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MEETING AGENDA

9:00 to 10:00 - Welcome and Introductions
10:00 to 10:05 - Adoption of May 21, 2019, Meeting Minutes
10:05 to 10:15 - Summary of BTAC Activities
10:15 to 11:50 - Discussion on the Texas-Mexico Border Transportation Master Plan
11:50 to 12:00 - Open Discussion - Future Meetings and Topics
12:00 - Adjourn

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Good morning, everyone. Buenos días. Thank you for taking your seat.
I hope you've all had the opportunity to get some coffee and some treats. And at this time, we are very excited to start our meeting and we're going to start by turning it over -- by calling the meeting to order, of course, and then turning it over to Marc Williams. Good morning.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Secretary.
Thank you very much. And, Secretary Hughes, welcome. We are so excited to have you here and excited to have you join us here with the Border Trade Advisory Committee. As you will find out, this is a -- this is definitely a working committee.

And for the members of the committee, we are honored and excited to have Secretary Hughes joining us and being part of this effort. I've had the opportunity to sit down and visit with the Secretary about the work of this committee, along with Caroline Mays and Brian Barth and some of our team and have really described to her about the great work that this committee does and the importance of this committee to not only the Texas Department of Transportation, but the State of Texas. And Secretary Hughes was very enthusiastic about getting this next committee meeting
Mayor Saenz and other local officials were very generous hosts and I was honored to have the opportunity to tour the World Trade International Bridge and see firsthand the impact that trade and our border communities have, not just on Texas, but truly our entire nation. I was also grateful to have the opportunity to speak with Mayor Saenz and local officials about the unique challenges and opportunities that your communities face in expanding the cross-border economic activity.

And as I told the Mayor, this was my first trip to Laredo. It certainly will not be my last. And I appreciate IBC and everyone that were so wonderful in hosting me and welcoming me there and really sharing with me the challenges that you face in Laredo. My office has a meeting scheduled next week for El Paso. And in the weeks to come, we're going to continue to travel to the border to meet with stakeholders on issues that are critical to your communities. After having these experiences, I want you to know that I am committed to ensuring that I can be a voice for all of the border communities here in Austin and I've heard from all of you and I agree, for example, that the longer wait times are affecting business along the border on both the Texas and the Mexican side. So it is one of my goals for this committee and my hope that we can work together to do all that we can do to have a positive impact on our border communities.

By having a clear and well-defined Border Transportation Master Plan, we're going to communicate to our state, federal, and international counterparts our needs and priorities to help our border communities thrive, understanding that truly your success is our success as a state. As we progress through today's meeting, I want to keep in mind a couple of questions that we can address in our open discussions later this morning. One is we'd love to hear: How have the changes in wait times affected business operations in your community? The second is: What are two or three of the top issues that you believe as a committee we need to address? Third: What are some of the solutions you believe can help alleviate some of that impact? And four: How can we at the state level more effectively communicate this information to the entities that can make a difference? I look forward to hearing from each and every one of you today and ask that you consider me an ally in Austin for the needs of your respective communities and stakeholders throughout the border.
region. Thank you for being here. I'm really looking forward to learning more about the different backgrounds as we go around the table for introductions. And before we move on, I'd like to recognize a few special guests participating in the meeting with us this morning who represent the strong bond of collaboration and friendship that we want to maintain with Mexico.

First, let me start by recognizing someone who in a short time has become a friend and a strong ally in the daily work of strengthening the relationship between Texas and Mexico and that's Consul Pablo Marentes, who has been the new Consul General of Mexico in Austin since this summer and accompanying him is the Consul for Political Affairs, Jorge Salcido.

Thank you for joining us today. Both of them were instrumental in making my first trip to Mexico as Secretary of State a huge success by facilitating some of the meetings that we are able to hold there. I'm very grateful to them for that.

Furthermore today, we have two guests representing our neighboring states, Nuevo León and Tamaulipas. Please join me in recognizing Noé Fernando Garcia Cabeza de Vaco of Tamaulipas. And since he's sitting right next to them, I need to give a shout out to my fellow Commissioner at the Workforce. Commissioner Alvarez, thank you for joining us today on BTAC. But I want to thank all of our special guests here for their continued participation and engagement in this committee. Please send my warmest regards to Governor Rodríguez of Nuevo León and Governor Garcia Cabeza de Vaco of Tamaulipas.

So I'll begin our round of introductions with them and then at the end of today's discussion, I hope you can all stay after we have worked on this plan for the Texas-Mexico Border Transportation Master Plan for taking a group photo to commemorate our first meeting and thank you.

At this time, I will turn the microphone over to Consul Marentes to let him introduce himself to the group and then we can begin going around the table.

CONSUL MARENTES: Thank you. Muchas gracias, Secretary. Thanks a lot.

This is a privilege for me, for a councilman from Mexico for (inaudible) also to be in such an important meeting that begins today (inaudible) by Secretary of State in a very, very short time. She gives her entire time to this wonderful dream that (inaudible) Mexicans and Americans. Even though some
was a pleasure meeting you earlier and I'm very pleased to hear that you've already been to Mexico. That's an unusually quick time for a Secretary to do that, and I compliment you on that. We look forward to working with you and for you.

COMMISSIONER ALVAREZ, III: Good morning, everyone. My name is Julian Alvarez. I'm with the Texas Workforce Commission.

MR. CAMPIRANO: Good morning. Eduardo Campirano with the Port of Brownsville.

MR. GARCIA, JR.: Good morning. My name is Josue with Cameron County International Bridge System.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Good morning, everyone. I'm Gerry Schwebel with IBC Bank here in Texas.

MS. LOPEZ: Good morning. Marga Lopez, Progreso International Bridge.

MR. GIESBRECHT: Good morning, everybody. I'm Jacob Giesbrecht from Presidio.

MR. CALVO: Good morning. I'm Eduardo Calvo, the Secretary of Director of the El Paso MPO.

MR. ALVAREZ: Good morning. My name is Pete. I'm the TxDOT Pharr District Engineer.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good morning. Humberto Gonzalez, Director of TP&D for the TxDOT Laredo District.

TO welcome you and we want to thank BTAC members for showing up for the meeting and look forward to the discussion today. And with that, I'll turn it to Marc for a few more comments.

And I think what the Secretary wanted to do was after Marc makes comments, she wants to hear from you, take a few minutes to hear from you on some of the questions she asked earlier, she layed out, to give her some of your own words so you could give her some perspective on your involvement here and what you see kind of moving forward. So just kind of want to tee that up.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Caroline.

Looking through the agenda today, we're going to get into the weeds, get into a lot of technical details. This is -- as I mentioned before -- very much a working committee and I think we're going to exemplify that with the content that Caroline and her team have prepared for us today and I'm looking forward to the discussion.

So I'm going to be very brief. And the one comment that I would like to make is to recognize one of the members of this committee. This week, Gerry Schwebel was recognized in College Station as the winner of the Russell H. Perry Award that the Texas Department of Transportation.
So please, again, just remember to state your name clearly in the microphone as you speak during the meeting. And the first order of business is adopting the minutes. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes? Okay. Are there any questions about the minutes?

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Move for approval.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: All right. Well, now that I have a motion to approve the minutes, do I have a second?

MS. LOPEZ: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: All right. It's been seconded.

Everyone in favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Any opposed?

All right. The motion passes. Thank you all. The motion passes. Thank you.

At this time with the minutes from our last meeting approved, I will turn it over to Caroline to provide us with a summary of the BTAC activities.

Good morning, everybody. The last time we met was back in May and, you know, again some of the slides you saw at the last meeting; but with Secretary Hughes, she asked that we kind of give a recap of what you guys have done last year and this year and then kind of where we're going.

So as you can see up here, several things you all have done starting in 2018 and here I wanted to just capture what the role of BTAC is. You guys kind of know what your role is; but, you know, for the benefit of everybody in here, some of the key roles of BTAC is really to provide, one, help us identify the challenges and issues along the border, but to be a sounding board. As the Secretary mentioned earlier, this is a sounding board that talks about border issues, border policies, and also makes recommendations not just to TxDOT but also to the Governor. Through your work, everything you do here, to the Secretary and that's reported to the Governor. And then in this case, one other key elements of BTAC is going to be the Border Master Plan and the Border Master Plan will be sent to the commission for consideration and then also will be submitted to the Governor. So those are some of the roles.

And here it just shows the members of

Alliance and all the groups that have been involved in transportation issues and all the hard work of TxDOT. So we have a great relationship. Caroline, you know, has been, you know, the whip and I really am humbled by the award; but I truly believe that really it goes to everyone in this room who puts in the time and energy for our highways and our roads and really Texas infrastructure, the best state in the country. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you so much for everything you do.

And I do think, you know, obviously all of this takes a team for -- as everyone here knows and I do want to just take a moment to recognize my team at SOS. Our Deputy Joe Esparza is with us here today. Stephen Chang you'll see taking photos over there to the left is our Communications Director and, of course, David Zapata who is right here behind me and I know very familiar to many of you. I'm very grateful for all of the work that they do so that we can be of service and can be available to all of you. So I wanted to take a moment to say that. I'm very excited about the work we're going to be able to accomplish in this committee and I do want to begin the official business of the committee.
BTAC. You know, as you can see here, a fairly numerous
2 group of folks and dedicated and a lot of you have been
3 on this committee for a very long time and we appreciate
4 you all, you know, sticking around.
5
6 So looking at some of the accomplishments
6 of you guys in 2018. We had several meetings. You guys
7 participated in those meetings and some of the key
8 things you helped us -- you know, there was really -- a
9 lot of it was finalizing the blueprint, but also we
10 started in 2018 the discussions on the Border Master
11 Plan. We bounced the scope, got a lot of ideas, a lot
12 of input from you all on the Border Master Plan schedule
13 and actually started discussions on what it should look
14 like. And great attendance from the members and really
15 a lot of engagement from you all in 2018.
16
17 So one of the things that you all really
18 helped us with was develop a vision for the border. The
19 blueprint was the first really official document out of
20 this committee that laid the foundation of what kind of
21 picture, more strategic, what's the vision, what's the
22 mission, et cetera. And we went through this exercise
23 with you all and, you know, what you see up here is
24 essentially, you know, built from your input and a lot
25 of this is being carried into the Border Master Plan

Love has been very keen on that. He's like, "How can we
1 better tell the story? How do we get the information
2 out," whether it's on Facebook or Twitter, et cetera.
3 So those are some of the things that, you know, the
4 committees have been able to really help us flesh out,
5 just to name a few. But as you can see, there are
6 several things and a lot of this still carries on into
7 the Border Master Plan in one form or another.

And then really looking at 2019, as I
10 mentioned earlier, we had one meeting. This is the
11 second meeting for the year. And at the last meeting we
12 held, a lot focus again on the Border Master Plan. As
13 Marc mentioned, really that's the key activity for the
14 committee. Today we'll be spending a lot of time
15 talking about that and really we're going to see that
16 moving into the next year -- because we have to get this
17 plan completed by next year -- you're probably going to
18 see a few more meetings held than what we're holding
19 this year. We'll have two and the next year we'll have
20 several meetings. Really the key goal there is to help
21 us work through everything. Some of you were involved
22 during when the plan was drafted and it was really a
23 committee activity and we'll need you to provide input
24 on some of the technical documents as we move forward.
25 It's going to be critical.
So I mentioned the Border Master Plan today. These are some of the things you kind of helped us with already to do. I mentioned you helped us on the scope. You helped us to develop the goals and objectives. You’re going to see that there on the final goals today. You’re going to see the data collection, some development, and some of the preliminary analysis that was done as part of your input and really helping us gather the data; but also telling us what are some of the things that are important for us to analyze. So you’re going to see a lot of that today.

