



**TEXAS
FREIGHT
ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**



Texas
Department
of Transportation

Freight Advisory Committee

November 2, 2017, 8:30 a.m.

TranStar, Houston, Texas

Attendees

Committee Member	Organization	Attendance
Judge Emmett, Chair	Harris County	Present
Steve Boecking, Vice Chair	Hillwood Properties	Present
Ron Beeson	Lubrizol Corp.	Not Present
Russell Boening	Texas Farm Bureau	Not Present
Randy Brogoitti	Brogoitti Construction	Present
Paul Cristina	BNSF Railway	Present
Drew Crutcher	Landgraf, Crutcher & Associates	Not Present
Bryan Daniel	Governor's Office of Economic Development and Tourism	Designee Present
Michael Dyll	Texas International Freight	Not Present
John Esparza	Texas Trucking Association	Designee Present (Les Findeisen)
Roger Guenther	Port of Houston Authority	Present
Luis Hinojosa	Uni-Trade Forwarding, LLC	Not Present
Judge Clay Lewis Jenkins	Dallas County	Designee Present (Martin Molloy)
John LaRue	Port of Corpus Christi Authority	Designee Present (Jennifer Stastny)
Brenda Mainwaring	Union Pacific Railroad	Not Present
Kevin McIntosh	Kansas City Southern (KCSR)	Not Present
Jeff Moseley	Texas Association of Business	Not Present
Rolando Ortiz	Killam Development, Ltd.	Present
Keith Patridge	McAllen Economic Development Corp.	Present
Juan-Carlos Ruck	HEB	Not Present
K. Alan Russell	The Tecma Group of Companies	Not Present
Carlton Schwab	Texas Economic Development Council	Not Present
Todd Stewart	Gulf Wind International	Present
Jack Todd	Trinity Industries, Inc.	Designee Present (Josh Jemente)
Ex-Officio Members		

Christopher Evilia	Waco MPO	Present
Erin Ford	Retired – Houston County	Not Present
Senator Sylvia R. Garcia	Texas State Senate, District 6	Present
Clark Greer	Coca-Cola	Not Present
Rep. Armando Martinez	Texas House Member, District 39	Not Present
Rep. Sergio Munoz, Jr.	Texas House Member, District 36	Not Present
Rep. Poncho Nevarez	Texas House Member, District 74	Not Present
Mayor Pete Saenz	City of Laredo	Not Present
Gerry Schwebel	IBC Bank	Not Present
Danny Smith	United Parcel Service	Not Present
Paul Treangen	TNW Corp.	Designee Present (Clayton Kendall)
Matt Woodruff	Kirby Corporation	Not Present

TxDOT and Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI)

Caroline Mays	TxDOT
Peter Smith	TxDOT
Kale Driemeier	TxDOT
Sondra Johnson	TxDOT
Ricardo De La Parra	TxDOT
Charles Airiohuodion	TxDOT
Bill Brudnick	TxDOT
Arielle Carchidi	TxDOT
Peter Espy	TxDOT
Norma Y. Garza	TxDOT
Tim Juarez	TxDOT
Raquel Lewis	TxDOT
Travis Milner	TxDOT
Eliza Paul	TxDOT
Alisha Peña	TxDOT
Tony Uribe	TxDOT
Casey Wells	TxDOT
Beverly Kuhn	TxDOT
Jolanda Prozzi	TTI

Cambridge Systematics Team

Paula Dowell	Cambridge Systematics
Elizabeth Welch	Cambridge Systematics
Joe Bryan	WSP USA
Marie Lewis Adams	Nancy Ledbetter & Associates, Inc.
Steve Noble	Atkins

Other Attendees

Michael Bomba	Univ. of North Texas
Gary Bushell	Alliance for I-69
Maureen Crocker	GCRD
Georgi Ann Jasenovec	FHWA
Barbara Koslov	Harris County
Patrick Mandapaka	HGAC
Bruce Mann	Port of Houston
Sherry Pifer	SH 130
Michael Reeves	Ports to Plains
Joel Salinas	HNTB
Christopher Sallese	Dannenbaum
Russell Schaffner	Tarrant County
Kenneth M. Williams	GHP

Meeting Action Items:

- Committee members will provide any additional comments on the TFMP by Friday, Nov. 3, 2017.
- Project team will update the TFMP and submit to the Texas Transportation Commission.

1. Welcome & Introductions

Judge Emmett welcomed the group. He noted the excitement of the Houston Astros winning the World Series; however, the group is here to review the Texas Freight Mobility Plan (TFMP). It might be a shorter meeting than usual; he noticed the draft report was already bound.

Steve Boecking thanked the project team and TxFAC members who helped prepare and review the plan.

The TxFAC members introduced themselves. Caroline Mays thanked committee members; she acknowledged the process has been a sprint, but appreciated members’ diligence and time. She also introduced Casey Wells, a new TxDOT freight team member.

