

DRAFT MINUTES

HARTLINE STUDY GROUP FINAL MEETING
Friday, March 24, 2006 9:00 AM
601 E. Kennedy Blvd, 26th floor, Conference Room B
Tampa, FL 33602

Members Present (6)

Brian Blair, Chair
Chelsea Bridges
Norbert Gobin
Kathy Harris
Carlton Lewis
Barbara Merritt

Staff Members Present

John Dausman, Study Group Consultant
Sam Hamilton, HC County Atty's Office
Sandra Sroka, HC ADA Liason
Mary Shavalier, HARTline
Ray Miller, HARTline
Ned Baier, HC Plng & Growth Mgmt
Patricia Morrison, secretarial support

Members Absent (1)

Brian Delamer

Others Present

Gordon Dempsey
Bridget Chromwell
Mike McCoy
Loretta McKenny
Gloria Mills

Bill Schnell
Marilyn Smith
Konrad Smith
Sharon Streater
Mark Holan

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Brian Blair, chair, called the final meeting of the HARTline Study Group to order at 9:10 am. After introducing himself, Commissioner Blair stated this has been a great set of meetings, the public has been included in all of our meetings, and very much welcomed. Commissioner Blair asked each Study Group member and attendee to introduce themselves.

Mission Statements

Chelsea Bridges read the HARTline Mission Statement and Barbara Merritt read the HARTline Study Group Mission Statement.

Approval of minutes of March 10, 2006 meeting

Brian Blair called for comments and corrections to the draft minutes that were distributed before the meeting. Hearing none, Norbert Gobin moved that the minutes be adopted and Barbara Merritt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Marilyn Smith commented that she respected both the work and effort the members put into this study group. It almost didn't happen and I've told you why, but here you are. I just want to tell you that HARTline did not improve, they have

DRAFT MINUTES

given out a rather fallacious fairy tale of a business plan for the street car. How anyone could put their name on it as being management is not understandable. They've taken funds that are not authorized, that they are not going to get and put them as income or revenue; their expenses are way out of line; it is a fairy story. They are not going to change their ways until the BOCC forces them to. They just don't want to see reality. The reality is going to arrive shortly.

Mike McCoy, president of ATU Local 1593, thanked the committee for allowing the public to participate in such an open and relaxed forum. He commented that we don't get that very often.

Brian Blair thanked Mike McCoy and commented that the committee will bring its findings to the BOCC on April 5, 2006, at 2:15 p.m. (time subject to change). Commissioner Blair invited the public to participate as they have so graciously during the last two and a half months, to speak to the Board during the public forum at 9:00 a.m. Brian Blair asked John Dausman to review the handouts he distributed referencing the draft reports.

John Dausman commented that Study Group members received an e-mail a day and a half ago of the same draft that is available to the public today. He summarized two sections of the handouts, 1) the Executive Summary, pages 5 through 8; and 2) the recommendations, pages 9 through 12. He requested comments on pages 13 through 41 which are the descriptions of the information and the process. Even though the Study Group is reviewing the whole report, pages 13 through 41 are your consultant's description of the information you received and its process. He suggested that the Study Group concentrate on the Executive Summary and the specific recommendations. We have 20 recommendations in total. At the moment, you have adopted 1 through 4 as priority recommendations, 5 through 20 have been endorsed by the two subcommittees and discussed three meetings ago to be included in the final report. You have not taken an actual vote stating that recommendations 5 through 20 are exactly the way you want them to be. John Dausman referenced a single page handout from the first draft. I have received each of your comments and your thoughts and recommendations for follow up. I have received a few more recommendations even after the one page list was prepared. I want to talk about those suggestions to prompt Study Group discussion.

Kathy Harris commented that she thought that the Study Group got the report at the last minute and she had a board meeting yesterday. She did not have a chance to read it and analyze it in the fashion she would like to have done. First, the Study Group must not only approve the two sections John Dausman spoke about, but I think also the entire report because it will have the name of the Study Group. We do need to look at it in more detail than just the few pages that John Dausman pointed out. Secondly, the good we have done is compiling data and information stacks and stacks and so anytime you try to write a report based on

DRAFT MINUTES

that, it becomes a very lengthy process. I have found in my quick read, it doesn't specifically answer the questions of our mission, it assumes the reader has more knowledge than the reader may have. Probably because John Dausman's wealth of knowledge in this area, he can speak about these things as if everyone else knows what he is talking about, that is a concern of mine. Also, the structure of any report to me is valuable so it flows. Essentially, its the process we followed should be the report flow, those are my initial concerns. What I would propose is that we have one more meeting next Friday, a very short meeting, which will give John Dausman an opportunity to work on the finding of the report and incorporate the recommendations and changes so when we do approve it, we will receive the final document as it is going to be presented, that would be my motion.