And then finally, as I mentioned, you know, these are the meeting dates, you know, for this year. This is pretty much the last meeting. The next one will be January. And as you can see, we’re going to have a little bit more frequent meetings next year so that we can get to the finish line for the Border Master Plan development. So we’ll keep you posted on the specific dates; but as you can see in terms of at least 20 months, it gives you an idea of when those will occur.

So with that, Secretary, I think that’s my last slide and I’ll leave that up here for a minute. Any questions? Anybody want to add anything? Everybody is good? I see you shaking your head.

So go ahead and open your packet. We’re going to walk through what’s in the packet. It’s fairly heavy. So you should have the agenda. It looks like that. So that’s the agenda. And then you should have five PowerPoint – a couple of PowerPoint presentations. One should have been what I just presented right now and then the second PowerPoint should say, “Welcome and Introductions” and then the third PowerPoint should say, “Task 5, Binational and Multimodal Corridor and System Identification and Designation.” So you should have these PowerPoints there.

And then you should have the meeting minutes that you all adopted a few minutes earlier and then you should have several handouts – Handout 1, Handout 2, Handout 3, Handout 4, and Handout 5A and Handout 5B. And mine has Handout 7 – so six and seven.

Okay. Oh, yeah, I missed six. Six and seven. So you should have seven handouts in total.

MR. CANON: That’s a lot of trees.

MS. MAYS: Yes. But it’s important that we provide you guys with the technical information behind what we’re going to discuss today.

So with that, Secretary -- so with that, Secretary, we can...

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: It looks like we may be a little ahead of schedule on our agenda. But having finished the summary of activities, we’ll move onto the discussion on the Texas-Mexico Border Transportation Master Plan. And I think if you wouldn’t mind entertaining some of the questions I posed in my introduction, maybe we can just start with what the changes in wait times, have they affected business operations in your community and maybe we could just speak to that. If you’d like to contribute, we’ll have an open dialogue and kind of move along the questions and then Caroline will let me know when she wants to take the microphone back. So, thank you.

MR. VALE: As one of the points of entry, but earlier on we received the last -- I guess it’s been about a year, Claudia -- Unified Cargo Processing and what we have found is it improves the throughput and the efficiency of the port anywhere from 30 to 40 percent. And the primary obstacles to it not even being more are generally local infrastructure issues.

It is kind of very modern to realize that you actually exit and enter -- exit Mexico and enter the United States at the exact same time and that eliminates a whole stop somewhere on the other side. And so by working through the Unified Cargo Processing mechanism, we think that we need to find to take it even further to where we understand that ultimately a goal should be that we’re operating on both sides as if we were one point of entry servicing the legal needs of each country at the same time and that would even be better. But the throughput is the number one issue.

I look less at wait times than how much is coming out the door. Because wait time tells you how long it takes you to get to the door and I find that manufacturers have a better idea in that they measure not what goes into their warehouses, they measure what leaves to the customer and that is very important for what we’re looking at. So I want to encourage us to be as supportive of our respective federal government's processes so that we can make this happen better.

Our highways need to be -- for the first time, I think we’ve got four states in Mexico that participate with us here and I think that's a huge advancement; but I think we need to continue working directly through them to get to their Secretaries of Transportation and to federal Secretaries -- because the money in Mexico is funded very differently than the way we do it in the United States -- so that we can coordinate that.

I think that process is very important, Madam Secretary, that we not try to dictate; but try to...
encourage that the knowledge we share, so that when we're building on both sides, we will be -- and these are things that Gerry and a lot of us have been talking about for a long time; but now there's an opportunity to do it.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.

MR. VALE: Claudia, she can express the Mexican view very well.

MS. LAGOS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Sam.

Exactly, that's important. I think that's the main part of our participation in this group, it's to understand like how different our governments or systems are and it's really important for the states, the state borders to participate; but also the federal level. I'm glad that you already met with the SAG people and (inaudible) in Mexico City because they are like the main ones to make decisions in this kind of tables. And on our side, exactly the ones that can -- that have the final word for any infrastructure (inaudible).

So it's really important to have them participating not just the state levels. We are important, but we are not the final words in these kind of decisions and so that will be helpful. And it's important for the region to have the -- like the Unified Cargo Process at the port of entry because that reduces times and we have just one process that are important for both countries because if we speak with SAG, they will say that they're part is really important and CBP will say the same. But if he have both at the same facility, that reduces costs and times for the users of the ports.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.

Gerry.

MS. MAYS: If I could just please remind everyone, please state your name before you make your remarks because we have a transcriber. So it makes it hard; otherwise, it tells us that it's unknown, the speaker. So, thank you.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Caroline.

This is Gerry Schwebel. I'd like to cover a couple of things, you know, following up on Sam's comments. The newest outlier we have in our points of entry regarding wait times is, of course, the asylum seeker situation that we have at our points of entry and the reallocation or staffing of our inspectors who support the asylum seekers. So that has -- that definitely impacted our point of entry operations. It did create havoc at the beginning of the year. As a result and I guess private sector input

We have elements of experiences in Laredo where we now have inspectors at the mid bridge point as perhaps the first queue of review of the vehicles and individuals in those vehicles and then they come up to the primary lane and that process begins and if that vehicle needs to be sent to secondary, they'll put a cone in front of that vehicle and that inspector will escort that vehicle to the secondary inspection point. Those are delays and it may delay that one vehicle five minutes, four minutes; but you multiply it times 100 or 300 cars behind them and that also is having an impact for vehicular traffic at our points of entry.

So the dialogue at the local level -- and I don't know if that experience is happening at other points of entry, I assume it may be as well because policies are coming down from the top -- but I think that's also going to be something that we did not -- those that cross every day or families' livelihoods at our points of entries are being impacted in those wait times.

And I think the final point I'll say about wait times is that one of the things that we've also asked is for more dialogue between the stakeholders and CBP. Not on an annual basis or as a crisis happens, but on an ongoing basis. In the past, we would have
1 meetings on a quarterly basis with our counterparts in
2 Nuevo Laredo and in Laredo to address local issues and
3 how they are affecting our flow of commerce and people.
4 And I've seen that we distance ourselves sometimes. I
5 don’t know if other cities have examples, Eagle Pass or
6 others. But we in Laredo have gotten away from that and
7 I think that’s contributed perhaps to some of the
8 challenges that we’ve been facing.
9 I’ve encouraged CBP to go back to that
10 type of ongoing discussion so we can address and react
11 on a faster, more timely basis, rather than wait until
12 there’s a crisis or something bad happens at our points
13 of entry where we’re reacting. So it's more of a
14 proactive measure that we would like to encourage and
15 push harder at the border, as well.
16 CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you for that.
17 John.
18 COUNCILMAN LOVE, Ill: Thank you, Madam
19 Secretary.
20 MR. BARELA: There’s a lot of Johns.
21 CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Please state your name
22 before your comments and then pass it over to --
23 COUNCILMAN LOVE, Ill: Sorry about that.
24 John Love, Mayor Pro Tem City of Midland. I think it
25 may be a shock to some of you that Midland-Odessa is

1 actually not on the border; but we’re affected by it
2 still drastically.
3 The cost of living with respect to the
4 oil and gas industry is extremely, extremely high. Our
5 food produce, our construction costs. As a matter of
6 fact to come down here, I drove to Abilene to rent a car
7 to drive down here because the car rental prices were
8 double. So the wait times -- the wait times are -- the
9 reduction of them are essential to our service workers,
10 our first responders, our teachers. Those wait times
11 affect goods, produce, which makes a difference in their
12 lives. So that's what's happening in Midland-Odessa.
13 That's how those wait times affect us.
14 Midland has embarked upon a project
15 called “Priority Midland.” And one of their goals is to
16 reduce the truck traffic impact of the oil and gas
17 industry. We’re encouraging more pipelines to ship oil
18 and gas out of the Permian Basin and begin helping to
19 make our roads safer.
20 What would be a solution? The issue that
21 we have is the same as the solution and that is we
22 really need to get that bridge at Presidio finished.
23 That’s the issue and that’s also the solution because if
24 you finish that bridge, it takes a lot of pressure off
25 of the other ports. More importantly, it allows those

1 goods to flow a little bit more freely into the Permian
2 Basin.
3 And I think you’re last question was:
4 What can we do to communicate? I think that this
5 organization embarking upon a social media strategy and
6 just communicating what we do out of this organization
7 because it’s going to be extremely, extremely helpful.
8 Citizens/constituents do not know the issues or what’s
9 happening. And unfortunately, they get a lot of their
10 information from Facebook or Twitter and usually it is
11 wrong. So we won’t be able to inform everyone or change
12 everybody’s mind to the direction we’re heading in with
13 respect to border issues, but our story needs to be
14 known and we need to say it loudly and I think that
15 those that are interested in this issue will find that
16 information and just make all the difference in the
17 world.
18 CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.
19 MR. BARELA: Madam Secretary, Jon Barela,
20 Borderplex Alliance El Paso. You know, uncertainty is
21 the enemy of investment jobs and optimizing economic
22 development and the wait times that we’re experiencing
23 at the bridge are creating uncertainty. Part of the
24 Borderplex Alliance's mission is to create jobs, to
25 bring leads to the City of El Paso, the State of Texas

1 with private sector investment. Fortunately, the good
2 news is that we are at a record level for vetted leads
3 in our region, to include Ciudad Juarez and bordering
4 New Mexico.
5 The bad news is that virtually every
6 business -- at least in the manufacturing sector -- has
7 asked us not once, but many times if they come to visit:
8 What are the wait times like, and will the wait times be
9 abated any time soon?
10 A real life example of a region that is
11 very, very symbiotically related is that one of every
12 four jobs in El Paso is created because of jobs created
13 in Ciudad Juarez. If the manufacturing sector -- which
14 by the way, we are now the fourth largest manufacturing
15 sector in the entire country according to jobs, 300,000
16 of which are related to manufacturing. If we cannot get
17 cargo to and from our friends from manufacturing, the
18 plants in Ciudad Juarez to the U.S. to logistic
19 operations in the U.S. or vice versa, then our
20 optimization of job creation is limited not only in our
21 region, but throughout the entire State of Texas.
22 Real life example of where jobs in the
23 worst case scenario get lost has occurred. I know of
24 one medical device manufacturer that has permanently
25 moved jobs to Slovenia of all places because there is
1 some predictability and certainty with respect to the
2 supply chains and getting the material that they need to
3 get to other operations throughout the U.S. And there
4 are other examples.
5 So it's absolutely critical that we
6 understand the impact, the adverse impact it could
7 potentially have to this manufacturing boom that we are
8 experiencing, frankly, on both sides of the border and
9 the economic development that we're seeing in the State
10 of Texas. It's absolutely critical that we get this
11 issue solved.
12 The second sector that's being adversely
13 impacted in El Paso with respect to this is retail.
14 Yes, we know that there are cargo containers and
15 shipments from manufacturing that's delayed; but this is
16 also having an impact in El Paso's retail sector. It's
17 been estimated during the time of year, exchange rates
18 and whatnot, between 15 and maybe as high as 25 percent
19 of the retail trade that takes place in El Paso is due
20 to Mexican nationals coming across the border. The
21 bourgeoning middle class is helping spur that wonderful
22 opportunity that we see in retail in El Paso and in
23 southern New Mexico.
24 But when you have pedestrians and
25 noncommercial vehicles that have to wait two or three

1 waiting at Juarez to cross overnight. That takes
2 security to safeguard the shipments on the city streets
3 of Juarez. And so the drivers have to wait, switch
4 shifts in the queue, sleep in the truck, and then to
5 cross the next day. So that was in the first week or so
6 in the spring.
7 Working in El Paso with our stakeholders,
8 we work with CBP to adjust the schedules at (inaudible)
9 and Zaragoza to work better with the schedules with the
10 private sector. We've made a lot of progress in doing
11 that and so now, wait times have sort of stabilized to
12 normal levels, which is still high. I mean, two-
13 three-, four-hour wait times for trucks to cross. But
14 El Paso, working with the stakeholders, we've made a lot
15 of progress on coordinating schedules, with staffing.
16 The City of El Paso is one of the leading
17 communities in the U.S. funding overtime for CBP agents
18 to open more lanes and reduce wait times not only for
19 cargo, but also for vehicles and pedestrians. And so
20 that program, the 559, allows the City to donate
21 overtime hours and also improvement projects within the
22 property funded by (inaudible). So the City of El Paso
23 tolls (inaudible) to CBP to donate improvements, to
24 donate hours for more agents, reduces wait times. And
25 so I think that program, we need to work with
(inaudible), with SSFA, with the Mexican authorities enhancing that framework so they can create that same program on the Mexican side to allow the private sector, to allow the City of Juarez, the State of Chihuahua, and other ports along the border to donate improvements, donate staff time to (inaudible) to have a dual program on both sides of the border.

