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

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

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

So it's a pretty quiet time for us at the commission right now, and in terms of our workload throughout the year, that's pretty consistent with what a typical year looks like. We get really busy with the commission around grant program awards pretty much around the start of the calendar year and that continues on through June or July, and then we enter a quieter period, mostly because the federal program budgets aren't approved
as early as they might be and we typically don't get
apportionments until after the first of each year. So
that's our schedule with the commission.

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

Also, on behalf of the Midland-Odessa operator
we submitted a request for $3 million for a multimodal
facility, and on behalf of Texas State University a
project to purchase some commuter route buses of $3-1/2
million. Those last two submittals for Texas State
University and Midland-Odessa, Midland-Odessa could have
submitted on its own, they asked us to do, they weren't up
and running in the grant.gov program which was the way we
needed to submit these projects so we did that for them.
Other notices of funding availability, there was a livability initiative, and on behalf of the City of Conroe we submitted a $2.1 million project there.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Okay. Thank you.

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

The other major effort was around the TIGER III --

MR. GADBOIS: Eric?

MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir.

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

MR. GLEASON: Yes, sir, you can.

MR. GADBOIS: When last we left our heroes there was discussion at the semiannual meeting about the list of projects being about three times what you expected to get in funding, and you had requested that people give
some thought to how you might prioritize those projects or create a shorter list.

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: For what you actually submitted. And so if you can't address that now, you can just send to us what the rationale for the decision ended up being, but that's mainly why I was asking about this.

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

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

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

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

If the feds say we're going to give you $5 million for free, that's a relatively easy process for us. If we're going to give you $5 million for facilities, that's much more difficult because those tend to be chunkier in their needs. And then if they just say we're going to give you $5 million for you guys to decide amongst fleet, facilities and intercity bus how you want to spend it, that's the most complicated one of all. And so while it would be good news to get the money, we're...
going to have work really hard collaboratively together to
try and figure out how best to spend it should we be
successful.

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

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

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

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

And from a legislation standpoint, there's two
very different pieces of legislation, one in the Senate
and one in the House, either one of which is dead on
arrival in the other chamber. The Senate version is a
two-year version with more money in it that Senator Boxer is proposing, and then on the House side of things you've got Representative Mica with a six-year version but only with enough money in it that is identified as projected coming from the Highway Trust Fund, so quite a bit less money, in Representative Mica's bill, it is a six-year bill.

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

We're in reasonable shape here as a state from a federal program standpoint for our basic services, if for no other reason than because of the recent history of not actually getting federal apportionments until well into the spring of a federal fiscal year. Our programs generally don't draw down or need their federal program dollars until later in the fiscal year, and so most systems either run initially off the state funding they have which was awarded in June of this year, or use remaining federal program balances from the previous federal fiscal year, or some combination of both.
So we really don't anticipate any immediate crisis, if you will, around being able to sustain basic public transportation systems.

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

I don't know if the committee wants to explore that one any further or not, and I'll open it up for questions at this point on that topic if you want. (No response.)

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

We now have the urbanized area criteria that the census is going to use. Once again, the census isn't
going to announce their final determinations until the
spring, but we've got a set of final urbanized area
criteria and we are asking TTI to take those and apply
those against the research they've done and to pull
together what they think is our best guess at the moment
on the impacts of the census. And I think, Kelly, Linda
Cherrington is thinking they can complete that work by the
20th of September, and we do have an advisory group
meeting scheduled for the 27th of September, so we'll be
diving into that just as soon as we get it.

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

Any questions on that one?

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Eric, has
there been any discussion at the state level on the Census
Bureau's final criteria related to the agglomeration and
the fact that the Census Bureau has now done a 180 on
their proposed criteria where the small urbanized areas
would become part of larger urbanized areas and now
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they're saying they're not going to do that, that 2,000 small urban areas would remain?

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Well, if you go back to the work that actually resulted in that number, in that $3.2 million, if you go back to that work, when it was done it
actually assumed, with the exception of McKinney and Dickinson -- I think, Kelly -- with the exception of those two areas it actually assumed that all the other areas continued to get state grant funding. So we kind of missed the agglomeration issue when we did the calculation. So the good news is the census determination is largely consistent with our assumption.