Brian Blair commented that Kathy Harris is going to be presenting the report to the BOCC and both John Dausman and myself will speak, but Kathy Harris will be doing the overall presentation to the BOCC. I think it is imperative she feels comfortable in what she is saying and if necessary, I can be here for a short meeting next Friday.

Norbert Gobin commented that we met last week and that should have been the final meeting. The format was acceptable to me before. Kathy Harris disagreed with the format then. We have reformatted it. I think the 20 recommendations are still the same recommendations both committees agreed to nearly a month ago. I am very comfortable with the report as it is, and I think we should move forward with those. Tweaking pages 13 through 41 is fine, but I think the heart of the matter is those 20 recommendations.

Kathy Harris responded, referencing the Executive Summary handout, the report doesn't summarize what is in the report. To me, the Executive Summary was written to summarize what was in the report, which was one of my concerns. Anytime you give a fact, there should be a footnote. If you are saying there was press coverage, there should be the date of the coverage. If you are attributing to someone, the person who said it, their name should be there. If you are talking about other examples of ways to provide the service, then those examples should be given. I think that its all here, its just a matter of putting it all in the proper sequence and making sure we are not being overly repetitive in some other things we are saying.

Carlton Lewis responded to some of the comments from both Norbert Gobin and Kathy Harris. The comments that Kathy Harris made about the understanding this difficult of a document and whether it would be lay friendly, I don't think that should be the intent of the report. The audience are the people who have the power to do something about it. Even though John Dausman spoke technical jargon, the people who are making the decision have an understanding. I came to this meeting thinking I had some knowledge, but I have learned from the process. I don't think the path put before us could have been answered within

DRAFT MINUTES

such a short period of time when HARTline has been around for such a long time. I think HARTline has made an improvement but to find a solution to what we are asking, we have made progress towards our goal and have set a template for progress in a system that we could move forward. As far as another meeting, I think another meeting is not necessary. I don't see any reason to have another meeting.

Chelsea Bridges agreed with Carlton Lewis' comments. The Study Group has reviewed all recommendations over the past couple weeks and it's not new. If we could focus and go through the list, we could get them agreed and adopted. We don't need another meeting. Rearranging the report could be collaborated between John Dausman and Kathy Harris since Kathy is presenting the report to the BOCC.

Brian Blair asked the maker of the motion and the Study Group, if it would be acceptable to authorize Kathy Harris to meet with John Dausman to determine the format based on the information to present the report to the BOCC, since she is the presenter of the information.

Kathy Harris agreed as long as everyone is comfortable with that.

Carlton Lewis and Chelsea Bridges commented that they were comfortable with that.

Norbert Gobin commented the report is going to be presented in a PowerPoint presentation, 4 to 5 slides, or 10 slides and maybe including a few of my photographs. I understand wanting to capture footnotes, names and places, but I think we have done a superb job and the report should stay; I would defer to you on further changes and therefore, I don't believe we should meet next Friday. Any changes should reflect the same 20 recommendations as stated and agreed in the report.

Kathy Harris asked can you tell me where to find in the report, the cost and the benefits of the unincorporated county to participate in HARTline? That was our central question.

Norbert Gobin commented yes, the cost and benefits are found throughout this report.

Kathy Harris asked Norbert Gobin to show where in the report?

Norbert Gobin referenced in the handout several charts that show the rate of increase of the county versus the city, it had 800% for one and 500% for the city. Here is the percent of service for the county, here is the percent of service to the city. Those comparisons are being made through out this document. During the time of crisis, there were cut-backs and the county lost out. There was

DRAFT MINUTES

indications that there was not an allocation formula that holds HARTline to actually provide additional service to the county. There was indication by the lawyers that there is no legal hammer. Perhaps there is a legal hammer that needs to be changed in the governance; the issue of governance needs to be addressed. We do recommend freezing the ad valorem allocation beyond 2006. Unless there is some legal change, HARTline can continue doing business as it wishes.