2. Review of Comments Received on the Draft Freight Plan

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of comments received on the draft TFMP during the public comment period from Sept. 26 – Oct. 26, 2017. She reviewed a printed document distributed to the TxFAC members which included all public comments and how the team responded. Not all comments required changes; some were simply commentary, and many were duplicates. Several commenters expressed praise and/or support for the TFMP. Ms. Dowell thanked the TxFAC for providing input throughout the process, and noted the TFMP was a better document due to TxFAC comments.

Paul Cristina noted the team made many positive revisions based on comments from the railroads.

Ms. Dowell added that TxDOT is on the verge of getting a new data set, which will be included in future plan updates. Comment 27 on page 61 lists additional projects suggested to be added to the plan – they are included in a proposed project list, Appendix B.

Senator Garcia asked if the printed document represented all comments received, or only those which resulted in plan changes. She thought 130 comments was a small number; people might not be paying attention to this process. Ms. Dowell replied the printout only included written comments received during the public comment period – not the ones that had been discussed during TxFAC meetings, or those received during stakeholder workshops. Senator Garcia noted the team needs to clarify that these are only the comments received during the comment period, but input was incorporated throughout the process.

Chris Evilia stated there are parallel processes going within the 25 state MPOs that also informed this process, and the team might want to note that as well. The MPOs also engage stakeholders within their regions in order to develop plans.

3. Final Review of the Draft Freight Plan and Recommend for Commission Adoption

Judge Emmett noted on the list of acronyms, ATA should be American Trucking Associations, plural. AAR is shown correctly in the acronym list, but Page 1-9 references the American Association of Railroads, when it should be the Association of American Railroads. He suggested the committee review chapter by chapter.

Roger Guenther asked to what extent committee members could see how comments were addressed. Ms. Dowell said prior to this meeting, the team had been posting track changes versions of each chapter online, but they got too messy to be readable. However, the printout of public comments shows how the team responded to each comment, and the TxDOT comment table has a response column.

Chapter 1

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 1, Introduction, which sets the stage for the TFMP.

Martin Molloy noted page 1-8 introduces the concept of 313,000 centerline miles – is that general roadway miles, or TxDOT miles? He thought there were 80,000 miles of TxDOT highways in Texas. Caroline Mays said he was correct, 313,000 represents all roadway miles. The language will be changed to say roadway miles, not highway miles.

Roger Guenther mentioned page 1-9 states Texas ports handle the second-most maritime tonnage, but lead the nation in international and intrastate waterborne shipping. How can Texas be both second and first? Ms. Dowell stated Texas does lead in international and intrastate, but not in interstate trade. Louisiana is the overall leader. Caroline Mays asked the ports how they would like that section to be worded. She recommended separating the sentences.

Judge Emmett stated when people think about freight, they don't just think in terms of crude oil and petroleum products. Overall movement of ships is the more important measure.

Steve Boecking recommended keeping the measures constant, and only including what really matters to the readers.

Roger Guenther noted the document consistently uses tonnage, which is a good measure. Chris Evilia agreed tonnage makes the most sense for the TFMP, since it affects the need for infrastructure.

Mr. Guenther stated the third sentence in the paragraph was the most important part, which talks about ports as economic engines. He recommended keeping the part about Texas having the second-most overall tonnage, and scrapping the rest. The second part of the second sentence muddies the water.

Jennifer Stastny suggested including the tonnage of all Texas ports in a box on the page.

Todd Stewart asked if there was a way to define deep vs. shallow-water ports. Caroline Mays said yes, the team could add a footnote.

Martin Molloy stated he would keep the mention about international trade, but not intrastate.

Chapter 2

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 2, Strategic Goals, which lays out a list of plan goals and compares them to goals in the Texas Transportation Plan, TxDOT Strategic Plan, and FAST Act.

Mr. Molloy asked whether the goals and policy/program recommendations in Chapter 2 follow the same logical order. Ms. Mays said yes; the whole document follows the goals. A graphic on page 2-8 shows the hierarchy of strategic goals and sums them up.

Paul Cristina noted the railroads communicated with the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) about the idea of a multimodal investment strategy for the state. Can the second objective under Goal 7 on page 2-6 just say “potential funding sources” instead of “potential alternative funding sources”? The committee agreed this change is appropriate.

Chapter 3

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 3, The Importance of Freight Transportation to the Texas Economy. She mentioned the team changed many of the graphics in the chapter in response to comments. Paul Cristina noticed there are now more trains in the graphics.

On page 3-8, Judge Emmett asked whether “delivery” could be changed to “movement” in the first sentence under Rail Economic Impacts. Also, the second sentence states that historically, railroads have been considered only for bulk commodities, which is not really true. In past days, railroads delivered all types of goods. Maybe “historically” could be changed to “in recent years” or “in recent history.”

Three sentences later on the same page, Judge Emmett asked the team to change “This enables the railroads to provide...” to “Railroads now provide...”

Judge Emmett said he attended a recent conference which included a lunch presentation on the dramatic growth in air freight due to e-commerce; that should probably be included on page 3-9.