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

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

At the end of the day, everybody, the $3.2 million is actually a two-year number in total. The annual impacts of the census were forecast to be $1.6 million a year, we have $3.2 million in this next biennium. We don't anticipate having to use any of this money until the second year of the biennium, so I'm
confident that we have enough money to get through the
next two years. The issue may be when we come up with a
total impact number, the issue may be whether or not on an
ongoing basis the additional $1.6 million a year is
enough. Does that make sense?

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay.

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

MR. GLEASON: Yes.

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

MR. GLEASON: Those systems, if you take places
like Temple, for example, that is forecast to go over,
they would still continue to get state grant funding. The
amount they would get, their population which accounts for
half of the amount they get, is capped at 199,999, and so even if they grow to 225,000 or 230,000, they only get credit toward the first 199,999.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: I don't have any plans to try and do that analysis. I think it's a good suggestion. My hope is many of those systems have already done it and
understand it themselves, because there are some nuances I think in the federal program for programs that go over that threshold initially.

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

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

MR. KIRKLAND: Eric, this is Kelly. That is described in the research product that TTI prepared, the census impact report, and there's just a description in there of this is what's likely to happen. Particularly those three areas, Killeen-Temple-Belton, Amarillo and Brownsville, are likely to go over 200,000, and then if there is no change at the federal level they would lose the ability to use their federal 5307 funds for operating.
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MR. GLEASON: Kelly, isn't there some transition recognition at the federal level, though?

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Right.

MS. BLOOMER: I think, Glenn, you bring up a good point and something we've been talking about as a committee related to the census impact, I know, Eric, we've been talking about it at the PTAC and state level for quite a while, we've been telling in our region our providers since they became eligible for urban funds in
2003 to start thinking about it and the possibility of the eligibility to use their funds for operating assistance. I don't think I can comfortably say that any of them are any better prepared today than they were in 2003 when we started warning them, but I think that is a good idea looking at the operating assistance and what it does.

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

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

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

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

And then I think one other issue to add on that is sort of the timing and the cash flow issue. With the
2000 census we had a lot of providers -- and I continually say this and maybe a little dramatize it -- that one day were 100 percent and the next day they were 50 percent rural and 50 percent urban, and how at the state level we can sort of assist in transitioning folks like we're talking about at the federal level, so you're not one day you're a small urban and the next day you're a large urban and then all the requirements that come with that.

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

MS. BLOOMER: Perfect.

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

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

MR. GLEASON: Yes. I don't have the list with me, let me try and remember off the top of my head. I was hoping I might not have to answer that question. Let's
see, we have Bryan Baker from Spartan South Plains, we have Norma Zamora from Brownsville Bus, Dave Marsh from the central area, Carole Warlick, of course we have J.R., and we have Linda Pugh from the Texarkana area. How am I doing, Kelly?

MR. KIRKLAND: John Hendrickson from Waco.

MR. GLEASON: And John Hendrickson from Waco.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: As far as I know, and I talked to James Bass, who is the department's chief financial
officer on Monday and he didn't have a schedule for the effort yet. Hopefully that will get underway relatively soon. I think it's always good to tackle these issues fairly expeditiously once they're raised, so hopefully there will be something there shortly.

And that completes my report.

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

MR. GLEASON: On the new executive director?

MR. ABESON: Yes.

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

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

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: This is Glenn. The announcement
that went out in the paper was for the interim executive
director that is in place until they hire an executive
director.

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

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

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

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

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

   MR. ABESON: Okay. Thanks.

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

   (No response.)

   MS. BLOOMER: If not, we'll move on to agenda
item number 4, Review and adopt the PTAC Strategic
Plan/Guiding Principles. And I'd like to turn it over to our subcommittee, Al, Glenn and Kelly. Al, would you like to kick us off?

MR. ABESON: Sure. Thanks.

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

So working together through conference call and the magic of the computer and the internet, we came up with the draft that you have in front of you. I think that most important are the principles themselves, secondly is, of course, the way in which they would be used and that relates to the grid that we threw in at the very end of the principles just as one possible approach to ranking potential activities using the principles.
And with that, I would hope that after we discuss to the degree that we need to discuss -- and I'm not quite sure how to read the fact that there were no comments from anybody but I guess that could be a good thing -- that we would adopt the principles and I would hope take the next step which is to define what the next step is. Hopefully that's helpful.

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

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

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

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

(General laughter.)