Kathy Harris commented that doesn't answer the question, our first page should describe what the cost and benefits are of the unincorporated county's participation in HARTline. I think we've gathered that data, but its not clear in a forum of a report.

Chelsea Bridges commented that would be the report writing. We spoke about changing the report between Kathy Harris and John Dausman. We could vote on our 20 recommendations and at least get that done today.

Brian Blair commented to Kathy Harris that you have the authorization to deal with John Dausman on how to present the report to the BOCC. John Dausman you have done an outstanding job in putting this report together, the person that presents this report must feel totally comfortable with what she is going to say. When the study group for the indigent healthcare plan made their report, the person appointed to head the study group was chastised for a lack of detailed information. We want to add to our report a summary.

Kathy Harris commented I think John Dausman has done a great job to pull together just an enormous amount of information in a very short period of time to get it to this forum. I just want to be sure when we make our final report, that our recommendations are clear, based on sound information and easily readable by anyone.

Brian Blair called for a motion that Kathy Harris meet with John Dausman to work out the verbiage she feels comfortable with in presenting what we have already gathered. Motion moved by Carlton Lewis and Chelsea Bridges seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Carlton Lewis asked to get a copy of the report before it goes.

Ray Miller commented that it is important to identify the data sources referenced, a lot of this data came from different sources, most of which came from HART. He asked, how did this group come to identify equity? The use of revenue miles as equity is the core what you are measuring but how did you determine that is how you measure equity?

Brian Blair commented that equity was based on what you gave us with the beginning map. It came from a HARTline board meeting.

DRAFT MINUTES

Ray Miller commented you could measure equity in a number of different ways.

Brian Blair commented because that's what you gave us when I asked for it.

Ray Miller commented you asked for the data and we gave you the data and then the data turned into an interpretation of equity. Why is this data used as the equity definition? I am just giving you a general comment, it's your report. But certainly if I am reviewing it, I am saying what is equity?

Carlton Lewis commented as I said at our previous meeting, equity does not mean equality but fair share.

Ray Miller commented yes I think you should describe in your report how you concluded that. I am not saying it is right or wrong. I would think you should mention your definition of equity and how you came about getting to that conclusion.

John Dausman commented that actually half a dozen different measures such as revenue hours and revenue miles, passengers, load factors – were all measured. What I would clarify in the report based on your comment, is the charts that have specific route mile data as an example of how we came to what we have among the half dozen presented. It wasn't the sole feature, in fact, the spreadsheets from HARTline had miles, hours, passengers, rates, overhead, depreciation, and federal and state funding splits. I take that as a good suggestion to clarify the much larger range. Just because there is one chart to demonstrate a conclusion doesn't mean it was the only feature measured.

Brian Blair asked Ray Miller if grant dollars are based on population.

Ray Miller commented that's correct, that's one of the variables.

Brian Blair asked isn't it one of the larger variables?

Ray Miller commented its not countywide but defined as urbanized. Population is one of the variables, service miles and population density, so population is a key factor.

Carlton Lewis asked why has equity risen to such status and has such importance? He referenced questions 1 through 6 in the Mission Statement. At what point did we raise equity to that level?

Kathy Harris commented there is nothing in our mission that asks us to determine equity. There are different ways of measuring equity. I think what we are saying is this is what the unincorporated area is getting in terms of service miles. I think we also had a list of some other intangibles that probably need to

DRAFT MINUTES

be here. This is what they are paying for. If you look at that picture you are able to draw the conclusion that in these areas, the unincorporated area isn't getting as much. We talked more about making the distribution of resources in terms of is there any consideration by HARTline to unincorporated areas tax contribution in terms of the service. With everything that I have heard, what is in HARTline's mission isn't enough. You don't receive the money and say okay this is the unincorporated money, this is the city money, so we are going to divide the money up to provide the services. Maybe the heading is probably what brings you to that concern. I don't think that we were defining service miles as the determinant for equity.

Brian Blair commented if you go back to the HARTline board itself there were some opposed that fact. For example, the rubber tire trolleys to be replaced for five new buses at a cost of \$345,000 each or \$1.7 Million plus. I asked what it cost to put the fancy packages on the sides because that's what downtown Tampa wanted and those were \$35,000 a bus extra.