Ms. Dowell stated it was included under trends in Chapters 4 and 8, but the team could add a sentence in Chapter 3 as well.

Roger Guenther noted the section on Waterborne Economic Impacts on page 3-8 only alludes to energy. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) is helpful for other commodities as well. Ms. Dowell said the team could expand the reach of industries.

Randy Brogoitti asked about the reason for including bicycles on page 3-9. Are we setting ourselves up for bicycle freight lanes? Ms. Dowell acknowledged the team did receive some public comments on that; it is an emerging trend. Todd Stewart concurred. Mr. Brogoitti stated it seemed too detailed for a statewide plan. Judge Emmett suggested deleting the mention of bicycles and keeping “personal courier services,” which could include bicycles.

Rolando Ortiz argued that if a mention in the plan would help secure funding for downtown bike lanes, it could improve overall transportation. However, he agreed “personal courier services” should cover bicycles.

Steve Boecking noted page 3-10 talks about the importance of freight reliability for manufacturing and raw materials, which is true, but it is also applicable to finished consumer goods. Ms. Dowell noted the plan included language on delivery of finished products, but Mr. Boecking suggested adding a mention of consumer goods specifically.

Clayton Kendall said page 3-13 discusses Class I railroads serving agricultural customers across the state, but does not mention shortline railroads, which should also be included. Ms. Mays agreed.

Chris Evilia asked whether a description of industries was included for the graphics in the chapter; Ms. Dowell replied the descriptions had been moved to a technical document in the appendix.

On page 3-12, Exhibit 3-6, Judge Emmett noted the legend should say “e.g.” instead of “i.e.,” since the legend is providing an example of the commodities depicted. Ms. Dowell stated actually, automotive and electronics are not examples – those are the only things included in the graphic. The map is intended to provide an illustrative example of a complex supply chain. Perhaps the title of the map should change.

Judge Emmett asked whether the tonnage flows shown relate only to those industries; Ms. Dowell said yes. She reiterated that the team would change the title of the map.

Randy Brogoitti felt the first bullet point, sixth sentence on page 3-17 (“In the case where there is hydraulic fracturing...”) seemed to imply there are some cases that do not include it. Pretty much all wells drilled these days include elements of hydraulic fracturing. He recommended starting the sentence with “Hydraulic fracturing generates.”

Steve Boecking said the next bullet point on page 3-17 regarding resins seemed to indicate that all resins go out through the Gulf, when they are also exported through east and west coast ports. Judge Emmett suggested removing “Gulf” and leaving just “ports.”

Judge Emmett noted that Exhibit 3-9 only shows oil and gas moving from wells to refineries via pipeline, when a fair amount moves by truck when pipelines are not available. At the Port of Victoria, energy moves from well to truck to barge to refinery. Paula Dowell said the team could change the title of the exhibit to denote that it is an example of the supply chain.

Senator Garcia asked about the paragraph in red italic text on the top of page 3-18. It seems like such a general comment; why is it there? Ms. Dowell noted the other chapters have a similar summary at the end. Paul Cristina agreed, but noted Chapter 5 was different – it included a conclusion, in regular font. Judge Emmett said each chapter should be consistent. Ms. Mays suggested including a consistent summary section at the end of each chapter, in regular font.

Barbara Koslov stated the verbiage that accompanies Exhibit 3-6 should state that it shows an illustrative example of advanced technology and manufacturing freight flows.

Chapter 4

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 4, Overview of Trends, Issues, and Needs.

Judge Emmett asked if “drone pilots” was the correct term on page 4-14; Ms. Dowell said yes.

Paul Cristina mentioned the bullets on page 4-9 which discuss the amount of truck activity generated by one oil or gas well. He said the railroads could provide the number of rail cars needed to start re-fracking operations, etc. Caroline Mays welcomed the input but noted the team needs all comments no later than Friday, Nov. 3.

Judge Emmett noted the same sentence about drones on page 4-14 should say shippers “and carriers.” Steve Boecking added that if the report mentions some shippers/carriers, others will be offended; he recommended removing mentions of specific companies.

Chris Evilia noted Exhibit 4-3 on page 4-3 shows 2016 imports from Mexico totaling \$81bn, when the paragraph below says imports total \$294bn – which is it? Paula Dowell said the exhibit shows Texas numbers; the number in the paragraph below is for the whole U.S.

Mr. Evilia also mentioned it was hard to see which trend is high, medium, and low in Exhibit 4-5 on page 4-7. There needs to be consistency between the paragraph and the exhibit.

Randy Brogoitti said Exhibit 4-6 on page 4-10 seemed to correlate with the previous discussion on pages 4-8 and 4-9, but then the report goes immediately into a discussion on renewable energy. It is hard to determine which graphic relates to which discussion. Can the renewable energy paragraph be dropped down lower on the page so it relates to the right exhibit?

On page 4-4 under Panama Canal Expansion, Steve Boecking said he was not aware that the expansion would result in freight shifting from west coast ports to the Gulf region. Roger Guenther said the report is correct, there has been a shift.