If we have all lanes open on the U.S. side, if there's a strain on the (inaudible), it's pointless, right? The whole system needs to work. And so I think one solution is to work with Congress in Mexico City to get that program started and copy the U.S. program. So that's on the cargo side.

On the POE side, to further add onto what Jon was saying, the City of El Paso is also working on a new survey at the bridges on the Juarez side to understand crossing behavior on the pedestrian side and vehicle side year-round. So this survey, we're funding it also via P3 via the tolls to be able to understand the cross behavior -- how often people cross? What impact their choice model to cross walking or in a vehicle? What bridge they use? Whether they go to school, go to shop, go to work for both U.S. residents and Juarez residents. So this survey has not been done along the U.S.-Mexican border and especially not a year-round survey. We're looking at surveying on the Juarez side from 6:00 a.m. in the morning until 10:00 p.m. at night, talking to crossers and really trying to see how El Paso benefits from the economic impact of those shoppers that cross into El Paso from Juarez, from Chihuahua, from other states in Mexico.

That will help us a lot to understand that behavior and how wait times impact their experience to cross.

So I think that's all I have to say. In the Governor's Office in Tamaulipas and also the federal government, but finally we got through that. But, you know, there has to be a better way for both countries to work better together to not have a major crossing port be closed down for that long.

One of the things, you know, that Cameron County is doing, is doing a lot of projects for (inaudible) acceptance in which, you know, the county, you know, along with TxDOT, you know, put up moneys to do infrastructure with some of the things that, you know, effectively the federal government doesn't have a line item for infrastructure. So we have to kick in and create those. And so part of that work that we've been doing is working with CBP as far as doing what they call non-intrusive inspection and they have a pilot program going in which equipment is going to be installed that's going to have facial recognition for people coming through, especially commercial traffic starting out with. So that's one of the points that, you know, that you're really going to be helping, you know, everybody along the border because that's something that, you know, within 45 seconds somebody will come through. You know, they'll have a picture of who it is. They're going through the Fast Program, those that are approved. So those folks will be able to go from Point A to, you know, Point B as Sam was talking about, you know, in a matter of minutes instead of having to wait, you know, a long time.

And, you know, there is a distinction between wait times and crossing times. Wait times is what the government gives you. Crossing times is when the people actually form lines. Many times, as Jon just talked about, it's on the Mexican side. So, you know, CBP doesn't count that. So that's a crossing time. That's a total -- that's a total cross, you know, time it takes for people to be able to, you know, cross the border.

So, you know, the solution obviously has to be technology. It has to infrastructure. And so that's something that we, as a group, need to be working towards trying to get more of that to happen as far as, you know, at the points of entry. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.

Let's just go around the table. Yes.

MR. GIESBRECHT: Madam Secretary, thank you so much and thank you for what you do, Caroline, the committee. We have -- I'm Jake Giesbrecht from Presidio and Caroline and her team were in Presidio a couple of days ago. It seems to me like a couple of days ago. So she helped us out. We did a workshop, and I thought it
was very interesting what you said that wait time issues and solutions and what we can do at each level. In Presidio, we went over some exercises and the wait times in Presidio are calculated sometimes differently too and I'm glad that you guys all agree that the wait time is from the middle of the bridge. That's what we do in Presidio.

On the Mexican side, it's a different story. But there's open businesses there, people that sell burritos have. But I think that's one of the advantage of wait times. That's the only one I can see. We have some very simple solutions that we are looking at in Presidio and one of them came out of the workgroup is -- were economic development (inaudible) is the time change. We're in a different time zone in Presidio. So that really cuts us off because CBP in Presidio is out of El Paso. So it's a different time zone. So they're always running on El Paso time. They start early and close earlier. Ojinaga has a different time. We start late and close late. So really in effect, we only have five or six hours that we can work the commercial port. So those are the issues. Solutions I think would be very simple. I know Caroline is probably looking at the change in time, but that would be a tremendous thing for us in Presidio.

You know, the comments made about Midland-Odessa, the connectivity, the issues caused there, especially in two ports. You're familiar with ports being from Corpus Christi. You know, you've visited many. But one of the things that's important I think is as all of these efforts between various parties -- I mean, I'm on the Port Authority Advisory Committee, as well. We had a discussion about a couple of other transportation plans that TxDOT is doing and, in fact, the introduction of this plan. One of the things that's really important in my opinion is that the messaging be consistent in all those transportation studies because at the end of the day, we all share the same issue. Wait times at the port may be driven by wait times at the port or, you know, everything we do at the Port of Brownsville is driven by Mexico. 90 percent of what we do is import commodities from foreign countries to export commodities to foreign countries, which is Mexico. I mean, that's all we do. But I do think it's very important that when we talk about these issues, we may talk about them in different settings; but they're all relevant, that the messaging in there be consistent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 50</th>
<th>Page 51</th>
<th>Page 52</th>
<th>Page 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 consistent. So when we go to our federal government,</td>
<td>1 Yes.</td>
<td>1 We have one element that I forgot to mention that</td>
<td>1 about getting to the bridge. I'm not talking about at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 which we seem to believe that they're the save-all.</td>
<td>2 MR. SCHWEBEL: Gerry Schwebel again.</td>
<td>2 think we all -- because we are a board of trade advisory</td>
<td>2 the bridge. And then we also will have a challenge in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I share your comments about commonality</td>
<td>3 There's one element that I forgot to mention that I</td>
<td>3 group that is going to be a new element for us here in</td>
<td>3 that we don't have adequate USDA inspectors at our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 about, you know, bipartisanship about addressing</td>
<td>4 think we all -- because we are a board of trade advisory</td>
<td>4 Texas and (inaudible) is not here, but it's going to be</td>
<td>4 points of entry to accommodate that more intensive. So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 infrastructural; but that's been the case for a long</td>
<td>5 time. But yet, we don't have a plan on how to. And</td>
<td>5 our perishables and our produce crossings. It's going</td>
<td>5 we get the federal requirement, a mandate comes down,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 time. But yet, we don't have a plan on how to. And</td>
<td>6 certainly the maritime piece is one of those that is</td>
<td>6 to be impacted by an increase in inspection</td>
<td>6 and it's going to impact our points of entry and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 certainly the maritime piece is one of those that is</td>
<td>7 kind of left behind and, you know, in this country --</td>
<td>7 as well our wait times in our commercial operations.</td>
<td>7 as well our wait times in our commercial operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 kind of left behind and, you know, in this country --</td>
<td>8 well, Texas for example is a maritime port, whether we</td>
<td>8 So, again, I think that's something that we should also</td>
<td>8 So, again, I think that's something that we should also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 well, Texas for example is a maritime port, whether we</td>
<td>9 realize it or not. Texas leads the nation in maritime</td>
<td>9 just keep at the top of mind what that impact may be.</td>
<td>9 just keep at the top of mind what that impact may be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 realize it or not. Texas leads the nation in maritime</td>
<td>10 commerce. More commerce originates or is passed through</td>
<td>10 that -- the concerns that we've had is</td>
<td>10 that -- the concerns that we've had is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 commerce. More commerce originates or is passed through</td>
<td>11 by Texas by volume than any other state in the country.</td>
<td>11 it's going to create more delay in those</td>
<td>11 it's going to create more delay in those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 by Texas by volume than any other state in the country.</td>
<td>12 Channel deepening is a huge issue. The</td>
<td>12 perishables. And right now, it's tomatoes. Next,</td>
<td>12 perishables. And right now, it's tomatoes. Next,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 sustainability of the industry and what it contributes</td>
<td>13 Texas has five projects</td>
<td>13 And that's a challenge that I think we</td>
<td>13 And that's a challenge that I think we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to the state is a huge issue. Texas has five projects</td>
<td>14 that are authorized for deepening and yet only one of</td>
<td>14 all need to monitor very closely in the coming months</td>
<td>14 all need to monitor very closely in the coming months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 that are authorized for deepening and yet only one of</td>
<td>15 three in the nation that is even receiving any federal</td>
<td>15 and and measure the impact of what that will affect</td>
<td>15 and and measure the impact of what that will affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 three in the nation that is even receiving any federal</td>
<td>16 support to do so. You know, that's one area</td>
<td>15 here. So that will create an impact on the commercial</td>
<td>15 here. So that will create an impact on the commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 support to do so. You know, that's one area</td>
<td>17 internationally as a country we're falling woefully</td>
<td>16 traffic. Then if you have perishables that are now</td>
<td>16 traffic. Then if you have perishables that are now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 internationally as a country we're falling woefully</td>
<td>18 behind everybody else and that is how do you address</td>
<td>16 going to be slowed down because of the inspections, more</td>
<td>16 going to be slowed down because of the inspections, more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 behind everybody else and that is how do you address</td>
<td>19 that issue in the maritime sector. But there is a lot</td>
<td>17 intensive, other trucks will be -- you know, I'm talking</td>
<td>17 intensive, other trucks will be -- you know, I'm talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 that issue in the maritime sector. But there is a lot</td>
<td>20 of good work going on and I think it's important that</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 of good work going on and I think it's important that</td>
<td>21 when we get into these discussions, we may not be at the</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 table at the same time; but the issues are very relevant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 and the messaging needs to be consistent so we're all</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 telling the same story.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 I certainly know that we will be meeting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 as a port industry with Caroline and her team to talk</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 about these issues, but it's very relevant to this</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 discussion as well and so that messaging needs to really</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 be consistent because I do agree that Texas needs to be</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 a leader in leading that dialogue and not fall back and</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 say, &quot;Hey, this is a federal issue.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 If we stay back and wait for the federal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 government to solve it, it's never going to occur.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 MR. CAMPIRANO: That's probably more I've</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 said in two years.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: And to give you credit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 for your statements, I will indicate for the record that</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 it's Eduardo Campirano speaking from the Port of</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 Brownsville. Thank you.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 I will just take a brief moment to</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17 recognize that Senator Campbell and Senator Lucio have</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 representation here today. Thank you, Brandon and Dan.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 And if I've left other individuals out that are here</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 representing any of our legislators, let us know. But</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 thank you for your interest and your commitment to these</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 issues as well. Please send our regards to your bosses.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 Thank you.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Alvarez, TxDOT Pharr District. One of the things when we talk about communication, part of that is decision making. We have had several projects over the years with the necessary x-raying and processing of the traffic there within the commercial side. So the port is definitely growing. Right now, we are working together with the City of Piedras Negras, our sister city, to assure the expansion or our second international bridge. There have been discussions of a third international bridge; but right now, both communities have decided that it is in the best interest to assure that the efficiency of the ports that we currently have, are at its full capacity. And I think that that's what we see at all borders, but we will continue to work to enhance upon that. There has been a major discussion within our community as far -- or within the private sector. Eagle Pass is looking right now with some of the vendors of produce. So we are also experiencing some of that, that need within the area. But it is definitely a growing port and we will continue to do everything we can to make sure that, one, Eagle Pass is at the table and, two, that during this planning of the Border Master Plan, in general, that we meet the needs of the communities have decided that it is in the best interest of get the goal met by Piedras Negras and Eagle Pass. We have to credit a lot to the work that he has done and I think that that's something that we all need to do to see what we can do for other points of entries and their port directors because at times, a lot of that lands in their hands and some of them don't want to take that aggressive approach to actually want to make a stronger stance in moving some of these decisions or making these decisions. So we have been able to definitely see our port grow. Just recently, we were able to expand upon the commercial expansion for our port of entry, which added an additional two lanes for faster transit with the necessary x-raying and processing of the traffic there within the commercial side. So the port is definitely growing. Right now, we are working together with the City of Piedras Negras, our sister city, to assure the expansion or our second international bridge. There have been discussions of a third international bridge; but right now, both communities have decided that it is in the best interest to assure that the efficiency of the ports that we currently have, are at its full capacity. And I think that that's what we see at all borders, but we will continue to work to enhance upon that. There has been a major discussion within our community as far -- or within the private sector. Eagle Pass is looking right now with some of the vendors of produce. So we are also experiencing some of that, that need within the area. But it is definitely a growing port and we will continue to do everything we can to make sure that, one, Eagle Pass is at the table and, two, that during this planning of the Border Master Plan, in general, that we meet the needs of the Texas-Mexico border. Thank you. Mr. Alvarez: Good morning. Pete Alvarez, TxDOT Pharr District. One of the things when we talk about communication, part of that is decision making. We have had several projects over the years with the necessary x-raying and processing of the traffic there within the commercial side. So the port is definitely growing. Right now, we are working together with the City of Piedras Negras, our sister city, to assure the expansion or our second international bridge. There have been discussions of a third international bridge; but right now, both communities have decided that it is in the best interest to assure that the efficiency of the ports that we currently have, are at its full capacity. And I think that that's what we see at all borders, but we will continue to work to enhance upon that. There has been a major discussion within our community as far -- or within the private sector. Eagle Pass is looking right now with some of the vendors of produce. So we are also experiencing some of that, that need within the area. But it is definitely a growing port and we will continue to do everything we can to make sure that, one, Eagle Pass is at the table and, two, that during this planning of the Border Master Plan, in general, that we meet the needs of the Texas-Mexico border. Thank you. Mr. Alvarez: Good morning. Pete Alvarez, TxDOT Pharr District. One of the things when we talk about communication, part of that is decision making. We have had several projects over the years with the necessary x-raying and processing of the traffic there within the commercial side. So the port is definitely growing. Right now, we are working together with the City of Piedras Negras, our sister city, to assure the expansion or our second international bridge. There have been discussions of a third international bridge; but right now, both communities have decided that it is in the best interest to assure that the efficiency of the ports that we currently have, are at its full capacity. And I think that that's what we see at all borders, but we will continue to work to enhance upon that. There has been a major discussion within our community as far -- or within the private sector. Eagle Pass is looking right now with some of the vendors of produce. So we are also experiencing some of that, that need within the area. But it is definitely a growing port and we will continue to do everything we can to make sure that, one, Eagle Pass is at the table and, two, that during this planning of the Border Master Plan, in general, that we meet the needs of the Texas-Mexico border. Thank you.

