6 measure up to that one. So let me very quickly go over a
7 number of items. Glenn suggested a number of topics and
8 I'll try and touch on as many of those as I can.

9 Not a very busy time for the division at the
10 commission meetings. In July we did have three minute
11 orders: we awarded some funds for lead agency
12 coordination planning activities, some development credits
13 to Alamo Area Council of Governments, and then some RTAP
14 funding up to the Texoma area agency. That was it for
15 July. We didn't have anything on the August calendar,
16 nothing for September, but we do have a couple of items
17 for October.

18 So it's a pretty quiet time for us at the
19 commission right now, and in terms of our workload
20 throughout the year, that's pretty consistent with what a
21 typical year looks like. We get really busy with the
22 commission around grant program awards pretty much around
23 the start of the calendar year and that continues on
24 through June or July, and then we enter a quieter period,
25 mostly because the federal program budgets aren't approved

1 as early as they might be and we typically don't get
2 apportionments until after the first of each year. So
3 that's our schedule with the commission.

4 Question on the discretionary grant
5 applications, if you recall from our last meeting we
6 described a number of notices of funding availability that
7 the FTA had published. The department did submit a number
8 of projects, principally for the state of good repair,
9 called for project. Kelly did give me a list of all the
10 ones that we did submit. On behalf of the rural programs
11 in Texas, the department submitted a project totaling
12 about \$31 million. It was comprised of just over \$11
13 million for vehicles, \$10-1/2 million for facilities and
14 then \$9.6 million for intercity bus needs, and so we
15 combined those three areas into one project submission for
16 state of good repair.

17 Also, on behalf of the Midland-Odessa operator
18 we submitted a request for \$3 million for a multimodal
19 facility, and on behalf of Texas State University a
20 project to purchase some commuter route buses of \$3-1/2
21 million. Those last two submittals for Texas State
22 University and Midland-Odessa, Midland-Odessa could have
23 submitted on its own, they asked us to do, they weren't up
24 and running in the grant.gov program which was the way we
25 needed to submit these projects so we did that for them.

1 Other notices of funding availability, there
2 was a livability initiative, and on behalf of the City of
3 Conroe we submitted a \$2.1 million project there.

4 And Kelly, do you recall what that was for
5 specifically?

6 MR. KIRKLAND: Yes, Eric. I think that was
7 mainly for streetscape improvements, sidewalks and
8 passenger shelters for potential bus service.

9 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Thank you.

10 And then there was another part of the
11 livability issue, I believe, where the funding was from
12 the Alternatives Analysis Program at NTA, and on behalf of
13 the Midland-Odessa West Texas area we submitted a service
14 integration pilot request there.

15 The other major effort was around the TIGER
16 III --

17 MR. GADBOIS: Eric?

18 MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir.

19 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Can I back you up
20 for just a second?

21 MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir, you can.

22 MR. GADBOIS: When last we left our heroes
23 there was discussion at the semiannual meeting about the
24 list of projects being about three times what you expected
25 to get in funding, and you had requested that people give

1 some thought to how you might prioritize those projects or
2 create a shorter list.

3 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

4 MR. GADBOIS: And mainly I raise this issue to
5 better understand what the rationale was for the final
6 submission.

7 MR. GLEASON: For what? I'm sorry.

8 MR. GADBOIS: For what you actually submitted.

9 And so if you can't address that now, you can just send
10 to us what the rationale for the decision ended up being,
11 but that's mainly why I was asking about this.

12 MR. GLEASON: Let me address it a little bit,
13 Glenn, and then I simply want to acknowledge to the
14 committee that it's my belief that we need to work with
15 our community of providers to come up with a more
16 deliberate strategy, if you will, anticipating on an
17 annual basis a state of good repair call for projects from
18 the feds.

19 We need to be in a better position each year to
20 be able to select those projects which have the best
21 chance for award, and I will say that we aren't in a great
22 spot, if you will, right now for that, we are in more of a
23 reactive mode, if you will. This is a somewhat recent
24 recurring funding opportunity on behalf of the feds, and
25 we aren't yet in a position, I don't think, anyways, to

1 compete as well as we might.

2 What we did in this case is we were fairly
3 permissive, if you will -- if that's the right word -- at
4 this point in the process in terms of selecting projects
5 to move forward. It was only those projects that either
6 didn't fit the scope of the call to begin with or so very
7 much just in the "I've got an idea" phase that we felt
8 like we needed to do quite a bit more work on those to get
9 them to a point where they might be competitive.

10 And so it's my expectation if we are successful
11 in getting funding -- you know, we got a fifth of what we
12 asked for in total the last time we tried this, or
13 something less than that, and so with a \$30 million
14 application, if we get \$5 million, we've got our work cut
15 out for us in terms of picking those projects that we
16 would use those funds for.

17 If the feds say we're going to give you \$5
18 million for free, that's a relatively easy process for us.

19 If we're going to give you \$5 million for facilities,
20 that's much more difficult because those tend to be
21 chunkier in their needs. And then if they just say we're
22 going to give you \$5 million for you guys to decide
23 amongst fleet, facilities and intercity bus how you want
24 to spend it, that's the most complicated one of all. And
25 so while it would be good news to get the money, we're

1 going to have work really hard collaboratively together to
2 try and figure out how best to spend it should we be
3 successful.