Ray Miller commented we are bidding it now, that's our estimate.

Brian Blair commented well if that's what downtown Tampa wants, downtown Tampa should pay for it. This funding comes directly out of monies that could be used for general buses.

Ray Miller commented it could be used for any additional capital expenditures. There is a need for additional buses right now.

Brian Blair commented there are other capital expenditures. That is one of the things that we discuss about the parity level. We are looking for the most relevant common denominator that people could understand.

Norbert Gobin asked did we approve the 20 recommendations?

Brian Blair answered no we have not voted yet.

John Dausman commented you voted on which ones to be redrafted by me to present to you and they were presented two Fridays ago. I am not remembering an actual vote to approve the redrafted list.

Norbert Gobin moved to vote on them and be done with it.

Kathy Harris asked was Norbert Gobin's motion to approve the recommendations or to call a vote on them?

Chelsea Bridges commented if you vote on them then you can open it for discussion before we vote.

DRAFT MINUTES

Brian Blair asked is there any discussion first?

Brian Blair called for a motion that the 20 recommendations be adopted. Motion moved by Norbert Gobin and Chelsea Bridges seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Kathy Harris commented I have a question on recommendation number 3. How do you see that being played out? Will there be a newspaper ad asking service providers to submit a proposal?

Brian Blair answered, first the BOCC would have to approve the recommendation. As we know, there are only a couple of things the BOCC could actually do. 1) Audit its contributions through impact fees. 2) Appoint county board members to the HARTline board that live in unincorporated Hillsborough County. The Board could move to make more of a balance. They can appoint up to six board members. The last thing we want to take away the half mil that supports transit. That's your only hammer I think after that, it would take two years is that right? There is governance verbiage that could be included as a secondary option to submit to the BOCC. What you can do immediately is hope that HARTline respects the wishes of the BOCC since the county is the largest contributor that keeps them a float. If they don't, that's for the entire BOCC board to decide.

John Dausman suggested that recommendation number 3 be revised to include Carrollwood because Carrollwood is such an important suburban area of our community. This change was suggested by Study Group members and I endorse that myself. The Study Group might want to consider that as you discuss this issue of priority recommendation 3, although its not exactly the question that was raised.

Kathy Harris commented I would want to make sure that the first part of recommendation 3 is written as it was intended. That HARTline notify all entities of the county, state and/or nation, that it welcome all qualified entities to contact HARTline and offer to submit a bid to provide vehicular mass transit in any and all areas of Hillsborough County. That's the part I want to make sure that we have a clear understanding of how that will come about. This to me is a critical recommendation that we talked a lot about in terms of privatization. I don't want the way it is worded to miss the important point.

Barbara Merritt commented on recommendation number 8 that the BOCC should request HARTline provide a plan of action. They are going to implement it; only HARTline knows what resources they have and what budget. If they are going to come back and share information, that's good, if we don't have a plan of action, it doesn't go anywhere.

DRAFT MINUTES

Kathy Harris commented Ray Miller could just put an article in the newspaper stating they did.

Ray Miller commented on recommendation number 3. I am not sure you if you are referring to all the services that we provide because there are clear regulations that can't displace existing employees. If we are going to issue an RFP, it needs to be for a specific amount of service and defined for anyone to respond to an RFP. New service would be a different situation, because we are not displacing workers. I don't think its your intent to displace workers which means we are paying two salaries for the displaced workers as well as the contractors. I think you mean new services.

Kathy Harris commented on recommendation 20 as the lead into recommendation 3 in the rewrite.

John Dausman suggested that the Study Group has consistently identified priority recommendations as the key issues. I don't think that it should be one member and your consultant deciding what goes into the priority recommendations. I do endorse the concept of recommendation 20 to undertake a study whether to privatize the management of the core system. If you want to move that up to either be included with recommendation 3 or a part of the priority recommendations the Study Group should vote on it. I would request that endorsement today from the group and then the crafting of the language can occur as you have already designated. Recommendation 3 is getting long already, but we can work that out.

Brian Blair asked if there is a motion to do that?

Carlton Lewis commented I don't know whether I would agree that it should become a priority recommendation. What's the clear benefit of moving 20 into the priority list?

Kathy Harris commented I think it helps clarify.