Martin Molloy asked if the TFMP intends to address modal equity. Instead of burying it, should it be included as a goal or policy in this report? Paul Cristina said ideally, yes; the railroads talked

directly to the TTC about that issue. At this point, the railroads assume there is a separate discussion occurring on that front. Ms. Mays noted the team has extensively addressed railroad comments about modal equity, including a word-by-word review of policies in Chapter 11. Mr. Cristina agreed the policies include much more multimodal language, but multimodal and modal equity are two different things.

Caroline Mays agreed modal equity should be emphasized in the policy recommendations.

Under the Panama Canal Expansion on page 4-4, Todd Stewart suggested the team state the expansion will reduce delays within the canal only. Also, it already has reduced shipper costs.

Chapter 5

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 5, Freight Policies, Programs and Institutions.

On page 5-8, in the second paragraph on Texas ports, Jennifer Stastny recommended adding “or contract service providers” to the end of the sentence on mixed ports. On page 5-18, she recommended changing “public funds” to “local tax revenues.” Also, for better continuity, she suggested moving the second paragraph under “Ports” to after the first sentence, then the rest of the first paragraph can become the new second paragraph.

Ms. Stastny recommended changing the language on Rider 48 to say it funded “public roadway connectors to ports”; Rider 48 did not fund inside-the-gate port projects. Also, under Funding for Port Capital Improvement Projects, it should again say “public roadway connectors to ports.”

Roger Guenther also noted the first sentence under “Ports” on page 5-18 should first say ports are funded with port revenue, then local tax revenue second.

Rolando Ortiz asked if this language also applied to land ports; Ms. Mays said no, just sea ports.

Jennifer Stastny stated the section on page 5-23 titled “Rider 45 and 48” should instead be called “Port-Related Funding Initiatives.”

Ms. Mays said section 5.5 would be titled “Summary” instead of “Conclusion,” as discussed earlier.

Chris Evilia suggested some additional language for page 5-5 under the Metropolitan Planning Organizations bullet, including “regionally significant projects within an MPO area are required to be identified within a Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Non-attainment MPO areas have the authority to determine how CMAQ planning occurs in those regions.”

On page 5-17 under “Railroads,” Paul Cristina said the sentence starting “Operating revenues include...” should be deleted, and the following sentence combined with the first.

Steve Boecking noted page 5-8 under “Texas Airports” states that Fort Worth’s Alliance Airport is completely private, which is not true; it is owned by the city of Fort Worth.

Senator Garcia stated pictures always tell a story. She went through all the chapters, and there are no pictures of airports or pipelines. It would also help to have a picture of multimodal loading/unloading, etc. Also, the Texas Senate Transportation Committee is having a hearing on Nov. 15 regarding UTP funding and infrastructure impacts from Hurricane Harvey. Members need to hear from the TxFAC in the interim. She invited TxFAC members to come and testify.

Caroline Mays said she asked Senator Garcia to look through the Executive Summary and provide input.

Jennifer Stastny noted page 5-19 says more than \$300m has been invested in Texas ports since 2010, but page 6-3 says \$1.1bn. Ms. Dowell said the data is from two different sources, but the team would make sure the information is consistent.

Chapter 6

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 6, Designating the Texas Multimodal Freight Network. She noted the TxFAC's significant involvement in creating the network.

Randy Brogoitti stated page 6-4, section 6.3.1 implies that all rural highways are divided, when that is not the case. Ms. Mays said yes, that was the goal of the Texas Trunk System, but it has not been fully implemented. The team will revise the language.

Martin Molloy recommended page 6-11 include information on how the Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs) will be updated in future.

Jennifer Stastny said the sentence at the bottom of page 6-15 should say "two million or more." On page 6-16, the third sentence of the paragraph at the bottom should refer to the GIWW as a "shallow-draft waterway."

Judge Emmett asked whether the team decided to use the term "shortline" rather than Class III railroad, such as in the legend for Exhibit 6-10 on page 6-15. The railroads said yes.

Keith Patridge noted that Exhibit 6-9, Texas-Mexico Commercial Vehicle Border Crossings, showed 14 border crossings. The Donna International Bridge also permits empty containers and should be counted as the 15th.

Martin Molloy noted page 6-12 mentions that CUFCs will be evaluated and re-designated annually in coordination with large MPOs, which is good. TxDOT and the MPOs will need to talk offline about the details of how that will work.

Chris Evilia said he envisioned the MPOs identifying those facilities through the transportation planning process, but it would be larger number of miles than allowed by FHWA. The MPO would then prioritize. The Federal system is very prescriptive, with few miles available.

Judge Emmett asked whether the Port of Calhoun was shown on the proper bay in Exhibit 6-11 on page 6-16. Jennifer Stastny said yes.

Chapter 7

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 7, Freight Assets, Conditions, and Performance.

Paul Cristina said page 7-24 may need to include differentiation between Class I and shortlines, because their needs are not the same. Perhaps the team should include a small paragraph describing differences between classes in terms of weight limits, etc.