4 So I'm looking forward to that conversation and
5 it's my belief that over the next year or so we're going
6 to need to work hard to put ourselves in a better position
7 to be more competitive on these kinds of calls.

8 MR. SALAZAR: Eric, this is J.R. I was just
9 wondering if you had some sort of estimate or do you have
10 a good guess as to when FTA is going to notify you or
11 notify us?

12 MR. GLEASON: Well, they said that they thought
13 September-October, so I think we're entering into the time
14 frame, end of September or October when we'll be hearing.

15 And that kind of leads me to the next topic
16 which is what's going on back in D.C. around authorization
17 and SAFETEA-LU, and you have probably been following that
18 as well and know that Congress has got to make some
19 decision over the next ten days or so on whether or not to
20 extend SAFETEA-LU and as a result of that the gas tax and
21 all those kinds of things.

22 And from a legislation standpoint, there's two
23 very different pieces of legislation, one in the Senate
24 and one in the House, either one of which is dead on
25 arrival in the other chamber. The Senate version is a

1 two-year version with more money in it that Senator Boxer
2 is proposing, and then on the House side of things you've
3 got Representative Mica with a six-year version but only
4 with enough money in it that is identified as projected
5 coming from the Highway Trust Fund, so quite a bit less
6 money, in Representative Mica's bill, it is a six-year
7 bill.

8 And so now they get to work on a compromise
9 version or whether there will be yet another piece of
10 legislation that has a better chance in both houses
11 remains to be seen. In the meantime, if they can't reach
12 a decision over the next ten days or so to extend SAFETEA-
13 LU, then we enter into kind of an uncertain time with
14 respect to federal funding and federal reimbursement.

15 We're in reasonable shape here as a state from
16 a federal program standpoint for our basic services, if
17 for no other reason than because of the recent history of
18 not actually getting federal apportionments until well
19 into the spring of a federal fiscal year. Our programs
20 generally don't draw down or need their federal program
21 dollars until later in the fiscal year, and so most
22 systems either run initially off the state funding they
23 have which was awarded in June of this year, or use
24 remaining federal program balances from the previous
25 federal fiscal year, or some combination of both.

1 So we really don't anticipate any immediate
2 crisis, if you will, around being able to sustain basic
3 public transportation systems.

4 We run our administrative program in arrears,
5 essentially, and so, again, the federal funding issue
6 wouldn't become an issue for us administratively until the
7 next state fiscal year. So I think we can weather those
8 kinds of storms reasonably well, assuming that they get
9 this thing resolved quickly if they can't get it resolved
10 in the next ten days.

11 I don't know if the committee wants to explore
12 that one any further or not, and I'll open it up for
13 questions at this point on that topic if you want.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GLEASON: Other things that are happening,
16 census advisory group, we talked at the last meeting and
17 you blessed the notion of the department bringing together
18 a group of providers from our rural and small urban
19 systems to take a look at the likely impacts of the 2010
20 census and to help the department come up with some
21 administrative code changes to allow us to be able to be
22 able to focus the funds that are in the budget to address
23 the impacts of the census.

24 We now have the urbanized area criteria that
25 the census is going to use. Once again, the census isn't

1 going to announce their final determinations until the
2 spring, but we've got a set of final urbanized area
3 criteria and we are asking TTI to take those and apply
4 those against the research they've done and to pull
5 together what they think is our best guess at the moment
6 on the impacts of the census. And I think, Kelly, Linda
7 Cherrington is thinking they can complete that work by the
8 20th of September, and we do have an advisory group
9 meeting scheduled for the 27th of September, so we'll be
10 diving into that just as soon as we get it.

11 I'm thinking the earliest that we would be
12 looking at moving toward the commission with proposed
13 rules would be at the November commission meeting, it may
14 even be the December meeting. So from a committee
15 standpoint, I think the committee might be looking at
16 something toward the end of October or in early November
17 in terms of looking at a set of proposed rules that would
18 allow us to address the census impacts.

19 Any questions on that one?

20 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Eric, has
21 there been any discussion at the state level on the Census
22 Bureau's final criteria related to the agglomeration and
23 the fact that the Census Bureau has now done a 180 on
24 their proposed criteria where the small urbanized areas
25 would become part of larger urbanized areas and now

1 they're saying they're not going to do that, that 2,000
2 small urban areas would remain?

3 MR. GLEASON: There might be some boundary
4 changes, but if a community was a freestanding small urban
5 area as defined by the 2000 census, they would continue to
6 be considered as a separate small urban area by the 2010
7 census even if the urbanized area, the larger area totally
8 engulfed it, if you will. I think it just changes the
9 flow of the money, Michelle, in terms of where we need to
10 put it for impacts. And I don't know what kind of
11 discussions you're thinking about beyond that.