Norbert Gobin commented it could mean that people haven't read the whole thing and digested it. Otherwise we could take other recommendations and squeeze them into recommendations 1 and 2. Where do you draw the line?

Kathy Harris commented that its repetitive in certain areas and probably shouldn't be.

Norbert Gobin commented I recall when we tried to hold this down to 4 to 6 recommendations, but you insisted on having all these small ones. Now we are trying to merge them together.

DRAFT MINUTES

Kathy Harris commented that we have in our minutes from March 3, the consolidation of recommendations. I think once we are sure that all this consolidation is done, all of these things will be taken care of.

Carlton Lewis commented I have a question on what Mr. Miller said.

Ray Miller commented there are regulations under 13C of the FTA that protect workers and if you displace them you continue paying their salary for 6 to 10 years.

Carlton Lewis commented I thought the expansion of service would need more people.

Ray Miller commented if we displace an existing worker, you pay for 6 years.

Kathy Harris commented I thought that I was clear that we did not want to take any action on drivers.

Brian Blair commented, of course we don't, just the inclusion of the private sector.

Ray Miller commented the unions have done a great job in terms of protecting the workers.

Brian Blair commented that covers just the drivers, is that correct? That doesn't hold true to the staff, the administrative staff?

Ray Miller commented some of the staff are a part of the labor contract employees.

Kathy Harris commented the thing to think about is what are the rights of the employees when you run out of money? What do you do when you don't have the county unincorporated tax?

Ray Miller commented you sell equipment and terminate service. That's what you do. The community doesn't get any more transit service.

Kathy Harris commented you don't pay anyone for 6 years under that scenario. I think what we are trying to do is come to some agreement so we don't get to that point.

Ray Miller commented now, you have taken it to another level.

Carlton Lewis commented you have sliced it up for me, I am looking for expanded services and now we are saying we are accountable and can't change any services because they might displace the workers. I don't think we have a

DRAFT MINUTES

need to displace the workers. I think you might want to hire more people to fill in the gap.

Brian Blair commented you also need to do it efficiently and that's where they are talking about the audit. That has nothing to do with the drivers. If anything, we are going to need more drivers. That's the way I see it.

Carlton Lewis commented it also places HARTline in the bidding process if HARTline is out bid, HARTline would maybe be displaced if it didn't get the business.

Norbert Gobin commented we are trying to decide on these 20 recommendations not whether we are going to move forward on discussion. We keep getting side tracked.

John Dausman commented if I could add some comfort to the Study Group members the list of topics to be added to discussion of issue section includes some important scenarios that I believe came from your discussions and are particularly consistent with public input. The report does not acknowledge the fear of the public that they did not want transit service in the City of Tampa to be reduced and repeatedly, this Study Group has confirmed that is not the intent. The second, we also heard, that the bus drivers are not the problem, its not the pay rate, its not the cost, its not the doing of the job, in fact, just the opposite. What we heard from Mr. McCoy is the high rate of turnover due to morale issues, some of them are operational, meaning the high percentage of split shifts, which leads to high turnover, and we learned that other systems try different methods to solve some of these problems. It certainly doesn't mean firing the drivers, it means focusing on core routes, running traditional transit system in the core routes, you still have the drivers and union, every one of the companies contracted said if that is what we want they will take the union and all. If you want to contract out the management, if you want to provide us with everything from buses to facility, okay, we have that already. The issue of going immediately from looking at different options in the total mix to letting everyone go, there are 100 steps between those two and the last 75 of them, this Study Group was not involved in. So I would add the comfort that I wanted to raise those two issues for your endorsement that those themes should be in the report because we heard them in the Study Group. I didn't do that in the first draft, to acknowledge the public's concern about transit level inside Tampa, it's a real concern and a public fear, we don't want that to happen. And the second is the bus drivers are not the problem. That has never entered the intent of the group or the investigations because we didn't see any savings from that. In fact, the difference of the concept was that HARTline shouldn't be the agency to run all feeder services. But with the rate of turnover that occurs now, if some feeder services were provided by others, the turnover would soon cover that. Everyone in the union ranks would still have a job.

DRAFT MINUTES

Norbert Gobin commented I think we should call a vote.