Mr. Cristina also asked whether the third mobility and reliability performance measure on page 7-49, regarding percent of the shortline network with 286,000 lb weight capacity, was a useful measure. It may look like the rail network is not meeting its goals, when many shortlines may not need that much weight capacity. Clayton Kendall concurred that many shortlines do not require that high of a weight limit.

Chris Evilia inquired how many miles of two-way frontage roads discussed on page 7-22 are in urban vs. rural areas. Two-way frontage roads in urban areas may be more of a priority. Ms. Dowell said the team could add in that information.

Randy Brogoitti asked if Exhibit 7-17 on page 7-21 includes all truck parking facilities. It seems that the map only shows TxDOT-owned rest areas, and does not include private parking. Ms. Dowell said the team would double check and clarify that information in the write-up.

Jennifer Stastny requested that section 7.3.1 on page 7-28 refer to “Texas maritime ports” instead of “seaports.” Also, Exhibit 7-26 on page 7-32 says the Port of Victoria cannot handle unit trains, when it handles unit trains regularly.

Chris Evilia asked whether the section on freight airports on page 7-37 includes a discussion of displaced thresholds that may reduce runway lengths, or mentions that certain weather conditions can require longer runways. Steve Boecking said generally speaking, 10-11,000 ft. runways cover all weather conditions, and the report may not need that level of detail. Ms. Dowell said the team could add a sentence stating that weather conditions can affect runway requirements.

Chapter 8

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 8, Freight Demand, Forecasts and Scenarios. The team made significant updates to this chapter in response to TxFAC comments. The forecasts are less specific, and the team added several disclaimers.

Steve Boecking felt the population and employment forecast information on page 8-1 was confusing; the first bullet talks about counties growing by at least one million people, then adds that McLennan County is growing by 38 percent. The report should be consistent between numbers and percentages.

Judge Emmett was not sure why McLennan County was called out. He asked whether the report defined the Texas Triangle; Ms. Mays said yes, in the Trends, Issues and Needs chapter (Chapter 4).

Paul Cristina said he thought the team did a good job of disclaiming the forecast information, and felt satisfied with the edits.

Martin Molloy noted page 8-28 includes information on alternative freight futures, and says the recommendations in Chapters 11, 12, and 13 have been evaluated against the futures. However, that is the last time the futures are mentioned in the whole report. Ms. Mays apologized, and said all mention of the freight futures were intended to be deleted from the document. Section 8.3 will be removed.

Chapter 9

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 9, Strengths and Weaknesses of the State's Freight Transportation System.

Chris Evilia noted differences between the way traffic level of service (LOS) is described on page 9-1, and how it is shown in exhibits on pages 8-13 and 8-14. He recommended the report be consistent. Ms. Dowell agreed.

Paul Cristina said the railroads had asked the team to delete the bullet on page 9-4 about the need for additional connectivity in west Texas, or to clarify that it came from stakeholder input. Also, at-grade crossings do not necessarily create bottlenecks. On page 9-10, under public- and private-sector collaboration weaknesses, there should be a bullet about lack of funding sources.

Judge Emmett said the same section under public- and private-sector collaboration weaknesses states that the public sector has a long-term planning horizon and the private sector has a short-term horizon. Is that really true? That bullet should be removed, or changed to say something about inconsistent planning horizons or potential differences between planning horizons.

Jennifer Stastny said the fourth bullet on page 9-4 under Ports and Waterways should talk about connecting "deep-draft to shallow-draft ports" instead of "large to small." Judge Emmett said it was really more than that. Jennifer Stastny suggested just saying "connecting ports," and Judge Emmett agreed.

Chris Evilia suggested page 9-12 note the federal funding program remains highly siloed and prescriptive.

Randy Brogoitti noted the second bullet on page 9-12 talks about reliance on the gas tax, when it should be the fuel tax.

Martin Molloy stated the first bullet on page 9-1 should be reworked. It needs to emphasize that the 80,000 miles of TxDOT highways create the most extensive highway network in the nation, not the 313,000 miles of public roadways. Ms. Dowell said the team would verify and clarify the information.

Steve Boecking said page 9-6, section 9.2.1 states that NAFTA eliminated all tariffs and trade restrictions, which is not necessarily true. A better term would be "qualified."

Rolando Ortiz noted the last line of page 9-6 includes a footnote reference in regular font size.

Paul Cristina said the comment on page 9-12 about a lack of dedicated funding sources for leveraging private funds should be identified as a weakness in the funding and financing section.

Chapter 10

Paula Dowell discussed an overview of Chapter 10, Freight Project Identification and Prioritization.

Chris Evilia stated page 10-3 under Metropolitan Transportation Plans should clarify that these plans are required to talk about freight in some fashion. The section should clarify whether NCTCOG and HGAC have standalone freight plans, or freight subsections of their overall plans.

Rolando Ortiz inquired whether the gaps identified with no planned projects (page 10-5) refer to gaps that the strategic projects are intended to fill. Ms. Mays said no, this is just the needs identification process.