12 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle again. There's
13 obviously implications specific to our region, but I think
14 from the statewide perspective I'm more thinking of the
15 impact to the state 5307 funds. We were thinking before
16 that some of those currently freestanding urbanized areas
17 might go away and hence fewer people would have access to
18 the TxDOT small urban pots, and that may now not be the
19 case. So does that impact any way that additional I think
20 it was \$3 million over the two-year period that may not be
21 as much as we thought now to go around to everybody that
22 would qualify for the state 5307 funds?

23 MR. GLEASON: Well, if you go back to the work
24 that actually resulted in that number, in that \$3.2
25 million, if you go back to that work, when it was done it

1 actually assumed, with the exception of McKinney and
2 Dickinson -- I think, Kelly -- with the exception of those
3 two areas it actually assumed that all the other areas
4 continued to get state grant funding. So we kind of
5 missed the agglomeration issue when we did the
6 calculation. So the good news is the census determination
7 is largely consistent with our assumption.

8 The only glitch, if you will, was with respect
9 to McKinney and Dickinson and I think the two of them
10 together is about a \$325,000 a year number. We had
11 assumed that those funds would be available to
12 redistribute to the remaining small urban areas, and so we
13 will need to cover that amount out of the \$3.2 million we
14 have.

15 But the other perhaps more significant issue is
16 around Galveston and likely that they will be classified
17 as a rural area, and moving their needs and performance
18 numbers into the rural program is likely to have a pretty
19 significant impact.

20 At the end of the day, everybody, the \$3.2
21 million is actually a two-year number in total. The
22 annual impacts of the census were forecast to be \$1.6
23 million a year, we have \$3.2 million in this next
24 biennium. We don't anticipate having to use any of this
25 money until the second year of the biennium, so I'm

1 confident that we have enough money to get through the
2 next two years. The issue may be when we come up with a
3 total impact number, the issue may be whether or not on an
4 ongoing basis the additional \$1.6 million a year is
5 enough. Does that make sense?

6 So we're good in the near-term, I think, in
7 terms of being able to mitigate the negative impacts of
8 the census. What I don't know and won't know until we see
9 the final numbers is how we stand from the standpoint of
10 on an ongoing basis was \$1.6 million a year enough.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

12 MR. GADBOIS: And Eric, along those lines,
13 because you just reminded me of this old little hitch --
14 this is Glenn -- it isn't only an issue of money
15 allocation, there is also kind of that backside issue of
16 if you go over 200,000 the feds stop allowing you to use
17 your money for operations.

18 MR. GLEASON: Yes.

19 MR. GADBOIS: And so are you looking at those
20 impacts as well and how we may or may not be able to
21 accommodate those?

22 MR. GLEASON: Those systems, if you take places
23 like Temple, for example, that is forecast to go over,
24 they would still continue to get state grant funding. The
25 amount they would get, their population which accounts for

1 half of the amount they get, is capped at 199,999, and so
2 even if they grow to 225,000 or 230,000, they only get
3 credit toward the first 199,999.

4 But we didn't try and anticipate in our work
5 plan and members of the committee the impact from the
6 federal side, we didn't try and build in funding to try
7 and mitigate the federal change impacts, we were focused
8 on mitigating the impacts on state funding.

9 MR. GADBOIS: One more just followup, because I
10 remember when this happened to Lubbock, it was a big deal,
11 but it's not just Lubbock that this concerns. Are we
12 going to look at that federal dollar impact for our
13 systems?

14 MR. GLEASON: I'm sorry. What was that again?

15 MR. GADBOIS: Every time this happens and
16 somebody either becomes included in a metro area and thus
17 the metro rules apply because the metro boundary is
18 extended, or they go over 200,000, we have this problem
19 with the federal money, and I'm just wondering whether
20 we're going to try to do analysis of that and better
21 understand it or whether that's just a problem the systems
22 have to deal with on their own.

23 MR. GLEASON: I don't have any plans to try and
24 do that analysis. I think it's a good suggestion. My
25 hope is many of those systems have already done it and

1 understand it themselves, because there are some nuances I
2 think in the federal program for programs that go over
3 that threshold initially.

4 I don't think it's a you-drop-off-the-cliff-
5 the-next-day thing. But we can certainly try and take a
6 look at that, Glenn, one, to identify the systems that are
7 likely to be impacted, and two, to at least talk with each
8 of them and see what kinds of plans they have underway to
9 address that.

10 On the good side of things, we've been talking
11 about this issue generally now for the better part of two
12 years and many of those managers of those systems that are
13 forecast to go over 200,000 have been a part of that
14 conversation. And so my hope is that that's been enough
15 of a wake-up call for them that they've done their
16 homework and understand the federal side impacts, but we
17 can certainly look into that.

18 MR. KIRKLAND: Eric, this is Kelly. That is
19 described in the research product that TTI prepared, the
20 census impact report, and there's just a description in
21 there of this is what's likely to happen. Particularly
22 those three areas, Killeen-Temple-Belton, Amarillo and
23 Brownsville, are likely to go over 200,000, and then if
24 there is no change at the federal level they would lose
25 the ability to use their federal 5307 funds for operating.