Ms. Mays: Thank you, Secretary. And Caroline.
1 thank you everybody for your great input. We appreciate it.
2 So we're going to move into the work
3 session part of the meeting. And before I turn it over
4 to Tim, I want to make sure you guys know it's not
5 Caroline that does everything. I have a bunch of
6 talented folks and team with me here. So if you're on
7 my team, please stand up. Loretta is taking pictures
8 right there. But I have some in the back. I have, you
9 know, pretty much all of my groups.
10 I have three groups at TxDOT. I have the
11 Border Team led by Tim and then I have the Freight
12 Team -- Casey is right there. Then Akila leads the
13 Corridor Planning Team. Then I'm missing two of my
14 board people. Giacomo is here and Loretta is taking
15 pictures and then I think Eduardo is somewhere. I'm
16 missing one or two of my people, but I wanted you all to
17 kind of see them and recognize them. They're the brains
18 behind a lot of this work. I'm the spokesperson.
19 There's Eduardo. Most of you know Eduardo. So I just
20 wanted to, you know, thank them for their tireless work
21 and they make this all happen.
22 (Round of applause)
23 MS. MAYS: So I will now turn it over
24 Tim, but I want to kind preface what we're doing today
25 is that this is kind of where the rubber meets the road.
26 The last few meetings, we've talked a lot about, you
27 know, more the qualitative stuff where we've asked you
28 or we've talked to you about goals and objectives and,
29 you know, what you would like to see in the plan or
30 things we've heard from the stakeholders.
31 So what we're doing now is more of the
32 data-driven part of the plan. So what you're going to
33 see a lot today is some of the -- I'm going to
34 underscore -- preliminary data. Some of the analysis.
35 We're going to kind of give you a little bit of a taste
36 of what's to come, but we want to hear from you whether
37 we're going in the right direction or the data you're
38 seeing doesn't make sense and we'll try and connect it
39 to why it's important to the Border Master Plan.
40 And we have a team of consultants, and
41 I'll let Tim kind of introduce them; but we want to hear
42 from you. Please feel free to ask questions and add
43 things as we go through this. It's a work session.
44 This is not just a presentation. Really it's to get
45 your input because we want to take this information and
46 we're going to be sharing it with the binational group.
47 I think the first meeting we have is next week in Laredo
48 and then we're coming to the Valley and then El Paso.
49 So this information is going to be shared with them at a
50 much more regional level, regional scale. So really
51 what diction you give us today, will also impact what we
52 share with the rest of the border community moving
53 forward in the next month or so. So, thank you.
54 Tim.
55 MR. JUAREZ, JR.: Thank you, Caroline.
56 Once again, I'm Tim Juarez. I'm the
57 manager for International Trade and Border Planning here
58 at TxDOT.
59 Secretary of State Hughs, welcome, as
60 well as all the Border Trade Advisory Committee members.
61 As Caroline noted, we really are going to
62 have a discussion today on the Texas-Mexico Border
63 Transportation Master Plan. As you may recall, this is
64 a binational plan and it is also multimodal. We will be
65 looking at the entire border region from El Paso, Santa
66 Teresa, Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, to the port of
67 Brownsville. We will take into account the 28 port of
68 entries, the support systems for those 28 POEs, as well
69 as its connectivity to the transportation network.
70 What you will hear today from the project
71 team is an update and discussion on where we are with
72 the Border Master Plan, but primarily to present to you
73 the goals and objectives, as well as the overview and
74 status of the data collection that we'll be utilizing at
75 a primary perspective for Border Master Plan and then
76 discussion on corridor identification process,
77 development of analysis areas, and designation of area
78 profiles.
79 I would like to introduce the project
80 team from the consultant side and I will turn this over
81 to Alejandro Solis, the project manager, who will
82 introduce himself and his team members.
83 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, Tim.
84 And good morning, everybody. For those
85 of you that don't know me, Alejandro Solis. I'm with
86 HDR. We're part of the consulting team for the Border
87 Master Plan. I'm the project manager. And I guess
88 following the theme of this is a team effort, we brought
89 a couple of our task leads. We have Donald Ludlow over
90 here. He's our data guru. He will be making a
91 presentation on what we have found so far preliminarily.
92 And I really want you guys to pay attention to that
93 because he shows a lot of the trends of the border that
94 we want to make sure that they resonate with you because
95 this is what we're going to be presenting at the
96 regions. And then we have over there Steve Decker,
97 who's leading the corridor identification. He's going
98 to be talking to us about the preliminary work on
99 identifying corridors and how we did it and also we want
1. To make sure that it resonates with you. And then next to him we have Stephanie White. She's our stakeholder engagement task lead, and you guys mostly know Stephanie. She will make protocol. She will get into that circle. She will be timing the comments. She will be pointing at people. So she's going to facilitate the discussion and hopefully we get a lot from you. So that's very important.

2. And then we also have other folks. We have Kaleigh over there. We have Robert Bryant over there. And who else do we have here? And Brian Swindell. Where is Brian at? Oh, over there.

3. And behind all of us, there's an army of people. So I just want to make sure that you guys know that all of this that you're going to see, it takes a lot of people and just grateful for them.

4. MR. JUAREZ, JR.: So just to remind you, it is a discussion. Everything that we will present today is based on what we heard from you at your May 21st BTAC meeting, as well as the first two rounds of the Binational Regional Steering Committee.

5. What you're about to see, once again, is just preliminary draft information. Why we are presenting it today is because we want to get your thoughts and your direction on where we go next with round three. And then that's what we're actually going to do. As Caroline mentioned, we will have round three of stakeholder engagement at the Binational Regional Steering Committees and we'll present that schedule at the end of the presentation.

6. And then after -- Secretary of State, after we complete round three, at the next scheduled Border Trade Advisory Committee, we will bring back the information we gather from those three regions and present it to you.

7. One thing I would like to note is that because it is going to be a discussion and we are seeking your input, if you do have a smart device -- an iPhone or anything like that -- we ask that during the metameter discussion, we're going to present some questions and we're going to seek your feedback and you should be able to connect to the TxDOT guest website if you don't have wi-fi. But before we begin the discussion, I wanted to let you know very preliminary thoughts and your direction on where we go next with.

20. MR. SOLIS: Thank you, Tim. And thanks for reminding the audience about the metameter. Most of you are familiar with it. We've done it with you in the past in May. It's the little thing that pops up on the screen and then your comments are shared live with everybody. They're anonymous, but everybody else can see and we're going to try to do the summary of those. So have your cell phones ready.

21. We're going to have a ton of questions for you. So let me start just by -- with introductions to welcome -- so we're going to move into a recap of the recent work we have done. So last time we met, as was mentioned by Caroline, was about six months ago. So we've done a lot of work since then. And I'm not going to go into all of the details because Caroline, I think, did a pretty good job of summarizing that. But the only things I want to point out are that, you know, we went through a couple of the topics that have been consistently developed over the past few months. So we have goals and objectives that we talked about in April and then we followed that in BTAC and then we closed that chapter in round two and we also presented methodology and data collection, presented methodologies on corridor identification, and then we validated that with the regional stakeholders.

23. So in a way, this is almost the program that's been developing for the past few months. And that's something -- hopefully, we're not presenting anything to you that you haven't heard about before in terms of the process or the way we're going to go about it. The only caveat is this is draft. So we've been working on this. We have data. We want to be sure that it's clear to everybody that this is a draft. This is our take on these topics, and we want to make sure that they resonate with you. So this is basically the chronology of what we have been doing, and it's consistent with what you will see today. So you will see all these topics.

24. The first thing that we want to touch base on is the goals and objectives. We've been working on this a lot, and we're not going to really spend a lot time. I also wanted to bring to your attention this is Handout 1. You will see on the slides on the bottom right corner, that we have listed where the handouts are needed. So your PowerPoint, you can always reference the page. So in this case, it's right there. It says Handout 1 and in the top left corner -- sorry -- top right corner, you're going to be able to see Handout 1. So that's what we will be kind of referring to very quickly. The handouts are, in most cases, a more detailed explanation of what we will see in the slides; but we wanted you to take home with you and then also kind of have that as a go-by for future reference.
baseline conditions. This goes into some of the nuts and bolts on the progress that we're making to point these out quickly. In your binder, Handout 2, service, cross-border resiliency, and asset preservation. In your handout, you have all the descriptions. So I'm not going to spend time there. I would rather move on to the next section, which is the part of the data that we are very interested in your -- getting your input on. And for that, I'll let Donald Ludlow lead the discussion with Stephanie's help. Mr. Ludlow: All right. Thank you very much. Again, Donald Ludlow from CPCS, part of the consulting team.