Kathy Harris commented I just want to say one thing before we do that. In my recommendations when I presented them, I wrote them out in terms of each one started with the "BOCC should," we can take that phrase out of each one. Instead of saying "recommendations to the BOCC," you don't have to repeat the phrases every time. Secondly, anywhere in the report where it states that the Study Group had made a determination, there should be a vote by the Study Group so it's not an opinion.

Sandra Sroka commented would you want it to say, for example, at the March meeting the Study Group concluded.

Kathy Harris answered yes.

John Dausman commented that you won't find a vote on each topic. The intent of the meetings are represented in the Executive Summary. Kathy Harris disagreed with me she said, well, you are really approving the entire report and that's your privilege. I was adding caution that you should be very careful about the representations made in the Executive Summary its your choice because that would be your vote today.

Brian Blair asked Norbert Gobin what are you moving?

Norbert Gobin commented I think the 20 recommendations, this represents our 80% solution we have done in 90 days, after 12 meetings we are splitting hairs talking about phrases, that's just playing with words, I would rather leave it just like it is and vote on it. And I see other heads nodded, we are not lawyers here, just citizen representatives.

Brian Blair commented I think as long as the essence of the report stands firm, that we give Kathy Harris as we recommended earlier, the leeway to present it how she wishes. As long as the body is exercised. We have already voted to give you permission to that.

Sandra Sroka asked if 20 recommendations are where you want to go as your base?

Brian Blair commented yes.

John Dausman commented can I make a clarification? Does the vote of 20 recommendations include adding the word "Carrollwood" to the list. The group concurred, yes.

DRAFT MINUTES

Brian Blair called for a motion that the 20 recommendations be adopted. Motion moved by Norbert Gobin and Chelsea Bridges seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Brian Blair referenced the handout of suggestions from the public at the HARTline Study Group March 10 meeting where Robert Babbitt reported the national cost of the government running a bus service versus the private sector. There is a significant difference. Again that's something that fits into number 3. Also, we had brought up the governance issue. Kathy Harris, do you want to expound on that more?

Kathy Harris commented I think we received a memo from the county attorney's office and I think we probably want to include that into one of the appendices in order to require a legislative change. You can recommend a straw ballot, but I don't think that's where we are going. At least I am not comfortable to make that recommendation. I think this memo clearly lays out what the options are, I would recommend we include this in the appendices and make reference to it in the report.

Brian Blair commented do we need a motion to do that?

John Dausman commented that any public comments will be included into the public comments suggestion list of the document. Minutes of today's meeting will be placed in to the appendices of the minutes. That's all a part of the normal process. The occurrences of today's meeting become a part of this document. You've voted on the recommendations and added Carrollwood. There were some other suggestions. The write up of the report might include the concepts I've talked about acknowledging the public fears about levels of transit inside Tampa and drivers not being the problem. I've heard from a couple of people that we should clarify. The recommendation talks to the promises made in the November, 1980 referendum had not been met. The suggestion was made that we should clarify that the promises were made in the press, not in the specific referendum language.

Ray Miller asked who made those, who was the spokesperson?

John Dausman commented it is in the appendix and it was a group formed specifically by the transit supporters to go from a June 1980 failed referendum in both jurisdictions to a slightly successful one in November 1980. One of the chief spokesmen was the chair of HARTline at that time. There is good press coverage on that chain of events. We need to clarify in the report that those promises were made in the press by people speaking on behalf of the city government and the transit agency. But they were not in the referendum language, that is true.

DRAFT MINUTES

Kathy Harris commented also that the whole membership model as it is laid out in Chapter 163 in the Florida Statutes and as it is laid out in HARTline Charter, rests on the premise that the members will be provided a service based on their funding. I think that it should be added to this part, that's the whole basis of the membership, why join if you are going to pay something and not get anything in return? I think that's clear in the statutes, I think that is clear in the charter. I think that's even more important than what was in the paper.

Ray Miller commented you'll pull that section of the charter?

Kathy Harris commented yes.

John Dausman commented there was one more suggestion, which was the discussion lead by Carlton Lewis regarding the issues facing transit caused by development patterns that lead to barriers to providing good transit. I am guessing from the progress of this meeting, adding it as a specific recommendation maybe not be the way to go at this point. I was going to suggest adding this idea to the description of the process you have followed and what has happened, that along with three other things I have just referred to, that we add a paragraph or two describing that discussion. Is the Study Group of the mind that the county commission should include planning for transit early in the process and that long term, the issue of gated communities, walls and barriers needs to be solved because once they become older and more dense, it is very very difficult to provide any type of common access. I didn't hear any disagreement with that in the group and its not in this report yet. That was the fourth topic; this group endorsed and supported it and I would recommend adding it to the report.