1 MR. GLEASON: Kelly, isn't there some
2 transition recognition at the federal level, though?

3 MR. KIRKLAND: Well, there was in 2000.
4 There's some statute that says that areas that go over
5 200,000 as a result of the 2000 census and says in like
6 the first year 2001 they can use up to like half of their
7 amount for operating, and then a third, and then a
8 quarter, but it phased out, and that would require an
9 amendment of federal statute to continue this time.

10 MR. GLEASON: So that was in federal statute,
11 that was not an FTA decision?

12 MR. KIRKLAND: Correct. That was a
13 congressional action.

14 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. That was
15 an add-on after the initial authorization and everything
16 shook out. Based on the response it was added on or
17 revised to allow that transition; initially that
18 transition wasn't planned.

19 MR. GLEASON: Right.

20 MS. BLOOMER: I think, Glenn, you bring up a
21 good point and something we've been talking about as a
22 committee related to the census impact, I know, Eric,
23 we've been talking about it at the PTAC and state level
24 for quite a while, we've been telling in our region our
25 providers since they became eligible for urban funds in

1 2003 to start thinking about it and the possibility of the
2 eligibility to use their funds for operating assistance.
3 I don't think I can comfortably say that any of them are
4 any better prepared today than they were in 2003 when we
5 started warning them, but I think that is a good idea
6 looking at the operating assistance and what it does.

7 I did want to clarify that I heard correctly,
8 because we're having this issue right now in our region so
9 before I tell an elected official, I just want to make
10 sure I am representing this correctly, if the McKinney
11 urbanized area remains its own urbanized area but moves
12 above the 200,000, they would still be eligible for state
13 funds, they would just be limited in their calculation at
14 a population of 199,999.

15 MR. GLEASON: I'd say that's correct. Right,
16 Kelly?

17 MR. KIRKLAND: Yes, that is correct. As long
18 as they do not create a transit authority, they would
19 still be eligible for the state funds.

20 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Well, that is great news
21 because we've been telling them they would lose their
22 state funds once that happened, so that might be good news
23 for them.

24 And then I think one other issue to add on that
25 is sort of the timing and the cash flow issue. With the

1 2000 census we had a lot of providers -- and I continually
2 say this and maybe a little dramatize it -- that one day
3 were 100 percent and the next day they were 50 percent
4 rural and 50 percent urban, and how at the state level we
5 can sort of assist in transitioning folks like we're
6 talking about at the federal level, so you're not one day
7 you're a small urban and the next day you're a large urban
8 and then all the requirements that come with that.

9 MR. GLEASON: Well, here's my idea on that,
10 Michelle. This is Eric. When we pulled this group
11 together to talk about the administrative code changes, it
12 occurred to me that I could also use this group as a
13 sounding board for that kind of question, you know, what
14 are the kind of things we can be doing to help these areas
15 make that transition.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Perfect.

17 Are there any other questions for Eric on the
18 Census Advisory Council item, or any of the other items
19 presented thus far?

20 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I just had one more
21 quick question. Eric, that group that you're talking
22 about, has that group been defined?

23 MR. GLEASON: Yes. I don't have the list with
24 me, let me try and remember off the top of my head. I was
25 hoping I might not have to answer that question. Let's

1 see, we have Bryan Baker from Spartan South Plains, we
2 have Norma Zamora from Brownsville Bus, Dave Marsh from
3 the central area, Carole Warlick, of course we have J.R.,
4 and we have Linda Pugh from the Texarkana area. How am I
5 doing, Kelly?

6 MR. KIRKLAND: John Hendrickson from Waco.

7 MR. GLEASON: And John Hendrickson from Waco.

8 MR. KIRKLAND: And you mentioned Carole but we
9 have Terry Reed down.

10 MR. GLEASON: So there's six individuals, plus
11 J.R. making seven. And so that's who we've got. I didn't
12 necessarily try and have everyone be in an impacted area
13 and I didn't necessarily try and exclude that either. We
14 have kind of a combination of people, some of them having
15 impact, some of them not. I looked at making sure we had
16 pretty good geographic coverage, West Texas, Central
17 Texas, areas that are perhaps not growing as fast as other
18 areas of the state.

19 Dave here in the Austin area has two new small
20 urban areas forecast to come up within his region. Carole
21 in the Hill Country, obviously a good opportunity to talk
22 with her about things they're doing in the Killeen-Temple-
23 Belton area, even though that may not directly relate to
24 the administrative code changes. And then Linda Pugh,
25 representing both the rural and the small urban up in the

1 Texarkana area.

2 I also tried to involve some people, kind of
3 new faces, if you will, in terms of engaging in
4 conversations with the department about leadership issues
5 and trying to kind of spread that opportunity around a
6 bit, so we've got some new faces at the table as well.

7 I just have one more item on my report and that
8 was to acknowledge the Transportation Development Credit
9 Rulemaking Advisory Committee. Michelle, obviously
10 representing PTAC, is on the committee. To my knowledge,
11 there's not been anything scheduled. I know that the
12 department has sent invitations out to every agency
13 looking for representatives on the committee as determined
14 by the commission action, but when I talked with the
15 Finance Department earlier this week, they did not yet
16 have a schedule for the rulemaking in mind.