Data underpins the Border Master Transportation -- the Border Transportation Master Plan. And today, I'm going to walk you through some of the very preliminary analysis of the data, focusing on baseline conditions. So the first thing I want to talk about is we've made a lot of progress in terms of collecting data and we owe a lot of that progress to you and also -- okay. There we go. Better. All right. We owe a lot of that progress to you and the MPOs, the local communities in Mexico and in the United States in providing us with plans, studies, and data to enrich this effort. Our goal is to have a consistent binational dataset that's rich in detail and that has data at the same level of granularity in Mexico and the U.S. Our building block in many cases has been the county level data in the U.S. and in Mexico, the municipio level data. So that's what we've aspired to collect.

We've been collecting this now and working on the analysis for a few months. You can see in the chart that we have made a lot of progress and we have a few more months to go. The idea behind the data collection is that it powers the rest of the analysis from the Border Master Transportation Plan and enables us to make good decisions. I also want to draw your attention to three handouts. It's a lot to consider. I'm just going to point these out quickly. In your binder, Handout 2, Baseline Conditions Process Review. This goes into some of the nuts and bolts on the progress that we're making.
I'm now going to walk you through a series of maps and these are all of the county or municipio level. This first one shows total border region population 2017. You'll notice that a lot of the population growth is concentrated in the metropolitan areas along the border region. It's not happening evenly. In fact, the next three slides which go into more depth on the border regions, I'll explain some of the nuances. But the growth is concentrated really around the El Paso/Juarez region, Laredo region, and the Rio Grande Valley. There's also a population concentration around Acuña/Del Rio, Eagle Pass, and Piedra Negras. Beyond that, the population is still relatively sparse along a lot of the border region with some notable exceptions.

This next slide shows a zoom on the El Paso, Santa Teresa, Chihuahua region. This is the second most populous region along the border. Juárez is the single largest jurisdiction along the border with a population of 1.5 million, which is just a little bit less than Philadelphia. It's a very being city. This area grew, Juárez in particular, by 630,000 people during this period of time.

The next region, the central portion --

MR. SCHWEBEL: Can I ask a question?

MR. LUDLOW: Absolutely.

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel.

My question is to Jon. Fort Bliss, how large -- do you know how many troops are at Fort Bliss?

MR. BARELA: There are approximately 35,000 troops. Including dependents, over 50,000.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Great, thank you. And we know Fort Bliss is a very important part of the regional economy in the El Paso/Juarez region. Thanks for that. And please, if you have other comments or questions, let's stop and I'll stop in a couple minutes just to discuss the population information with you.

So in the center of the border region, we have about 1.6 million people in the Nuevo Laredo/Tamaulipas region. And then the most populous part of the border region and of the study area is the Rio Grande Valley, where we have over 3 million people in that region.

When we talk about change in population patterns of this uneven distribution, the rural and the metropolitan differences that are really quite stark.

For example, we know that some of the largest changes in population have occurred in the major counties and cities and I'm going to rattle off a few for you just for a second. Juárez, 630,000 people growth. Hidalgo County grew by 480,000. Reynosa, 425. El Paso, a quarter of a million growth during that period and on and on. Even Ciudad Acuña grew by nearly 100,000 people, that municipio during that period of time. And Piedras Negras, likewise about 70,000 people.

But the growth as been uneven. Four Texas counties account for 94 percent of the growth during this period of time. That means that about 18 of the 24 counties in Texas grew by less than 1 percent over a 27-year period. So there's a very stark difference between the metropolitan and urban growth along the border over the last 27 years and the growth in the rural and smaller counties. There are some notable exceptions to that; but it's a very, very interesting story.

In terms of population growth percentage growth, that's a little bit different. The fastest growing by percentage jurisdiction was Ciudad Acuña with 171 percent growth during that period. Hidalgo County is next with 126 percent. Reynosa, 113. Webb County, 107. And Nuevo Laredo at 86. Juárez, Matamoros, and Piedras Negras were also in the high 70s. So those were the fastest growing by percentage, even though some of them had a lower base population, like Ciudad Acuña. A lot of that has been fueled by the massive development of maquiladoras and other industries in that part of the border region.

So are there any questions to this point?

Is this surprising to anybody, especially to hear about this metropolitan and rural divide in terms of that growth, population growth difference? Any questions or comments? Heads nodding? Makes sense?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel.

One of the things that we try to measure also on the border is the government families and, you know, the workforces and the population growth attributed to, you know, inorganic growth from the city or outside external growth as a result of, say, law enforcement. They're all part of our community, but they are still -- there's more of them coming in as external factors as a result of our border operations. I don't know if you track by sectors, you know, some of the population growth attributed to that increase.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, that's actually a really good question. We are collecting data, and we intend to go into that level of depth. So that's one of our next steps in our process. Today, I'm going to be presenting some of the total employment changes not
1. divided by sector yet; but that is definitely an area
2. that we’re going to go into more depth and we’ll have
3. that in the baseline condition's report in December.
4. Thank you.
5. Any other thoughts or questions?
6. MR. ZAPATA: Hello. David Zapata, SOS
7. Office. Just a very quick comment.
8. I think that the information presented
9. here today is going to be very helpful to add to the
10. border story that we’re trying to tell in the point of
11. there’s a lot of people not familiar with the city on
12. the Mexican side on the border area. A lot of people in
13. the U.S. think that -- either they have no clue what the
14. look of that city may be and some people, from my
15. experience and travel for the State, assume that it's a
16. smaller city than the American city. So as we share
17. this story of the border, letting people know with this
18. data that our sister cities are sometimes -- well, most
19. of the time, bigger than the American city is going to,
20. I think, be very helpful in increasing the awareness of
21. the need from both sides of each other, but also of
22. potential business interests in the future, as well.
23. MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, David. That's a
24. great comment. I think it is rather counterintuitive
25. for a lot of people when they think about those
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|1. population differences, to recognize that the sister
2. city in Mexico in most cases, like you said, is larger.
3. It's true in Juarez. It's true with Reynosa. It's true
4. with Nuevo Laredo and many others. And Matamoros even,
5. yes. It's almost universally true.
6. And that two-thirds/third's split is
7. actually a pretty good rule of thumb in terms of the
8. population distribution along the border in almost any
9. given area. So thank you very much.
10. Yeah, Sam. I anticipated your question.
11. MR. VALE: History teaches you that
12. because Texas was cut out of Mexico. They didn't cut it
13. in. They cut it out. And so the population centers on
14. the south side of the border, which is a river, are
15. generally historically much larger and in many cases,
16. originally were more developed. If you didn't want to
17. fight in World War I or II, you went to Mexico, not
18. Canada.
19. MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you. I do have
20. an observation on Canada that I'll share later on when
21. we get to border crossings.
22. Okay. So moving ahead here, one last
23. slide on the population area and that's density. In
24. general, the Mexican sister cities are more densely
25. populated than the U.S. side, which probably isn't a
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|1. surprise. In terms of regions in their entirety, the El
2. Paso/Juarez region is the most densely populated along
3. the border region. The Rio Grand Valley is second.
4. The density is interesting and important
5. because it's indicative of the transportation demand,
6. including pedestrian crossing, transit, and other ways
7. of connecting those communities.
8. So let's look at employment. So
9. employment along the border has increased significantly,
10. as well. And the total employment along the border is
11. now up to nearly 3 million, about 2.6 million, growing
12. fairly rapidly. The single greatest employment centers
13. along the border, number one is Juarez/El Paso, which is
14. just slightly ahead with more than a million jobs
15. presently. It's slightly ahead of the Rio Grande
16. Valley, which is just below that. The Laredo area also
17. has about 250,000 jobs. So like the population, the
18. employment is quite concentrated in a few areas along
19. the border and we’ll go into a few more details about
20. how it's grown and changed over the last few years.
21. So employment has grown by 95 percent
22. during this time period. Remember, population grew by
23. 70 percent; employment grew by 95 percent. So there's a
24. greater workforce involvement in the border region as
25. well during this period of time and it's probably driven
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|1. quite a bit of the migration and we'll go into some more
2. detail on that. The employment is split again kind of
3. in that one-third/two-thirds' rule, 1.3 million on the
5. El Paso and Juarez have had significant
6. growth. Juarez grew by 300,000 jobs in that period of
7. time. But Hidalgo County grew by 191,000 and Reynosa,
8. 160,000; El Paso, 124,000; and Matamoros, 93,000. So
9. the job growth has been very significant during this
10. period of time, as well.
11. If we look at it from a percentage basis,
12. it's a little bit different story. We have some less
13. populated counties that have grown and municipios that
14. have grown their employment at a very, very fast rate.
15. For example, the highest percentage growth is Ciudad
16. Acuña, 200 percent growth during that time; Reynosa,
17. 185; Hidalgo, 157. Webb, Nuevo Laredo, Maverick County,
18. Juarez, and Zapata Counties were all above 100 percent,
19. as well. And the total employment along the border is
20. from that one-third/two-thirds split is
21. in that one-third/two-thirds' rule, 1.3 million on the
22. U.S. side, 2.6 on the Mexican side.
5. El Paso and Juarez have had significant
6. growth. Juarez grew by 300,000 jobs in that period of
7. time. But Hidalgo County grew by 191,000 and Reynosa,
8. 160,000; El Paso, 124,000; and Matamoros, 93,000. So
9. the job growth has been very significant during this
10. period of time, as well.
11. If we look at it from a percentage basis,
12. it's a little bit different story. We have some less
13. populated counties that have grown and municipios that
14. have grown their employment at a very, very fast rate.
15. For example, the highest percentage growth is Ciudad
16. Acuña, 200 percent growth during that time; Reynosa,
17. 185; Hidalgo, 157. Webb, Nuevo Laredo, Maverick County,
18. Juarez, and Zapata Counties were all above 100 percent,
19. as well. And the total employment along the border is
20. from that one-third/two-thirds split is
21. in that one-third/two-thirds' rule, 1.3 million on the
22. U.S. side, 2.6 on the Mexican side.
5. El Paso and Juarez have had significant
6. growth. Juarez grew by 300,000 jobs in that period of
7. time. But Hidalgo County grew by 191,000 and Reynosa,
8. 160,000; El Paso, 124,000; and Matamoros, 93,000. So
9. the job growth has been very significant during this
10. period of time, as well.
11. If we look at it from a percentage basis,
1 61 percent job growth during that same period of time.
2 So there are some anomalies in that distribution.
3 Another important point is median
4 household income. We are digging into this in more
5 detail. We have this data right now at the Mexican
6 state level, but we're trying to get it broken down at
7 municipio level. But the basic story is that median
8 household income has grown along the border. It's
9 increased in 17 counties by more than 100 percent during
10 this time period. So this demonstrates some of the
11 linkages, at least in the preliminary analysis, between
12 job growth and prosperity.
13 It is an uneven distribution and I will
14 still point out that according to our preliminary
15 analysis, about 24 percent of people living in Texas
16 counties on the border region are under the poverty
17 line. It's 12 percent nationally. So it's about double
18 the national average. The median household income is
19 about 35,000 on the U.S. side. The U.S. averages
20 60,000. So there's still a lot of room to grow, but
21 those basic measures of human development are improving.
22 Are there any questions or comments about
23 this so far?
24 MR. BARELA: Madam Chair, Jon Barela. In
25 our region, there's a growing interest in wage growth

1 and I'm just curious. You mentioned a few statistics of
2 the median household income and border area versus --
3 compared to the U.S. national average. Do we have
4 anything in Mexico that's comparable? Do we have
5 detailed data on how wage growth in our border areas
6 compare to respective national wage growth in each
7 country?
8 MR. LUDLOW: That's a really good
9 question. So we are working presently with INEGI to try
10 to drill down on that data in more detail. In Mexico,
11 they have -- a lot of the focus and the readily
12 available data has been on human development and
13 poverty. The government agency Prospera, which often
14 provides some of the sustenance payments, has excellent
15 data in terms of who's at the poverty level and how it's
16 changing; but there's not as much readily available data
17 in terms of who's at the higher income levels and how
18 that's changing. So we're working on that.
19 We recognize that there's a gap there on
20 the Mexico side that we're trying to fill so that we can
21 tell the fuller story. We recognize that in both the
22 U.S. and in Mexico, that the investments that TxDOT and
23 its partners would make as part of this plan, need to be
24 linked to those types of indicators.
25 Any other questions or comments on this?