On page 10-21, Future Updates, Martin Molloy stated the MPO wants to know the process for including gap projects going forward. Is there a list of gap projects in the appendix? Ms. Mays said the plan does not include a list of gap projects. The implementation process involves working with TxDOT districts to see what projects could be included to address the gaps. The freight team does not develop projects – that is in the hands of the districts and the MPOs. Paula Dowell added the TFMP does have a list of proposed projects, but stopped short of matching those projects to identified needs.

Chris Evilia noted that statewide plans, MPO plans, districts plans, etc. all mutually inform one another.

Chapter 11

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 11, Freight Policy and Program Recommendations. The team undertook a detailed review of the language for all the policies.

Paul Cristina asked if the policies had been consolidated or re-ordered. Ms. Dowell said yes, the chapter consolidated from 21 to 19 policies.

Judge Emmett said page 11-2, section 11.1.3 should be titled “Coordination with Adjacent States and Mexico,” without “Other.”

Paul Cristina asked if TxDOT had identified any project selection criteria that would allow non-highway modes to compete on the same level as highway projects. Peter Smith said no, that is still a work in progress. Paul Cristina asked if the recommendation to include multimodal project selection criteria was included elsewhere in the policies; Ms. Mays said yes.

Chris Evilia said it was important for section 11.2.2 on page 11-5 to clarify that TxDOT will identify the entire universe of freight need beyond the limited federal requirements. Ms. Mays agreed. When the project team went through the Critical Rural Freight Corridor (CRFC)

designation process, they identified 26,000+ candidate miles, but could only include 745 CRFC miles. However, 26,000 is the true universe of need.

Martin Molloy noted Chapter 11 includes policy and program recommendations, but Chapter 14 has policy and program recommendations as well. He asked about the difference between the chapters. Ms. Mays stated Chapter 14 is an implementation plan for the recommendations. She said the team could include “implementation” in the Chapter 14 section titles, if that helps to clarify the difference.

Steve Boecking asked if the document was a draft printing, since some of the page numbers are cut off. Ms. Mays said yes.

Martin Molloy asked if Exhibits 14.1 and 14.2 were copied from the plan into the Executive Summary. Ms. Mays said yes, but the group would discuss the Executive Summary later.

Paul Cristina said page 11-9 should refer to rail as a practical modal “option” instead of “alternative.”

Martin Molloy noticed “highway” is listed in the preamble to the program recommendations on page 11-12, but it is not actually covered as a program recommendation. There is a write-up in the appendix that covers highways. He recommended the team either remove highway from the preamble, or add it into the program recommendations.

Chapter 12

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 12, The State’s Unconstrained Freight Investment Plan.

Judge Emmett said the numbers in Exhibit 12-11 do not add up, likely due to rounding. The cost of high priority projects should be \$626m, not \$625m. The total is \$670m.

Paul Cristina recommended that the second sentence of the first paragraph on page 12-13 state that grade separation projects will be identified by the MPOs and the TxDOT Rail Division, not the Class I railroads.

Chris Evilia said the first sentence of the same paragraph should say “separating,” and not “removing,” the crossings. Steve Boecking said the sentence also needed commas.

Caroline Mays noted the team would be making an addition recommended by Commissioner Vandergriff; he wanted to see a breakdown between urban and rural highway projects.

Paul Cristina asked whether the “Strategic Initiatives” section on page 12-26 presented a good opportunity to raise the issue of modal equity. He was not sure if referencing the Alameda corridor was a good idea, as it can elicit varied responses from stakeholders.

Chapter 13

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 13, The State’s 5-Year Financially Constrained Freight Investment Plan.

Randy Brogoitti noted there is a breakdown of urban/rural projects on page 13-7, with a bullet point about fully-funded projects, but nothing about other types of projects. Is this germane to information Commissioner Vandergriff wanted? Ms. Mays said no, this chapter is the financially-constrained plan and it can only include fully-funded projects.

Chapter 14

Paula Dowell discussed Chapter 14, Freight Transportation Implementation Plan. She noted there was no new information in the chapter, just a summation of action steps for Chapters 11-13.

Paul Cristina recommended the last bullet on page 14-1 say “highway” traffic congestion.

Martin Molloy suggested adjusting the titles of the tables in Exhibits 14.1 and 14.2 to “Recommended Freight Policy Actions, Short Term,” etc. Ms. Mays agreed.

Mr. Molloy stated there were 21 freight policy recommendations, not 19. Ms. Mays said yes, there are still 21 policy recommendations.

Randy Brogoitti noticed the bullet on page 14-2 regarding identifying current and future energy transportation needs. The future is so unknown, so how do you identify future needs? Could that bullet be modified to say “identify and continue to monitor current and future energy transportation needs”? Ms. Mays agreed.

Judge Emmett asked for clarification on the discussion of 19 vs. 21 policy recommendations. He said he only saw 18 items in the policy tables on pages 14-1 and 14-2. Paula Dowell said there are really 18 actions to implement 21 policy recommendations.