17 So, Michelle, I can't tell you when you're
18 going to see anything on that, and I don't know if you've
19 heard or seen anything beyond the initial letter.

20 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. No, I haven't
21 heard anything. I just was going to ask you if we didn't
22 have an update. As long as they haven't scheduled the
23 meeting yet, we're fine.

24 MR. GLEASON: As far as I know, and I talked to
25 James Bass, who is the department's chief financial

1 officer on Monday and he didn't have a schedule for the
2 effort yet. Hopefully that will get underway relatively
3 soon. I think it's always good to tackle these issues
4 fairly expeditiously once they're raised, so hopefully
5 there will be something there shortly.

6 And that completes my report.

7 MR. ABESON: This is Al. I do have one
8 question. In the Fort Worth Star Telegram there was an
9 indication that there's now a new leader for the
10 department, and I was wondering if there's anything you
11 can report on tendencies, interests, decisions made to
12 date?

13 MR. GLEASON: On the new executive director?

14 MR. ABESON: Yes.

15 MR. GLEASON: I have nothing to report other
16 than what you all might read in the newspaper. I know the
17 commission is interviewing, I think it's reasonable to
18 expect a decision fairly soon, but that's all I really
19 know.

20 MR. GADBOIS: The announcement, Al, was for an
21 interim executive director as they're hiring.

22 MR. ABESON: Right. I think that's correct,
23 Glenn.

24 MR. GLEASON: I'm sorry. What was that, Glenn?

25 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. The announcement

1 that went out in the paper was for the interim executive
2 director that is in place until they hire an executive
3 director.

4 MR. GLEASON: The commission has appointed John
5 Barton to be the interim executive director until they
6 make a final selection, yes. And John is closing in on a
7 30-year service to the department, was formerly the
8 assistant executive director over Engineering Operations,
9 and has been, at least in the August timeframe was the
10 interim deputy executive director and he's now been
11 appointed the interim executive director.

12 MR. ABESON: This is Al. Do you foresee any
13 implications for public transit?

14 MR. GLEASON: I'm sorry. What was that?

15 MR. ABESON: Do you see any implications of
16 this interim appointment on the operation of your
17 division?

18 MR. GLEASON: I don't have any idea. We'll
19 just have to wait and see on that one.

20 MR. ABESON: Okay. Thanks.

21 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Any other
22 questions for Eric?

23 (No response.)

24 MS. BLOOMER: If not, we'll move on to agenda
25 item number 4, Review and adopt the PTAC Strategic

1 Plan/Guiding Principles. And I'd like to turn it over to
2 our subcommittee, Al, Glenn and Kelly. Al, would you like
3 to kick us off?

4 MR. ABESON: Sure. Thanks.

5 I hope that, first of all, the materials that
6 you have, including the cover memorandum to the draft
7 principles, lays out pretty well what we -- we being
8 myself, Glenn and Kelly, and then Eric taking a few long
9 distance, very helpful shots at refining the language and
10 so forth as we were moving along -- but what we were
11 trying to do was respond to a decision made by PTAC at its
12 last meeting to try to develop some principles that we
13 could use as a committee that would be systematic,
14 rational, consistent to set priorities, and then hopefully
15 whatever methodology we decided to use would not only work
16 in the short term but perhaps pave the way for some longer
17 term continuing operation.

18 So working together through conference call and
19 the magic of the computer and the internet, we came up
20 with the draft that you have in front of you. I think
21 that most important are the principles themselves,
22 secondly is, of course, the way in which they would be
23 used and that relates to the grid that we threw in at the
24 very end of the principles just as one possible approach
25 to ranking potential activities using the principles.

1 And with that, I would hope that after we
2 discuss to the degree that we need to discuss -- and I'm
3 not quite sure how to read the fact that there were no
4 comments from anybody but I guess that could be a good
5 thing -- that we would adopt the principles and I would
6 hope take the next step which is to define what the next
7 step is. Hopefully that's helpful.

8 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Glenn or Kelly, was there
9 anything you wanted to add to that before we open it for
10 discussion?

11 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Only to say thank
12 you to Al for doing the lion's share of the core work
13 drafting these and having patience with me and Kelly in
14 our little tweaks and questions and exploration along the
15 way.

16 MR. ABESON: This is Al. That's well received,
17 but if there's credit it's for three of us, if there's
18 criticism it's also for three of us.

19 MR. GADBOIS: I was trying to avoid that part.

20 (General laughter.)

21 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Glenn. This is
22 Michelle. And thank you, Al and Kelly, as well.

23 Are there any comments from the rest of the
24 committee on the Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles?

25 (No response.)

1 MS. BLOOMER: I do have to admit, and I
2 apologize, I didn't get to read them until this morning.
3 It's been kind of crazy here. I had every intention to
4 review them last week and get my comments to Kelly as
5 requested, but I fell a little short.

6 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, we were thinking of you
7 with that process. I know you've got some.

8 MS. BLOOMER: But I want to echo Glenn's
9 comments, I really appreciate all the hard work and effort
10 that you three took on to put this together.