1 was like prior to NAFTA. They know what it was
2 post-NAFTA. It's all been wonderful and great jobs.
3 But before NAFTA, you know, unemployment rates along the
4 border were 15, 17 percent. And so we have a big gap
5 between pre-NAFTA periods and post-NAFTA periods. So I
6 don't know if there's a skew there or not. I'm just
7 throwing it out there.
8 MR. LUDLOW: No, that's a great question.
9 And I hope that we're able to provide a defensible
10 answer. But, yeah, it's the pre-NAFTA and being able to
11 provide that history. Even though some of us weren't
12 around, at least in the business at that point in time.
13 MR. VALE: You don't know what you
14 missed. Those were good times.
15 MS. MAYS: But to your point, Gerry, we
16 definitely will look at pre- and then now post-NAFTA. I
17 think there's a story to tell there. As you mentioned,
18 unemployment was very high. But we can also look at how
19 the population has also grown and employment, income,
20 all of that. I think all of that has a good story that
21 can help tell the border story.
22 So, consultants, get to work.
23 MR. LUDLOW: All right. Thanks,
24 Caroline.
25 One of the last points here on
I'm going to change gears here just a little bit and flip to a discussion of some of the cross-border movement trends. And for these, we've gone back to 1996, which is the earliest available from BTS, the Bureau of Transportation Statistics; but we're working with them to get a little bit more historic information on educational trends. And the bottom line here is that there's been a fairly significant increase in the number of people crossing the border than there are freight vehicles. But that ratio is changing. In this last 20-year period, we've seen a significant drop. Now, it hasn't always been even. It varies. For example, you know, in El Paso we saw a fairly significant drop. Roma we saw a significant drop. Presidio is about the same. It just depends on where you're at on the border. But taken as a whole, this is a really critical trend for us to think about. While the population has increased, the economic impact has increased, incomes have increased, border crossings have decreased.

So I wanted to see if there were any questions, comments, or discussion about this trend. What has been driving this from your perspective?

MR. VALE: It's very simple. It's security regulations. You know, that's what drives a lot of it. And freight generates business. Wherever there's trade corridors or freight moving, business develops. And where there's not, it doesn't grow at the same rate. You know, people were questioning the value of Columbus discovering the New World. Well, he discovered a whole new trade route and that's what was happening. Columbus was like an Italian holiday or this holiday or they had this -- I mean, obviously, it's security and policies in Texas that have driven this. And the workforce is expanding because of better educational attainment.

And for these, we've gone back to 1996, which is the earliest available from BTS, the Bureau of Transportation Statistics; but we're working with them to get a little bit more historic information on educational trends. And the bottom line here is that there's been a fairly significant increase in the number of people crossing the border than there are freight vehicles. But that ratio is changing. In this last 20-year period, we've seen a significant drop. Now, it hasn't always been even. It varies. For example, you know, in El Paso we saw a fairly significant drop. Roma we saw a significant drop. Presidio is about the same. It just depends on where you're at on the border. But taken as a whole, this is a really critical trend for us to think about. While the population has increased, the economic impact has increased, incomes have increased, border crossings have decreased.

So I wanted to see if there were any questions, comments, or discussion about this trend. What has been driving this from your perspective?

MR. VALE: It's very simple. It's security regulations. You know, that's what drives a lot of it. And freight generates business. Wherever there's trade corridors or freight moving, business develops. And where there's not, it doesn't grow at the same rate. You know, people were questioning the value of Columbus discovering the New World. Well, he discovered a whole new trade route and that's what was happening. Columbus was like an Italian holiday or this holiday or they had this -- I mean, obviously, it's security and policies in Texas that have driven this. And the workforce is expanding because of better educational attainment.
1 maybe a lot younger than most of these people were
2 alive; but it was an exciting place to go. The Cadillac
3 Bar or all that stuff. You had good quality places to
4 go, easy, convenient. Those things affect crossings.
5 To me as a bridge owner, I can tell you I know people
6 that say, "No, man, I can't go today because it's too
7 much time on the bridge, but we'll go on Wednesday
8 because it's a little less traffic on Wednesday and
9 we'll meet." So that's how we schedule our lives today
10 based on how difficult it is to get where we need to be.
11 MR. LUDLOW: Great. Well, I'm going to
12 move -- sorry.
13 MR. CORONADO: David Coronado with El
14 Paso. We have seen the same pattern or the trend for
15 crossings since the 1990s. So we track our bridges, all
16 these metrics, and we've noticed that especially on the
17 vehicle side. I mean, any shock from the outside,
18 whether U.S. or Mexico, whether it's violence, whether
19 it's the economy, great recession, crisis, all those
20 events since 9/11, make a huge impact on the way that
21 people behave as they cross between Juarez and El Paso.
22 We've noted that in the last few months
23 with agent reassignment with CBP, that has a huge impact
24 on wait times on the vehicle side and then people choose
25 to walk instead. So you see that in the crossings.

1 question. The 7,765 train passengers, where did that
2 drop from? Or where was there a train along the border?
3 MR. LUDLOW: You know, we are still
4 trying to figure that out. We have been combing through
5 the data and looking at excursion trains and other
6 things. So let us get back to you on that one. That
7 raised a question for us, too. We'll talk to BTS about
8 that, as well.
9 MR. BARELA: Yeah. It may be an
10 opportunity is where I was going with that.
11 MR. LUDLOW: Possibly.
12 Sam.
13 MR. VALE: It used to be that we would
14 cross the border because it was fast and quick and easy.
15 We would go to lunch. We could come back. Nuevo Laredo
16 had a booming industry. I mean, immediately across from
17 us. Reynosa did. It was a very different world at that
18 time and it's just a lot more hassle to do things that
19 are not more important. We still cross the border for
20 important things, but we don't do the casual things that
21 we might have otherwise done and it's just very
22 difficult. But that's been good for some side of the
23 border and not so good for the other.
24 I mean, you can go to Nuevo Laredo now,
25 Gerry. It wasn't that exciting place it was when I was
Our exchange right is also affecting all this. And the other thing we've noticed is even though the number of cars crossing the border is less, the number of passengers in the car is less as well. So fewer people crossing.

MR. BARELA: Quick note on that. I think, just to go back real quickly. The question has been answered ironically. El Paso had the 7,765, apparently was the train traffic. And correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the streetcar ended way before 1990.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you.

I'm going to move through a few of these last few slides relatively quickly. I did want to point out one or two other points here. One, you're not alone. We looked at the northern border and Canada has experienced a similar -- Canada-U.S. border has experienced a similar drop. I'll get back to you later

on the exact percentage, but it's very similar. And the population growth that is served by this corridor.

in terms of the overall breakdown, the last two slides show some of our preliminary data analysis of how the modes are changing during this period. Just a few things to note. Pipeline growth has been very significant and I think we know that's from Eagle Ford and other shale plays. Rail growth in Laredo has been very significant and I think we know that's from the railroads and other data that we have on passenger train. Just cargo.

MR. LUDLOW: So speaking of trains, the number of northbound trains has increased by 53 percent.

So that's a significant increase, and we can talk about this for a while in terms of what's fueled that growth.

I know we've got a couple of rail representatives in the room. One of the questions I would pose to you is: Are the trains also longer? And I think they are.

MR. MEADOR: Yeah, I think that -- Stan

Meador with Texas-Pacifico. I think precisely to that point is number of trains doesn't really say a lot.

It's the number of cars, right? And northbound loads are empty. I mean, it's the breakdown of what those trains consist of in each direction. That would be much more telling information.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Then we'll work with some of the railroads and other data that we have on that.

Trucks, up by 93 percent during this period of time. So contrast that with the negative 43 percent in passengers in vehicles and 93 percent increase in the number of trucks and that's been pretty uniform across the entire border. There are only a few border crossings that have seen some reduction recently.

On the trade side, I've just got a couple of slides here and just wanted to make a couple of points. The Texas trade gateways have continued to grow in an amazing trajectory. Laredo in 2013 was fifth. Now it's number one in the country. The number one trade gateway value. El Paso is 16th. It was 17th. Hidalgo is 28th. It was 30th. And Eagle Pass is 29th. It was 41st just in 2013. By contrast, Otay Mesa is the same and Nogales has fallen a little bit. So the Texas trade gateways, just even in the last five years, have gained incredible national prominence due to policy, nearshoring a lot of other trends and the tremendous population growth that is served by this corridor.

In terms of the overall breakdown, the five points. The Texas trade gateways have continued to grow in an amazing trajectory. Laredo in 2013 was fifth. Now it's number one in the country. The number one trade gateway value. El Paso is 16th. It was 17th. Hidalgo is 28th. It was 30th. And Eagle Pass is 29th. It was 41st just in 2013. By contrast, Otay Mesa is the same and Nogales has fallen a little bit. So the Texas trade gateways, just even in the last five years, have gained incredible national prominence due to policy, nearshoring a lot of other trends and the tremendous population growth that is served by this corridor.

In terms of the overall breakdown, the five last two slides show some of our preliminary data analysis of how the modes are changing during this period. Just a few things to note. Pipeline growth has been very significant and I think we know that's from Eagle Ford and other shale plays. Rail growth in Laredo and El Paso has been significant and, obviously, truck traffic has been big too. Overall there is an imbalance imports. Texas imports more than it exports, but it's a much better trade balance than we see with a lot of other countries and some of the trends point to a continued healthy trajectory in both the Texas and Mexico border economies.
We're going to look at some of the criteria we've used in the process and try to get some input from you folks.

Donald got heavily into the data. The data that he has talked about and is developed from this clearinghouse, is going to be used to support and is already being used to support this next Task 5 and this is the Binational/Multimodal Corridor and System Identification Designation. It includes -- I'll just provide a brief overview of some of the elements that we're going to talk about today, some of the key tasks that we made progress on.

There will be some handouts too that I'll identify for you to check out as we're doing the presentation if you want to and then we will have some questions posed through metamerter that if you could respond to online. I think we'll have three of those examples. So probably about maybe one question per topic. One or two questions per topic.

So with that said, the goal of Task 5 is really to connect with these various tasks with stakeholder input with the data inventory piece. And it's a data-driven process here, stakeholder-driven process where we're identifying in the first element corridor and POE identification and designation. That's the first several tasks that we're going to come to some conclusion. Once we identify those corridors and POEs and designate those for our analysis, we're going to go to the next phase which is the needs assessment. So those are the two elements of this primary task.

Today, we'll talk about three key things to the next phase which is the needs assessment. So the areas of analysis which we call spheres -- and, again, this is preliminary. This is draft. This coincides with Handout 5A, I believe. So it's 5A in your handouts that sort of describes this geographic scope that we need to conduct the analysis on. We've defined these spheres to understand the movement of people and goods and the impacts, et cetera, and then identify those needs which will help us define these projects later.

So Sphere 1 through Sphere 5. Sphere 1 is, you know, a 60-mile plus or minus distance. And you saw some of maps -- they're right here -- that Donald presented with the population data that represent that first sphere. This is the high impact area for this study. We're really going to conduct detailed analysis in this sphere. We have multiple levels of analysis in Sphere 1 as well that we'll get into in a minute.

Then Sphere 2, about 100 miles in and out of the border, key populations, good production. This is sort of a fungible border, depending on where these key connections are to the border. So they could be plus or minus 100 miles, but we're looking for input on that topic from you folks.

And then Sphere 3, 4, 5, those are the Texas entries and the four Mexican states and then we get into, you know, Canada, U.S., and Mexico for the last two spheres and we'll talk about those in a minute. So I just wanted to give some examples for each of the border regions. Sphere 1, in particular, the first graphic is the Zaragoza crossing. And you see on the left-hand side just the footprint of the crossing. We felt we wanted to show that, depict existing conditions to then spin into potential future projects and identify those on that system. Then the -- that's on the left. And on the right is about a 1-mile look with the connectivity of the multimodal system to that crossing. Also, these are all in Sphere 1.