Martin Molloy suggested revising the language in section 14.1.2 regarding implementing programs according to a timeline. Ms. Dowell said the team would rework the whole section.

4. Final Review of the Draft Executive Summary

Paula Dowell introduced the draft Executive Summary, which will provide highlights of the TFMP and hit the key points. The document is aimed at policymakers and stakeholders, who may not review the full detailed plan.

Steve Boecking said he liked the comment about the plan meeting the FAST Act requirements.

Judge Emmett asked the team to revise page 7 to say 313,000 total “roadway” miles. He also took issue with the key commodities listed under highways; when thinking of highway traffic, he did not often think of minerals, clay, concrete, etc. Paula Dowell said the figure was correct in terms of tonnage, but the commodities could be replaced with consumer goods.

Paul Cristina also disagreed that chemicals are a main commodity for railroads. Ms. Dowell recommended removing all mentions of key commodities and the committee agreed.

Todd Stewart noted the goals on page 2 give the appearance of being ranked in terms of priority, even if it is not intended that way. Ms. Mays agreed, and noted TxDOT's highest priority has always been safety.

Roger Guenther noted the committee has discussed priority of the goals in the past. He recommended removing "Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3," etc. so there would be less of a sense of priority.

Martin Molloy and Todd Stewart recommended moving up Goal 8, Economic Competitiveness.

Rolando Ortiz noted page 7 references 19 border crossings, but if the Donna International Bridge is added in the document, it should be 20 (to be consistent).

Paul Cristina asked about the source of the data on freight volumes on page 3. Ms. Dowell said it came from Chapter 3, and Mr. Cristina recommended citing the initial source. Ms. Mays noted that sourcing takes up too much room in a brief document; all that information is in the plan itself.

Martin Molloy recognized that if the team changes the order of goals in the Executive Summary, it will need to be changed throughout the TFMP document as well.

Barbara Koslov noted that pages 14 and 15 reference program before policy recommendations, while the document always lists policy recommendations first. These should be consistent.

Martin Molloy also noted that pages 14 and 15 are not the actual policy and program recommendations, they are the actions to implement the recommendations, which needs to be clearly stated.

Judge Emmett said the Executive Summary should include the actual policy and program recommendations, before the actions.

Roger Guenther liked the initiative for the Texas Global Gateway concept on page 18. He asked Judge Emmett how the effort could get started. He noted the Port of Houston has a Port Authority Advisory Committee, but it does not get much involved in policy.

Judge Emmett said the initial impetus has to come from TxDOT. All three of the groups listed (Border Trade Advisory Committee (BTAC), TxFAC, Ports Advisory Group) were formed by TxDOT. He asked about the makeup of the BTAC; Ms. Mays said it included county judges, MPO directors, border city mayors, and export trading companies. Secretary of State Cascos augmented the committee with representatives from the different modes, like trucking and rail. The current Secretary of State wants to add more private sector members. The Texas Ports Association includes all ports, and should be part of this. Judge Emmett said that was risky, because if you have a trade advisory committee in the mix why not add trucks, railroads, etc. The makeup of the advisory groups needs to be better defined.

Roger Guenther again asked how the effort could get underway. Ms. Mays said it could start right now. TxDOT has considered bringing the TxFAC, BTAC, and Ports Association together for a summit.

Rolando Ortiz asked if the BTAC was working on a Border Master Plan; Ms. Mays said yes. Mr. Ortiz said the two plans need to be in sync. Tim Juarez, who oversees the Border Master Plan process, said the TFMP will be the starting point for the Border Master Plan.

Roger Guenther said he had some additional comments about Chapter 11, which could be discussed after the meeting.

Judge Emmett said the bar chart at the bottom of page 19 should be consistent in terms of order between high, medium and low priorities. Also, the projects in the chart add up to 595, while the box at the top says 599 projects.

Chris Evilia asked about the meaning of the 2015 cost figure under Capacity/Congestion on page 9 – is that lost productivity, and is it an annual figure? Ms. Dowell said yes, it represents impacts to the industry. Mr. Evilia also felt the first statement under Public Awareness/Education implies that the public is slow on the uptake; maybe it should say “communicating” instead of “lack of understanding.” Also, a timeline should be identified for the costs under Funding.

Paul Cristina asked if there was a way to couple the bar chart at the bottom of page 9 with the descriptions page 10; someone might look at the chart only, and not see the following disclaimers.

Caroline Mays said the team would make some changes to the border crossings challenges section on page 9 – it will include border wait times and delays, and the need for coordinated border management. The numbers will be moved to another section, because they are facts, not challenges. Also, under Connectivity, the team will add some multimodal language.

Randy Brogoitti noted there was no mention of I-69 or I-20 in the third bullet point on page 11.

Chris Evilia said page 12 mentions coordination with neighboring states, but it should mention coordination with Mexico as well.