11 Most of my comments are very minor. One thing
12 I did want to mention is I really like how for each
13 principle we sort of state what the principle is, and in
14 most of them it starts off with a verb which I think is
15 good so it shows action. And then the first sentence of
16 the paragraph sort of describes in a little bit more
17 detail what that principle is, and even more importantly,
18 I think that second sentence where you say, Application of
19 this principle means, I think that's very helpful.

20 So I'll save my minor comments that I can just
21 share with Al. They're more sort of word choice and
22 grammatik tweaking.

23 And then sort of bigger ones, on Principle 6, I
24 think to be consistent with the other ones we need an
25 action verb in front of there. We say, Recruit, retention

1 and training of personnel. I think it would be good to be
2 consistent with all the other principles if we have a
3 verb, either encourage, support, or I thought maybe
4 enhance. And I think it would also be extremely
5 beneficial if we add that second sentence that says,
6 Application of this principle means what. Because I think
7 that's where we sort of get into how we go back to measure
8 how well we're meeting that principle.

9 MR. ABESON: This is Al. Michelle, I don't
10 know if you want to do this during the call or not, but on
11 the action verb, we could just say, Recruit, retain and
12 train.

13 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. And Al, I think we can
14 probably do it offline, because I think we're 99.9 percent
15 there, and I apologize we're not 100 percent there because
16 I didn't read it. And I think probably the same for
17 Principle 7, if we can just expand on that. Right now it
18 just says: Principle 7, Evaluation.

19 And I think really that's it. Otherwise I
20 think the guiding principles are exactly what I had in
21 mind, and then I like the addition of the matrix to help
22 us sort of gauge how independently we're supporting the
23 principles and then collectively how we can support the
24 principles.

25 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Michelle, while

1 we have you focused on this, I want to make sure and point
2 out how we resolve an issue that you and I think others
3 have raised. In paraphrasing your concern, are we
4 spending our limited money distributing the money
5 throughout the entire geography throughout the entire
6 state to provide as much service as possible kind of on an
7 even-handed basis, or are we focusing our limited
8 resources where the most people are and where the services
9 can make the most difference? That conundrum we decided
10 to put into Principles 1 and 2 and allow them to kind of
11 compete with one another.

12 As a consequence, in the guidance Al's
13 suggestion is look at the principles individually and in
14 total, or all of them. Because we think striking that
15 balance between encouraging and rewarding innovation and
16 then support of the entire system is the way to achieve a
17 balance. It doesn't settle it finally, it doesn't say
18 we're going to go this direction or that, it settles it in
19 terms of a balance, if that makes sense.

20 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. That makes
21 perfect sense, Glenn, and I think that's probably a more
22 appropriate way to address that issue than an all-or-
23 nothing. So thank you for incorporating that.

24 Are there any other comments from committee
25 members?

1 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. The only comment I
2 had is I'd just like to say the same thing everybody else
3 has said, I think you guys did a good job on lining those
4 out and I think they look good.

5 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle again. And
6 really at this point, I thought it would probably be
7 really helpful if at the next semiannual meeting in
8 January we could take the PTAC guiding principles and
9 present that to the statewide providers. I think that
10 might be, one, to show them a product of PTAC, and two, to
11 sort of give them an insight into what we're trying to
12 accomplish.

13 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. You can consider
14 yourself to be on the agenda.

15 MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Eric.

16 Okay. Are we okay in going ahead and taking
17 action on the Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles as it
18 substantially is now, with the ability for Al, Glenn and
19 Kelly and I just to work on very minor tweaks?

20 MR. GADBOIS: As a friendly amendment, let's be
21 specific, adding action verbs into 6 and 7, and making
22 sure there is an application statement for each of those
23 that helps us measure our activities.

24 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Yes, I would
25 agree with that.

1 MS. CRAIN: And this is Christina. I would
2 just add, Michelle, that you're going to work on just
3 basic grammar, that sort of thing.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Yes. I think we can tighten that
5 up a little bit too, but that won't dramatically change
6 the substance of the document at all.

7 MS. CRAIN: No.

8 MR. GLEASON: Michelle, this is Eric. I have a
9 question. I had not thought that the table that is
10 included at the end would necessarily be adopted as a part
11 of the principles. I think it's a very useful table. I
12 would think, if the committee wants to adopt it, I would
13 think that, Al, you might want to just add a description
14 of what it is or a title at least, because right now it
15 looks like it falls under evaluation.

16 MR. ABESON: Right, and that's, of course, not
17 the intention.

18 MR. GLEASON: Again, I don't know if I have a
19 strong preference whether the table is in or out, but if
20 it's in, I think some sort of a title would help in the
21 final piece.

22 MR. ABESON: My feeling is it should not be
23 part of the principles.

24 MR. GLEASON: That's kind of where I started
25 out.

1 MR. ABESON: And that was never my intent. Why
2 don't we just treat that as basically a working document
3 that would be used in applying the principles. Is that a
4 legitimate way to go?

5 MR. GLEASON: If that's a question to me --
6 this is Eric -- I would say yes, and I would leave it up
7 to the committee.