Brian Blair asked how would it read?

John Dausman commented unless you take different action right now, it would not become one of the 20 recommendations, but they would become sections in the report that you supported them and that the historical record would show, you looked at that and those things need to be fixed.

Kathy Harris commented I would suggest that we go through and add to the report an introduction, a history and methodology and procedures. I think those areas can be added to one of those briefs.

John Dausman commented he put that section in the back rather than the front because a lot of people stop reading after the third or fourth page unless they get to something really good. The order of the report can be moved around. There is a section about the study group process, with history, vote of county commission, those materials, there is a place for all of these ideas.

DRAFT MINUTES

Brian Blair commented when you present it to the Board, you can do as you please.

Kathy Harris commented I think when that discussion came up there was a motion for us to craft verbiage regarding the planning as well.

Carlton Lewis commented I would recommend that the statement be included in the report. I would like to see that motion made and that we add that element to the report.

Brian Blair commented you would have to go to the Planning Growth Management and ask them to add that to make the communities more bus friendly.

Ray Miller commented I think that would be a piece of it, but it is also support of developer education, even county commission education about what you can do to make transit more attractive, efficient and equitable.

John Dausman commented the sum of the words to me is what Kathy Harris said best that we've heard from the planning community that they've long believed these principals. The message would be this group's endorsement to the BOCC, please take their message seriously, there needs to be more weight. The planning group is already thinking about this, its already documented. Just overlooked. The audience is the BOCC not the Planning Commission and not the Planning and Growth Management Department and other planners.

Konrad Smith commented I think John Dausman stated that well. I think that it is the county's comprehensive plan and land use plan where it gets into lack of density. It's not the planners' understanding of what can make transit more attractive or better utilized, it's the county's land use plan that drives the decision. Our current land use plan is not particularly friendly to transit in the unincorporated area for all those reasons that John Dausman just stated.

Brian Blair commented that would be nice to happen.

Mary Shavalier commented there are ways to do it for new development but it's the retrofitting issue that is such a challenge. It is so tied into the ADA accessibility issue which is important to the whole community.

Marilyn Smith commented we are talking about how troublesome this could be. Watching government in 1988 when we went through many issues about the I-75 corridor, there was a transportation plan to go down that corridor and make those commercial pods. That never got implemented. They just threw it out, all of those recommendations. I don't care what it cost to go back and retrofit, people deserve what they voted on. We can't just throw that out. No matter how inconvenient it is, its time to say enough is enough, lets do it right. Those bus

DRAFT MINUTES

drivers aren't going anywhere, but we will get management changes. That's what the problem is.

Barbara Merritt commented that the comprehensive plan needs to be updated every 5 years. Maybe it might be a recommendation that transportation be a special consideration with community plans that the BOCC is reviewing. We did my area, and its 50 years old.

Ray Miller commented the county commission updated its comprehensive plan this year and there is a series of workshops remaining this year.

Brian Blair commented we would move to add that into this year's remodeling the comprehensive plan.

Ray Miller commented I think that it would reinforce some discussion about issues that are already occurring. It'll be taken before the Board and planning commission over the next couple of months.

Brian Blair commented the timing is perfect for that.

Gloria Mills commented I have attended all the Study Group meetings. There is a lot of good in these meetings. This may be the time that Hillsborough County is really going to look at transit as an alternative mode of transportation. Not necessary the only way, but an alternative for people, especially with gas prices being so high. We cannot neglect the fact that anything that is done right is going to cost more money. We can debate about how to do it which tax is best or which fee. But you can't deny the fact that to go mass transit, its going to cost something.

Brian Blair thanked Gloria Mills for her comments. He informed her that this entire plan will be presented to the BOCC on April 5 at the regular BOCC meeting on Wednesday. Right now the time scheduled is 2:15 p.m. but as you know, that could change. We invite anyone who attended these meetings, if they'd like to comment on any actions to be taken during the board meeting beginning at 9:00 a.m., during the public comment section. If you'd like to comment on what you have seen pro or con with the Study Group; that would be deeply appreciated.