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Glenn. This is Michelle. And thank you, Al and Kelly, as well. Are there any comments from the rest of the committee on the Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles?

(No response.)
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MS. BLOOMER: I do have to admit, and I apologize, I didn't get to read them until this morning. It's been kind of crazy here. I had every intention to review them last week and get my comments to Kelly as requested, but I fell a little short.

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

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

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

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

And then sort of bigger ones, on Principle 6, I think to be consistent with the other ones we need an action verb in front of there. We say, Recruit, retention
and training of personnel. I think it would be good to be consistent with all the other principles if we have a verb, either encourage, support, or I thought maybe enhance. And I think it would also be extremely beneficial if we add that second sentence that says, Application of this principle means what. Because I think that's where we sort of get into how we go back to measure how well we're meeting that principle.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Are there any other comments from committee members?
MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. The only comment I had is I'd just like to say the same thing everybody else has said, I think you guys did a good job on lining those out and I think they look good.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Thank you, Eric.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: This is Michelle. Yes, I would agree with that.
MS. CRAIN: And this is Christina. I would just add, Michelle, that you're going to work on just basic grammar, that sort of thing.

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

MS. CRAIN: No.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: That's kind of where I started out.
MR. ABESON: And that was never my intent. Why don't we just treat that as basically a working document that would be used in applying the principles. Is that a legitimate way to go?

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

MR. ABESON: Okay.

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

MR. ABESON: Right.

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

MR. ABESON: So moved. This is Al.

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

MS. BLOOMER: And again just to make it easy, J.R.?
MR. SALAZAR: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Brad, did you join us?

(No response.)

MS. BLOOMER: No. Okay.

Christina?

MS. CRAIN: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Glenn?

MR. GADBOIS: Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: Al?

MR. ABESON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BLOOMER: Michelle, yes. All right, we have unanimously approved our guiding principles and strategic plan. Great job, everybody.

MR. GLEASON: Great job.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. That concludes item 4.

Eric, do we have the flexibility just to sort of reiterate our plan since our first item was to work on the Strategic Plan/Guiding Principles in September, October-November we're looking at rulemaking for the census impact, possibly TDCs, and then starting or effort in January-February of taking our guiding principles and strategic plan and applying it to an item, either the coordinated planning or the 5310 Program?

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

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

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

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

MR. GLEASON: That works. As individuals if
you want to take a crack at that, yes.
MS. BLOOMER: And this is Michelle. I think I just heard Glenn volunteer.

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay. I think that would be helpful, Glenn, if you could help us sort of compile all the ideas we've talked about and maybe coordinate with the other members if that's an item of particular interest to them that they could help you fill out the matrix, and then hopefully in advance of our next meeting we could share sort of what all those ideas were and where they fall in the matrix so we can actually have a discussion about which items and determine which one or two items we want to work on at the beginning of the new year.
MR. GADBOIS: Certainly. And I'm just going to announce, Al, I'm coming to you as our master strategist to coordinate with you as well.

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

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

MR. GADBOIS: Certainly.

MS. CRAIN: That would be great.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Okay, great. Thank you for that update, Glenn.
Any other updates?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. MAYLE: Correct.

MS. CRAIN: This is Christina. Can you explain a little bit about what the class is and who you're
MR. GLEASON: Christina, this is something that we put together for the first time last year, and it's the Texas Transit Leadership Seminar. It's a seminar that is focused on both current leaders in those rural and urban systems that get state grant funding, as well as their direct reports, their deputies, people like that. It's intended to give them an opportunity to get together with their peers in a facilitated seminar/workshop format to learn about their own individual strengths and weaknesses as a leader, and then to work on topics of interest to the state as a whole and how they manage their programs.

We have TTI under contract with us and they subsequently have contracted with the Eno Center for Transportation Studies, Dr. Barbara Gannon and her staff. They conduct a seminar in Pennsylvania for Pennsylvania State DOT subrecipients, and they also conduct a national transit executive seminar twice a year, so they have quite a bit of experience in it.

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

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

MS. CRAIN: Great.

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

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

Yes.

MS. BLOOMER: All right. Thank you.

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

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

MS. BLOOMER: Ginnie, can you help us?

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BLOOMER:  All right. Any objection?

(No response.)

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

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

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.

9/13/2011
(Transcriber) (Date)

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