So then we have a -- this is where we want some key input from you folks. We looked at a 10-mile buffer, thinking that that was a pretty good assessment of where the key impacts would be in the border region in this sphere; but we're looking for your input. Maybe it's 15 miles. Maybe it's different per border region. So that's the key analysis area there, the 10-mile to 15-mile Sphere A we'll call it, Sphere 1A. And then the last graphic is the entire sphere for the El Paso region that just shows them adding to the study area of that sphere.
so we want to hear from you on that.

so we can move forward with doing the detailed analysis.

from you that, yes, these levels are okay and, you know,

but today we really want to get kind of a final input

wanting to make sure. We've discussed this in the past;

is kind of the roads that lead to that. So we're

starting to discuss it instead of waiting.

process to get online.

that's part of the question here, Kelly. And there's a

10 process to get online.

16 MS. MAYS: Yes.

17 MR. VALE: There is a number in there

18 that they use to say the border region. So 60 miles

19 certainly would be reasonable to have. Anything less

20 than that, you can say it's 1-mile port of entry. All

21 of those are going to be moving very fast.

22 The other area that Gerry is talking

23 about is where the development is going to take place,

24 somewhere in that 60 miles generally. Even El Paso, I

25 think, when you go out past the city limits, it's like

26 think, when you go out past the city limits, it's like

27 smaller POEs, 60 miles, might not necessarily be

28 smaller POEs, 60 miles, might not necessarily be

29 smaller POEs, 60 miles, might not necessarily be

30 smaller POEs, 60 miles, might not necessarily be
25 The port gates, you know, a mile outside of the port. So outside of CBP is very interested in a lot of these discussions, that allows the feds to kind of chime in, as well. That's really critical. So we want to make sure the connection to the ports and the exits to the concerns from the Mexican side, as well as on our side, connectivity to the port, we've heard a lot and a lot of comments from the Mexican side, as well as on our side, is the connection to the ports and the exits to the ports. That's really critical. So we want to make sure that allows the feds to kind of chime in, as well. CBP is very interested in a lot of these discussions, and less once you get outside of that. So outside of the port gates, you know, a mile outside of the port.
1 administration is looking at -- they look at the
2 northern region for infrastructure funding programs like
3 the emphasis is on the southern region and we've got the
4 west coast. I know that -- does that impact the sphere
5 of the five states that we're talking about here, you
6 know, negatively impact it or positively impact, this
7 administration's current plan? Do you know anything
8 about that?
9
10 MS. LAGOS: I'm not sure.
11 MS. MAYS: To answer that, yes, you're
12 going to see some of the maps later on, the corridor
13 designation. We've taken some of the preliminary plans
14 that the Mexican side has in place. So at least the
15 ones that we know. So we will show you some of those
16 because we've been in close communication with Mexico
17 City. We've had meetings with them and then, you know,
18 we've gotten some input from them on the emphasis of the
19 northern border and some of the plans that they have.
20 MR. DECKER: And these just show how
21 we're going to represent the information. So the
22 corridors of the designations and the material that will
23 come into play. We'll talk about that in a minute.
24 So the next piece here is the designation
25 process. It's preliminary. It's draft. We've used
26 some of the data that I'll talk about to help identify
27 corridors and designate corridors this is just
28 draft, some ideas that we had and there might be ideas
29 that we'd like your input on that. We're also going to
30 talk about POE designations, as well. And we'll talk
31 about that process.
32 So in terms of both U.S. -- Texas and
33 Mexico, there are a variety of sources that we use to
34 identify roadway systems that we wanted to take
35 advantage of that we understood are part of -- you know,
36 in the U.S. federal and State TxDOT designations of
37 facilities and the same side on the Mexico side and we
38 tried to merge those, take into account stakeholder
39 input from the previous meetings we've had to help us
40 start designating these corridors. So I'll walk through
41 that process right now.
42 So the first system in the U.S., its the
43 National Highway System which is the core system for
44 mobility and safety and those things in the U.S. Mainly
45 interstate and U.S routes. Layered on top of that is
46 the National Highway Freight Network, which layers in
47 the key freight corridors from the U.S. inside Texas.
48 Then we looked at the Texas Highway Freight Network and
49 layered that on top, as well. A little more detailed,
50 local connectors. And then the last is the Texas Trunk
51 System. Sort of a two- to four-lane highway system
52 1 designated in Texas. And then on the Mexico side, we
53 looked at the INEGI national database, the roadway
54 network, and then layered on top of that the Mexico
55 World Street View, which provides a little more detail.
56 So we combined those because this is binational here and
57 then from our first input in round one, these are some
58 of the corridors that were identified, whether it's
59 ports, primary trade corridors, ports on the Mexico side
60 that were identified through those meetings.
61 And then the second round, we had some
62 additional feedback input from mainly on the Mexico side
63 for these trade corridors. So we put all that stuff
64 together, added the stakeholders, and came up with a
65 graph of common facilities that we think could be a good
66 starting point here for roadways for the Border
67 Transportation Master Plan. And then from that, we sort
68 of identified some international corridors and those are
69 the roadways crossing POEs on both sides of the border
70 with major movements. Then merging international
71 corridor that seems to be something that could emerge
72 with major movements in the near future and longterm
73 future. Regional corridors, so those corridors that
74 connect the POEs to these international corridors to
75 other areas of distribution center kind of thing. And
76 then those local connectors. Those are shown in --
77 1 oops. I don't know what happened there.
78 MR. CAMPIRANO: I have a question for
79 you. Isn't there already an official designation for
80 the interstate system in the Valley? I didn't see any
81 indication of that on any of those that, you know, where
82 you already do have Interstate 69, Interstate 2; but
83 none of those appear in any of those maps if I was
84 looking at them correctly.
85 MR. DECKER: I believe they showed up on
86 the later maps with the stakeholder input maps with
87 those identified corridors and I think 69, it might be a
88 previous version of 69 into Brownsville/Laredo. You
89 know, the different alternatives? Let's see if we --
90 MS. MAYS: Yeah. I-69 should be on the
91 Texas Freight Network. And I-2, all of those corridors
92 are on the Texas Freight Network. They kind of will
93 blend a little bit because we're trying to layer. And
94 really what I want to say is that when Steve started
95 with the National Highway System, that's the basis and
96 then the feds a couple years ago came up with the
97 National Highway Freight Network and there were criteria
98 they used to select those. Then when we developed the
99 Freight Mobility Plan, we went through the exercise
100 again to identify the corridors based on certain
101 criteria and it includes, you know, 69 and others.
1 Actually, they tie to 69 because of the interstate is a trade corridor, a critical trade corridor. And then the Trunk System has been an effort that we have taken as key criteria is that the corridor has to connect to an international port of entry. So that's why we have the trunk here. So when we're layering all of these corridors, there's been previous criteria used to identify them as a basis to start this. The intent is to say, okay, this is a critical trade corridor, a corridor that supports trade in Texas or supports cross-border movement of people and goods. So that's really the intent of this. It's not to designate them as interstate or U.S. highways, but corridors or roadways that are critical to the movement of cross-border trade.

MR. CAMPIRANO: And that would be the case for those, as well as what would be I-169 --

MR. CANON: Yes, I was going to ask about that.

MR. CAMPIRANO: -- to interstate status as well?

MS. MAYS: Yeah.

MR. CANON: Because we have 169 now.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And then, you know, what Steve is showing here is really the broader one
down more specifically to specific corridors in those regions. We'll do it for Laredo. We'll do it for El Paso. So this is really an attempt to just kind of walk through the broader process.

MR. DECKER: And this is just for roadways, too. So we're going to define criteria that really links all the multimodal with these systems, as well. So this is just our first cut here with roadway. And then we just show the international -- maybe not on this slide -- but on this slide, we show the international corridor, the regional corridor, the local corridors, and the codes, how they connect with the various border regions. And this, of course, is just draft and preliminary. Obviously, there are other data sources we could use to assess and create these corridors.

And then here is for World Trade Bridge in Laredo. Same sort of deal where you get the international corridor in blue, regional corridor in yellow, and then the local corridors are in brown and those connections. And it does show that 60-mile connection to the right. Then the same here for B and M Bridge in Rio Grande Valley, just showing all those designated corridors there.

So with that said, there are other ways to, you know, identify these international corridors.

We can look at commodity flows. We could look at other data to support. So we're looking for input from you folks on that, as well. So are we missing anything, any data, important data here that would be useful to designate these corridors? That's the first question.

I think that's the only question for this one.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Gerry Schwebel. I wonder if we should include in those ports of -- we're talking about intermodal, as well. Should we identify any airports?

MR. DECKER: Yes. Airports will be part of the modal profiles that we develop, one of the modes that we develop for connectivity. Maritime, as well.

The port facilities, as well. Pipelines.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And, Gerry, we will include that because it's going to be multimodal. This one is just focusing on the highways and then we'll overlay all what we call the freight generators. We'll overlay the ports of entry, the airports, the maritime, and other generators of activity. And this one, again, is focused a lot on the goods movement side; but also we're going to be looking at the passenger side, as well. So what are some of those critical infrastructure to move people across the border, as well.

MR. DECKER: And one of the key aspects, too, is supply chains. How these goods are moved by different modes crossing the border, that kind of thing.

And that will be a big part of the profile analysis, the needs analysis, how does that work, how do we accommodate those kinds of issues and we're just not at this point yet.

Any other questions?

So we talked about some of the corridors.

Are we missing any corridors? 69 I think was in there. It showed both connections to the border, options for different modes crossing the border, that kind of thing.

And that will be a big part of the profile analysis, the needs analysis, how does that work, how do we accommodate those kinds of issues and we're just not at this point yet.

Any other questions?

So we talked about some of the corridors.

Are we missing any corridors? 69 I think was in there. It showed both connections to the border, options for 69. Are there others that we're missing?

And we have gone through a couple of rounds of this from various other stakeholders on that, as well.

MS. MAYS: Steve, if you can go back to one of the answers to Gerry's question. There's a slide -- the one with the stakeholder input.

MR. DECKER: With the what? I'm sorry.


MR. DECKER: I think it's the next one.
1 extremely important. I know that we're talking about
2 60 miles, but what's happening is just a few miles
3 beyond that 60 miles. We're getting ready to have a
4 huge, huge economic explosion and I just wanted
5 everybody in the room to be aware of that and understand
6 that because the economic engine of the United States is
7 Texas and the economic engine of Texas is the Permian
8 Basin oil and gas. So it's very, very important. I'm
9 glad that corridor is included.
10  CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you.
11  MR. SCHWEBEL: So moving on to the next
12 one, Kelly.
13  So we're going to look at assessed POEs.
14  We did some designation work as well based on
15 information we had at the border crossings. We looked
16 at three different options, but there are multiple
17 options for the size of the POEs to understand large,
18 medium, small in terms of activity, for later analysis
19 in terms of what we're doing and how we connect those
20 to -- those POEs with the designated corridor.
21  So we looked at commercial truck
22 movements crossing the border, passenger car movements,
23 and then pedestrian movements. And like I said, there
24 are other options. Here we just show, you know, the
25 examples of the bridges again in the three regions and

1 If you guys get it before we do, please send it to us.
2  MR. SOLIS: Caroline, I was just going to
3 mention that we have an insider on that, our liaison
4 with the Mexican government having been very active on
5 the status of that, both the national development plan
6 and the sectorial infrastructure plan. So he's in
7 contact with them and we hopefully can get the inside
8 scoop before it gets published.
9  COUNCILMAN LOVE, III: To give you just a
10 little background information about that corridor and
11 why it's so important. I'm silently cheering over here
12 that it's in there. The Permian Basin has the largest
13 secure oil field in the world. Two-thirds of it is the
14 Delaware Basin, which sits in the Pecos. Right now, a
15 study was conducted by Ray Perryman and also Pecos went
16 to the State legislature to create a management
17 district. What they're trying to do is they're trying
18 to establish a permanent resident workforce in Pecos.
19 And the study shows that if they are able
20 to get, I think, 14,000 residential units in the next
21 five years, the Pecos economy will go from 500 million
22 to 3 billion in 11 years. So they're trying to
23 establish this permanent workforce there and they're
24 really exploring very, very fast.
25  So this trade corridor is extremely,
So like I said, there are other ways in which we could cut this pie and define sizing. You know, you could look at combined vehicles, cars and trucks. You could look at combined vehicles with pedestrians, as well. Or you could rate vehicle movements differently, like trucks you could rate differently. So those are some things we could explore, but that was our first cut and we are interested in your suggestions.