8 MR. ABESON: Okay.

9 MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. So I think
10 based on the conversation, just to reiterate, we're going
11 to go ahead and move to take an action on approving the
12 PTAC Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles, with the additions
13 to Principles 6 and 7 we mentioned, and then some minor
14 grammatical formatting, and then remove the table and use
15 it simply as a tool in applying the principles, not
16 incorporated as part of the principles.

17 MR. ABESON: Right.

18 MS. BLOOMER: If we're all onboard with that,
19 do I have a motion to approve the Strategic Plan/Guiding
20 Principles?

21 MR. ABESON: So moved. This is Al.

22 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn, and I'll second
23 Al's motion.

24 MS. BLOOMER: And again just to make it easy,
25 J.R.?

1 MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

2 MS. BLOOMER: Brad, did you join us?

3 (No response.)

4 MS. BLOOMER: No. Okay.

5 Christina?

6 MS. CRAIN: Yes.

7 MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

8 MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Al?

10 MR. ABESON: Yes, ma'am.

11 MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, yes. All right, we

12 have unanimously approved our guiding principles and

13 strategic plan. Great job, everybody.

14 MR. GLEASON: Great job.

15 MS. BLOOMER: All right. That concludes item

16 4.

17 Eric, do we have the flexibility just to sort

18 of reiterate our plan since our first item was to work on

19 the Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles in September,

20 October-November we're looking at rulemaking for the

21 census impact, possibly TDCs, and then starting or effort

22 in January-February of taking our guiding principles and

23 strategic plan and applying it to an item, either the

24 coordinated planning or the 5310 Program?

25 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. What I might

1 suggest to the committee is maybe if we're planning to get
2 together in late October or early November to look at some
3 administrative code, and I'm just thinking off the top of
4 my head for the first time here, what we might also
5 include on that committee agenda taking a look at this
6 table, this working table that we have here and use that
7 as a way of identifying the next one or two priorities
8 that the committee would like to focus on.

9 MS. BLOOMER: Eric, this is Michelle. Are you
10 suggesting we do that between now and the next meeting or
11 at the next meeting using the table to identify the next
12 two topics.

13 MR. GLEASON: I'm thinking about we do it at
14 the next meeting as a committee conversation, because I
15 think we need to choose where to go next. And I'm just
16 thinking off the top of my head that wanting to use that
17 table, that might be a good opportunity to help us try and
18 understand where we might want to go next.

19 MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. Can I suggest
20 that we do a little interim work and at least start
21 proposing items that would fill in that table via email,
22 sending them to Ginnie, and then we are more ready for a
23 conversation in October?

24 MR. GLEASON: That works. As individuals if
25 you want to take a crack at that, yes.

1 MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I think I
2 just heard Glenn volunteer.

3 MR. GLEASON: I'll leave that up to you.

4 MS. BLOOMER: Between now and the next meeting,
5 which I think we're anticipating late October, early
6 November, maybe taking ideas from the committee and maybe
7 starting to fill out the matrix based on ideas submitted
8 as well as any of our topics between the June meeting and
9 I believe it was our April workshop that we may have
10 identified.

11 MR. GADBOIS: And I'm happy to compile. What I
12 was suggesting is that we, as a committee, take on the
13 homework assignment of sending Ginnie items we want filled
14 into that table and where we think they fit or how we
15 think they fit, and then I'm happy to compile all that.

16 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think that would be
17 helpful, Glenn, if you could help us sort of compile all
18 the ideas we've talked about and maybe coordinate with the
19 other members if that's an item of particular interest to
20 them that they could help you fill out the matrix, and
21 then hopefully in advance of our next meeting we could
22 share sort of what all those ideas were and where they
23 fall in the matrix so we can actually have a discussion
24 about which items and determine which one or two items we
25 want to work on at the beginning of the new year.

1 MR. GADBOIS: Certainly. And I'm just going to
2 announce, Al, I'm coming to you as our master strategist
3 to coordinate with you as well.

4 MR. ABESON: I'd be delighted to help. This is
5 Al. And one other thing that needs to be done with the
6 grid is somebody needs to establish some kind of a
7 numerical scale if we're going to do weighting.

8 MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. Glenn, can you
9 get with Ginnie and maybe send something out through
10 Ginnie to us that indicates what it is you're kind of
11 specifically asking and give maybe a time frame on when
12 you want that back?

13 MR. GADBOIS: Certainly.

14 MS. CRAIN: That would be great.

15 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Are there any other
16 items or questions?

17 MR. GADBOIS: I just have one that isn't on the
18 agenda and it doesn't require really any discussion, it's
19 sort of just a notice to you, Madam Chairman. I ran into
20 Mary Anne Griss at an event a week or so ago and as a
21 consequence she's now looking forward to PTAC coming and
22 visiting with her and/or Chairman Delisi about what the
23 PTAC is doing.

24 MS. BLOOMER: Okay, great. Thank you for that
25 update, Glenn.

1 Any other updates?

2 MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. The only question I
3 have left is, Eric, how are we on the leadership seminar
4 coming up, everything lined out?