Steve Boecking asked whether there were only two strategic projects identified on page 18; Ms. Mays said yes. These are projects that are not in any plan today. Judge Emmett said the paragraph at the top of the page needed to be rewritten. It should not say these are “significant investments” – it should say that these projects have been identified as being critical to the future of Texas, but are not currently in any plan and need to be developed, etc.

Chris Evilia recommended the constrained Five-Year Freight Investment Plan show a map of projects, but realized it might not be very useful or visible on a statewide scale. Ms. Dowell said that map exists in the plan, but is not very informative.

Paul Cristina again asked the team to add “highway” before traffic congestion on page 16.

Judge Emmett brought up the two-page photo in the back of the document, and asked if SH 153 shows anywhere in the plan. He asked why the document devoted two pages to a rural highway. It doesn't make it look like Texas has a congestion problem at all.

Barbara Koslov said the chart on page 22 shows a total of \$65.8bn, but the text says \$64 bn. Ms. Dowell said the team would change the text to say \$66 bn.

Rolando Ortiz felt the document was difficult to read with the white text on blue background vs. red. He thought the previous plan's Executive Summary was easier to read.

Martin Molloy noted there are really only two specific projects listed in the whole document – the strategic projects. If the Executive Summary will be widely read, why are these called out? Ms. Mays stated the summary could not include all 612 projects; the strategic projects were highlighted because they need to be developed. The freight team itself cannot develop projects.

Judge Emmett suggested including the strategic projects at the end, so they follow all the other projects. Ms. Mays said the team placed them on page 18 because they are part of the unconstrained plan. If they are moved to the end, the context is lost.

Roger Guenther said for the document to tell the story correctly, it should discuss first-priority projects before those that are unplanned and unfunded.

Martin Molloy noted the TxFAC does not select projects, but informs policy recommendations. It reads like the group is recommending projects. Ms. Mays explained they are not really projects, but feasibility studies.

Judge Emmett stated the unconstrained plan already has 200+ proposed projects; it can stand alone. He again recommended moving the strategic projects to the very end in a smaller box, since they are not even part of the freight network.

Paul Cristina asked whether the section on multimodal and alternative technology freight corridors (page 18) could include "alternative modes and technologies" instead of just "alternative technologies."

Judge Emmett recommended dropping "sea" from the last part of that same sentence so it says "ports and international border gateways."

Roger Guenther asked if this initiative was limited to port and border regions; Ms. Mays said no. Judge Emmett recommended coming up with a new description.

Ms. Mays said the team would be adding information to page 5 about policy and regulatory issues that will shape freight's future. Refining will be added to the section on energy. On page 20, they will remove the table with the different modes, and add them as bullets on the previous page.

Todd Stewart noted that while safety is TxDOT's top priority, the first sentence of the document does not mention safety.

Ms. Mays said the next two topics on the agenda, “Freight Plan projects submitted for FY 17 National Highway Freight Program funding” and “Freight Plan projects let since 2016 adoption” were informational, and she would send copies of those materials to the committee.

5. Freight Plan Implementation

Caroline Mays covered the team’s next steps. They would revise the document and submit the TFMP to the TTC. The TxFAC needs to send a letter to Chairman Bugg that the committee recommends this plan be adopted.

Roger Guenther recommended the TxFAC give authority for TxDOT to move forward; Rolando Ortiz seconded. All members were in favor.

Ms. Mays discussed TxDOT’s upcoming implementation efforts, including developing an implementation framework, a Highway Freight Network Technology and Operations Plan, Freight-Centric Highway Design Guidelines, a Statewide Truck Parking Plan, multiple regional/district freight studies, and an analysis of the economic impact and consideration of freight transportation. She noted the TxFAC’s role going forward is to champion these efforts and provide ongoing input.

Paul Cristina noted the TxDOT Rail Division, HGAC, and NCTCOG were all scoping rail studies.

Ms. Mays stated the rail subcommittee has been very successful; they will also be focusing more on rural issues in the future. She appreciated shortline railroads being part of this process. She thanked the MPOs, which have added a good dimension to the discussion, and emphasized the need to continue working together. Local issues are often the most visible, and MPOs need to be looking at local freight projects. She thanked truck and port modes, as well as all members, for participating in the TFMP update.

Peter Smith added that MPOs will play a big part in implementing projects in the unconstrained plan. TxDOT needs to get its plans lined up with MPO plans in order to get projects funded.

Chris Evilia said most MPOs in the state are beginning the next MTP process. They will probably be seeking out stakeholders to help develop those plans.

6. Open Discussion

Caroline Mays concluded by stating the whole process could not have been possible without Judge Emmett. Without his leadership and efforts, the plan would not be what it is. She communicated her appreciation on behalf of TxDOT, and thanked the TTC, Paula Dowell and the consultant team, Georgi Jasenovec and FHWA, her staff at TxDOT, and Peter Smith.

Judge Emmett said this was not a goodbye, but the TxFAC has been very helpful and productive. He thanked all members, and said TxDOT and the consultant team have done a great job. He said he would attend the upcoming TTC meeting.

Meeting adjourned 1:42 p.m.