Gloria Mills commented April 5 is busy for me, we'll see what we can do.

John Dausman asked the Study Group whether it wanted an actual motion or just a concurrence to add the thoughts. As long as you don't want a recommendation, the group concurs with the description of adding the thoughts and I am grouping them together of the public fears of not reducing transit in Tampa, the bus drivers are not a problem, and the development planning process that the BOCC should endorse moving transit to a more prominent

DRAFT MINUTES

position in the planning process. Those can all be added descriptions as long as we don't have any strong objections but if you want an actual motion for one or more of those recommendations, then I think you should take a vote.

Brian Blair agreed and asked to add Temple Terrance to the comment on city service levels because even though they are smaller, we want to assure them that we are not out to take a bite out of their service because they are a participating municipality.

Kathy Harris commented that is important to add. You would have to look at how the county has changed over the past years. The initial way of providing transit in terms of having a central downtown area flow out also needs to be looked at in terms of planning. If you are planning a transit system that is based on an old premise of a downtown central system, central city, and the central city now maybe there is one in Brandon or Plant City so the sprawl has to be taken into consideration in the planning of the mass transit system as well as the county's planning. I would make sure that we include both sides of that in the planning process.

Brian Blair commented good point.

Barbara Merritt commented that state agencies have to be completely reviewed every 10 years. Everything has to come back to the drawing board. I don't know if that would be appropriate to add that language into the governance. There has to be a complete overlook by everyone but I don't know how we do it on HARTline, how each jurisdiction has their say. The Sunset provision would be one thing we could look at. I don't know.

Brian Blair asked Sam Hamilton to comment.

Sam Hamilton commented, I don't believe there is any kind of sunset provision in Chapter 163 under transit authorities, it would obviously require a legislative change.

Brian Blair commented it would be through governance.

John Dausman commented no motion for an additional recommendation, so we are staying with the 20 recommendations. With that, pending final public comment, we are done.

Brian Blair called for final public comment.

Gloria Miller requested Mr. Dausman send her the meeting minutes.

John Dausman commented they will be posted on the Study Group website as soon as they are done. With Patricia Morrison's help we have been getting them

DRAFT MINUTES

out about a day and a half later, so Tuesday morning they should be on the county website and I can e-mail them directly to Gloria Mills. If anyone else wants e-mail direct, let me know, otherwise look on the HARTline Study Group A to Z index. This draft report with alterations will go there too.

Carlton Lewis commented to everyone who have been here, thanking them for being here, it has been a tremendous experience, a learning experience for me and I consider it an honor to have served with such tremendous minds and people. I would have never perceived to have come to this point in time working with a Study Group but it has been a true honor and privilege to work with you. I think you put your heartfelt minds and talents forth and I want to thank you. I am glad to have worked with you.

Brian Blair thanked Carlton Lewis for his comments.

Bill Schnell commented as a Hillsborough County resident I want to thank everyone for taking time out to do this as it was needed for a number of years. I really appreciate everyone who donated their time and talents for this endeavor.

Kathy Harris thanked the public for their involvement from the beginning. She thanked HARTline, Mary Shavalier, Debbie Ward and Ray Miller for their participation. She thanked the Study Group members for their participation and the help from the county attorney's office, Christine Beck and Sam Hamilton for bringing things forward.

Brian Blair started by thanking all the board members, you have been great. HARTline staff, thank you so much for all of your participation. The public has been dynamic, Sandra Sroka thank you for coming and being with us the whole time and county staff also to reiterate what Kathy Harris said. I would also like to thank Kathy Harris for chairing the Finance Subcommittee. Thank you to everyone who has been here. As Ray Miller concurred in the past, a lot has been learned just through this committee by HARTline sitting in here, I think a lot of changes have already taken place. I believe some are on the drawing board that we have talked about just because of the dialogue that everyone had here from the public to the board members to everyone that has been here. I thank our consultant, John Dausman who has done an outstanding job and I thank you John [applause]. I see Gordon Dempsey, Channel 8 is here, I see Tampa Tribune, Mark Holan. Hopefully, the bus riders will be the ones will gain the most from all this hard work. I appreciate everyone.

Kathy Harris commented I will get you all my comments to John Dausman by Monday.

Brian Blair adjourned the meeting at about 10:30 am.