MS. MAYS: Steve, can you go back to the slide that shows the commercial breakdown? Yeah, that one.

So we wanted to present this to the committee. Just using the preliminary analysis as Steve showed, this is kind of where the crossings fall. Does this make sense? Is everybody comfortable with this, or do we need to look at it differently?

And I think what we heard from you a while back was we will need a way to be able to assess like ports with like border -- or ports with border crossings and not -- you know, we don't want to be assessed or our needs are not the same as Laredo. So this is kind of our attempt and one is on the commercial vehicle side. So should we -- does this make sense from your perspective?

David, I see you shaking your head. Any comments? No?

Anybody else?

Jake from Presidio?

MR. GIESBRECHT: I'm good.

MS. MAYS: Laredo?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Are you taking into consideration also what the joint committee related to the border crossings already has under review?

They present an application and the ports of entry are in -- are those taken into consideration that came to these numbers here?

MS. MAYS: No. BBXG has, at least from my knowledge -- I don't know if Tim can speak to this -- but I don't think they've done this type of exercise to look at bridges small, medium, large, and very large. They've not really done that. What they do is more really present the needs of the actual federal compound issues and not necessarily in this way. We're using this to help us assess the needs unique to small bridges, assess needs to medium, and et cetera. And then also when it comes to investments, needs, et cetera, to recommendations so that small bridges are not compared to larger bridges. So that's really the intent here.

Mr. Vale: Many of those would still be using the same highway systems because you ultimately don't -- you're not going to create a lot of new highway corridors right now with interstate quality. So the access, regardless of where it was or going to be created, it's going to be using one of those systems for at least the near future. Then after that, you could have some differences; but that's way out. That's 15-, 20-year stuff.

MS. MAYS: Yeah.

MR. VALE: So I think this is good, what you're doing here.

MS. MAYS: If Sam says it's good, I'm happy.

MR. VALE: It's not perfect, but it's good.

MS. MAYS: Do you need anything, Sam?

MR. DECKER: We'll move ahead to the last piece here. It's about needs, and this is all preliminary draft in terms of our needs assessment. So before we just -- we got into the corridor designation identification process. We're going to population that with different information in terms of modal profiles, et cetera, for the existing and future. This piece is really assessing the needs of those corridor systems and those designated systems.

So the first thing we're going to do is a thing called a SWOT analysis, which is Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses, and Threats. We're going to perform that at each border crossing in terms of identifying issues, trends, needs we have. We'll get into some of the issues later. And then we're going to also do a transportation system needs evaluation, too, in terms of those spheres that we were talking about earlier and that's going to be very quantitative, looking at metrics that will show some of the metrics. So, obviously, this is data driven. We're basing this on the input and we've already received some stakeholder input in the last two meetings, sets of meetings. We're linking this, the metrics and measures, to goals and objectives just so we're in line with the vision and the goals and objectives defined earlier by Alejandro.

Here are some examples of measures, statistics we can use to assess needs in terms of congestion, travel speeds for the highways and roadways, and a variety of other metrics by mode.

And then I just wanted to identify a few 2017 statistics that show for each of the examples for El Paso, Laredo, Rio Grande Valley. This is that...
10-mile look that shows traffic demand, average annual daily traffic for 2017 and the red show the primary movements and then the green and less than green show less movements. These are key inputs to assessing needs.

Congestion, obviously, is a big deal.

Understanding congestion levels. You see the red. Those are congestion conditions right now in 2017. This is daily, of course; but we'd like to get to some peaking, as well. But this indicates bottlenecks, which is a key issue when it comes to needs evaluation. And then truck percentages of this all day average daily traffic. And, obviously, the red show the higher percentage of truck movements, which impact the system in multiple ways. So we want to understand that percentage, as well.

Then we looked at this called a safety incident crash map and it just shows concentration of the accidents/incidents in the border region. Obviously, the urban areas have a higher, you know, concentration of incidents compared to the rural. And we have good data that supports this and that supports that safety goal defined earlier by Alejandro in the process. So these are just some statistics we can show and we'll have plenty of data to represent needs on the system.

And then in terms of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats analysis, we've already identified some front stakeholders' various needs and issues. We've talked about hot spots, bottlenecks, wait times, seasonal characteristics, workforce, future capacity issues. All that will be built into the SWOT analysis for each POE. We're conducting a field visit for each of the POE, understanding issues, trends, and needs. We're going to link all this stuff up together in our analysis with corridors and, of course, linking to goals and objectives.

So this wraps up this end of the presentation with this question. Are there any comments about this needs analysis framework? Obviously, it's tough stuff to identify, you know, looking at this right now and identify some comments. But brief comments would be great and other comments would be welcomed as well that might come in later.

MR. GIESBRECHT: I've got one question and it's on the multimodal and probably more for Stan. The multimodal infrastructure for the railroad crossings, it's x-rays and -- in Presidio, we're working on multimodal infrastructure need between the car port -- truck port of entry and the rail port of entry.

Is that what this is doing here?

MR. DECKER: If there's a need (inaudible).

THE REPORTER: I can't hear him.

MR. JUAREZ, JR.: Steve, microphone.

MS. MAYS: The needs assessment is going to be critical. So some of these needs and your unique because you have both the rail and the vehicle or highway crossing. Some of the bridges only have highway. Some have both, you know, rail and highway.

So, yeah, they are going to be all kind of unique. So we want to make sure we're addressing all those. Like I mentioned earlier, really tailoring some of the needs assessment is going to be critical. So please let us know what exactly you would like us to be looking at in terms of identifying the needs that are unique to your border crossings that might not be the same for somebody else.

MR. DECKER: Just to add on to that, Jake, the tradeoffs and that need between those modes that could define a project, a technology project, et cetera, that will come later.

MR. CANON: Andrew Canon, RGV MPO. On the reliability, is that a traditional volume over capacity that you're looking at on the congested or is it actually a delay situation where we're looking at operational improvements that could benefit what you're showing on the tables?

MR. DECKER: Right. I think the reliability really is related to travel time. Is that system reliable for you and me to travel every day? So it does account for bottlenecks and delay, et cetera. It doesn't have to be infrastructure. It could be operational strategies that could help improve that travel time reliability of that facility or a facility.

MR. CANON: I think that would be important to point out because operational improvements traditionally are, you know, incredibly less expensive than adding capacity, new infrastructure projects where if you have vehicles sitting at a light or a situation for over a certain period of time and you simply just widen lanes. I mean, you have the same number of vehicles. It's just five wide instead of three wide.
I think it would be important to know if those were operational strategies that we should be looking at in the future or if they're actually adding capacity projects that we need to look at.

MR. DECKER: I totally agree with you, and we haven't gotten to that point yet in the analysis; but operational infrastructure, combinations of by mode for these needs based analysis by corridor is definitely what we're looking at. We're talking about technology as well as the POEs, those kinds of improvements. So it's a whole mix of different types of solutions and strategies, including policies. You're absolutely right.

MR. CANON: Thank you.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Gerry Schwebel. I plan on -- you included in the slide -- let me see where it is -- safety hot spots. One of the things that we're trying to track in Laredo at the 38-mile marker, we have a border control check point. So we created a congestion of a backpack of trucks based on the staffing we may have at the port of entry. Sometimes that goes up to two miles where trucks that are northbound 35. So what that creates, especially for just in time delivery for some of these trucks, once they get through the border control check point, well, they speed it up. And
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I shared with Mr. Williams, you know, I'm noticing an increased number of accidents along 35. I can't attribute it to any particular reason; but as I drive, I do see trucks speed more often and I know perhaps, you know, that's a DPS issue or it's a -- but these are things that are being created right now as a result of processes or that impacts the flow of those trucks. And I don't know if it happens down in RGV or Eagle Pass, 93. Do you see more and more of that type of congestion in those border patrol check points?

MR. DECKER: We haven't dug too deeply in that data, but we could also present truck related incidents as well separate from all others. So there are a variety of slices here we could try to get at that issue.

MR. CALVO: This is Eduardo Calvo. As part of the needs assessment, are you guys going to be collecting any new data? Origin/destination patterns are so important at the high level, but also at the local level. Are you -- is this going to be capturing or collecting some data for that?

MS. MAYS: No, we're not in our interviews. We're doing interviews, extensive interviews; but not like a survey or what David had talked about what they're doing in El Paso. We're not
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But especially we saw that with the recent migrant crisis. The ports of entry that were more affected were trucks going into Santa Teresa, crossing into New Mexico; but then at the end of the day, they still go to Texas through one of our state highways. So that has to be included in the analysis because it may not affect a crossing because it's in New Mexico, but all that traffic at the end of the day goes into Texas.

MR. JUAREZ, JR.: So, Eduardo, when we identified the region, especially for El Paso, Santa Teresa is included as part of that. When we go and do the subarea analysis, we will also look at the Santa Teresa POE and its connectivity to the international trade corridor. We just wanted to give a broad example just for those specific regions, but it is included as part of your overall system.

MR. CALVO: It may be one of the medium size crossings on this list.

MR. JUAREZ, JR.: And we'll note that for inclusion in the table.

MR. SOLIS: Okay. So we're going to move on to the last section. We have a summary of the discussion. You guys have a handout on that. So I'm not really going to spend a lot of time. The only thing I wanted to mention is this one. I want to spend one
I welcome and for your time here today and unless anyone has anything they want to share before we conclude, I will go ahead entertain a motion.

MR. CORONADO: Thank you, David.

Coronado. So Bridges is working -- El Paso is working right now on a survey that we want to send to owners or agencies that manage bridges, toll bridges specifically in Texas. This survey includes questions on staffing levels, whether it's part timers, full timers, seasonal workers, to one bridge system or your bridge system in Texas. We have schedules, number of lanes, a whole host of issues that we want to learn from all of you, the process in Texas.

It's very micro-level, very detailed, you know, specific questions on the commercial side vehicles and pedestrians. So be on the lookout. Hopefully, we will get responses, you know, fairly quickly and then we'll send that also to Tim and Giacomo for this study.

On the top of the table, we have the next steps. Those are the tasks we will be completing over the next three months or so. I'm also not going to spend time there just to be respectful of the time.

Right now we're close to noon. And with that, I just want to pass it on to closing remarks to Tim and Caroline.

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHS: Thank you. We do want to be respectful of your time. This is, of course, my first meeting, my first BTAC meeting, and I certainly appreciate everybody's input. Clearly it seems that we all agree wait times on inspections, on infrastructure, on technology, on the importance of the trade corridor, and so many of the things that were mentioned here today. And then with respect to some of the studies, it sounds like if you've seen one border crossing in Texas, maybe you've seen one border crossing in Texas. So we're going to expand the spheres. Maybe go back a little bit beyond 1990 to see some of the NAFTA impact.
favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIRWOMAN HUGHES: Any opposed?

All right. We are adjourned. Thank you

and safe travels.

(Meeting adjourns at 12:03 p.m.)

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: Cameron..collective</th>
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</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cameron</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>51:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>16:11 27:19 110:19,24 125:5,18 126:14</td>
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