5 MR. GLEASON: This is Eric. We have 23
6 participants, so we're still looking for two more, and
7 J.R., you're going to try and shake a couple of bushes for
8 me out there.

9 MR. SALAZAR: I did. I talked to Ginnie a
10 little bit about that yesterday and I had no luck with
11 that one, but I'll keep trying.

12 MR. GLEASON: Well, we'll be good with 23.
13 It's a tremendous opportunity for these folks, they'll get
14 a little more individual attention with there being not
15 quite so many people in the class, and we're planning to
16 move ahead.

17 I think the seminar, Ginnie, what's the exact
18 date in October, is it the 17th?

19 MS. MAYLE: It is the 16th through the 19th.

20 MR. GLEASON: 16th through the 19th for the
21 first session, and then again in January right after the
22 semiannual meeting for two days.

23 MS. MAYLE: Correct.

24 MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. Can you explain
25 a little bit about what the class is and who you're

1 looking for?

2 MR. GLEASON: Christina, this is something that
3 we put together for the first time last year, and it's the
4 Texas Transit Leadership Seminar. It's a seminar that is
5 focused on both current leaders in those rural and urban
6 systems that get state grant funding, as well as their
7 direct reports, their deputies, people like that. It's
8 intended to give them an opportunity to get together with
9 their peers in a facilitated seminar/workshop format to
10 learn about their own individual strengths and weaknesses
11 as a leader, and then to work on topics of interest to the
12 state as a whole and how they manage their programs.

13 We have TTI under contract with us and they
14 subsequently have contracted with the Eno Center for
15 Transportation Studies, Dr. Barbara Gannon and her staff.

16 They conduct a seminar in Pennsylvania for Pennsylvania
17 State DOT subrecipients, and they also conduct a national
18 transit executive seminar twice a year, so they have quite
19 a bit of experience in it.

20 We worked hard to try and put together a
21 curriculum which was distinctive from the oh so many other
22 leadership and management training courses that are out
23 there. We surveyed rural and urban providers at the
24 beginning on what their needs were, what their current set
25 of training was with respect to leadership, did quite a

1 bit of background work with that. We had 25 participants
2 last year.

3 We aren't planning to offer it next year. I
4 think we've tapped out on the level of interest, at least
5 within Texas, but I may take the step to engage the
6 Southwest Transit Association, representing six southwest
7 states, in terms of whether they're interested in a format
8 that might include folks from those other states as a next
9 step for us.

10 MS. CRAIN: Great.

11 MS. BLOOMER: And Eric, this is Michelle. Just
12 to confirm my memory, the focus is more on leadership and
13 management versus say the daily nuts and bolts items.

14 MR. GLEASON: It's actually on leadership and
15 not management and definitely not daily nuts and bolts.
16 Yes.

17 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you.

18 If there are no other questions, comments or
19 updates, I will take a motion to adjourn the meeting.

20 MR. ABESON: This is Al. Just before that,
21 Michelle, I presume we're going to get an announcement of
22 our next date fairly quickly?

23 MS. BLOOMER: Ginnie, can you help us?

24 MS. MAYLE: Yes. I'll work on that and get
25 something out to you, some proposed dates.

1 MR. ABESON: Thank you.

2 MS. BLOOMER: And that's still dependent,
3 right, on the rulemaking of the census impacts and it
4 maybe a while till we know when we're hitting that. Is
5 that correct, Eric?

6 MR. GLEASON: I think so. We're going to have
7 our meeting on the 27th and we'll talk amongst ourselves
8 about the process. I'll talk with Bobby Killebrew and
9 Kelly and we may be able to chart out a schedule before
10 that meeting I mean, I think there's only so much to be
11 done at this point and we're just going to have to sit
12 down and write some administrative code and figure out our
13 internal schedule for getting that approved through our
14 Office of General Counsel. So we'll try and get something
15 out before the end of September on the next meeting, if
16 not, it will be right around the end of September for that
17 next date.

18 MS. BLOOMER: Okay. Thanks, Eric. And I think
19 that would be great because I would like to attend in
20 person in Austin, especially if we're going to have a good
21 discussion on sort of the matrix that Al and Glenn put
22 together and then our next topics. Personally, I feel it
23 just helps to actually see people, it's kind of hard to do
24 this over the phone. So as much time as we all have, so
25 if we can possibly make it to Austin for the last meeting

1 of this calendar year, that would be great.

2 If there are no other items. Al, I think you
3 made a motion and then asked a question.

4 MR. ABESON: Sort of. Let me move adjournment.

5 MS. BLOOMER: All right. Any objection?

6 (No response.)

7 MS. BLOOMER: Hearing no objections, this
8 meeting is concluded. Thank you all.

9 (Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., the teleconference
10 meeting was concluded.)

11

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

MEETING OF: Public Transportation Advisory Committee
LOCATION: Austin, Texas
DATE: September 8, 2011

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages,
numbers 1 through 42, inclusive, are the true, accurate,
and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording
made by electronic recording by Nancy King before the
Texas Department of Transportation.

(Transcriber) 9/13/2011
(Date)
On the Record Reporting
3307 Northland, Suite 315
Austin, Texas 78731