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PROCEEDINGS

SECY. HUGHS: Well, good afternoon, everyone. I know that we typically have our meetings in the morning and that there had been a Commission meeting this morning and lots of other obligations, so it looks like there are 93 people on this call.

We'll wait to see if we have a quorum and we'll wait, if we need to, until such time as we have one. But I want to thank all of you for joining us and for accommodating your schedule to be able to be with us this afternoon.

We are so grateful to be able to continue to have these Border Trade Advisory Committee meetings, albeit it virtually, but it's exciting that we get to do this and continue the great work that all of you are so instrumental in.

And so this is our third meeting of the fall, and I hope that we've all been staying safe and healthy since we last met. I know we're all concerned about our friends in El Paso and other parts where we are getting increased numbers, and so it really does highlight just the need to be evermore vigilant of ourselves, our family, our friends and our neighbors as we continue to also go on with our lives and try to have some sense of normalcy in the very abnormal situation that we find ourselves in.
It is such an honor to serve as chair of this committee and very much looking forward to the discussion today, but I do want to take a moment to mention since we last met our nation and our state, of course, voted in the 2020 general election last week, and I want to commend Texas voters for their participation despite those challenges that we face with COVID-19.

The election here in Texas really was a resounding success and the turnout among registered voters was the highest that we've seen in 28 years of Texans exercising their right to vote. I'm very grateful for the tireless work of election officials, workers and volunteers across the state who were able to successfully operate thousands of county polling locations across Texas on election day and ensure safe, free, and fair elections.

Now I want to shift back to our work here at BTAC and thank all of our friends and partners at TxDOT, starting, of course, with recognizing our distinguished commissioners, Alvin New and Laura Ryan, for their service and their commitment to this group. Thank you for joining us and for making sure that Texas's trade relationship with Mexico grows even stronger.

And of course, I want to recognize Caroline Mays and her entire team, Ken, Giacomo, all of you that help us; Loretta, everyone that helps and plans and
ensures that our meetings are run smoothly and that we continue to move forward in progressing towards this final plan as we near the end of 2020. We are so fortunate to have y'all as partners, and we appreciate your continued support and service to the people of Texas.

As you know, the ongoing mission of this committee is to work collaboratively to help create a positive and lasting impact for our border communities through the completion of the Border Transportation Master Plan.

Over the course of the past year members of this committee have provided invaluable feedback towards this plan. This committee has discussed unique challenges that COVID-19 has presented to cross-border trade paused by mutually-agreed-upon travel restrictions between the U.S. and Mexico.

These restrictions have affected traffic as well as the prior operations and the committee has suggested greater and continued collaboration with Mexican state and federal partners in order to address these challenges.

We've also discussed the challenges of current and needed infrastructure, expressed concern over potential impacts to the supply chain and the manufacturing industry and retail sector as a result of
increased wait times along the border, and stressed the
need for us to make our efforts better known to the
public.

And we've highlighted and welcomed the
announcement that TxDOT has acquired access to the Texas
Transportation Institute data to help measure border
crossing wait times, supplementing the existing
methodology used by CBP. This development has helped us
to more accurately estimate the exact amount of impact of
wait times and better convey the significance in our plan.

As the year comes to a close and we near the
completion of our Border Transportation Master Plan, it is
imperative that we continue to generate invaluable
feedback as a committee to help to complete this plan.

Today, as part of the overall presentation, we
will review an executive summary of the Border Master Plan
as it stands from TxDOT. We need everyone on this call,
every member of BTAC, to be fully engaged and actively
participate in the committee discussion to help TxDOT and
HGR further revise the plan and the executive summary to
ensure that both are an accurate reflection of our state
and your individual areas' needs.

Every single word in this document will matter,
and so it is important that we take this time this
afternoon and beyond as we go to the completion that we
really look at the words and the meaning and that everyone is comfortable with this executive summary and with the information that we'll have an opportunity to review and comment on as the meeting progresses.

Your specific input and feedback on topics discussed and presented during and after this meeting are key to drafting a plan that correctly addresses the needs of our border areas and ensures your community is well represented and that your projects are included and considered in the final plan.

Now more than ever, if you have not provided prior feedback, it's vital that you do so now and speak up to share the needs and concerns of your communities. Your feedback is really valuable, it will have an immense positive impact in helping to draft and present the final version of this plan.

At this time I also want to recognize the representatives from each of our four Mexican border states who are again joining us today: Anna Alvarez, Binational Affairs from the Ministry of Economic Development of Chihuahua; Guillermo Gonzalez, the Undersecretary of Infrastructure and Roads from the Ministry of Transportation of Coahuila; from Nuevo León, Noe Garza, the CodeFront Director; and Manuel Salias, the General Coordinator of Promotion and Projects CodeFront.
for Nuevo Laredo; and from Tamaulipas, Carlos Garcia Gonzalez, Secretary of Economic Development in Tamaulipas, and Ernesto Gonzalez, Director of Foreign Commerce of Tamaulipas.

We also have the pleasure of welcoming to our meeting representatives from the Mexican Federal Government: Erika Garcia, the Director of International Projects, Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes; and of course, our friend, Consul General of Mexico here in Austin, Pablo Marentes, and Jorge Salcido, the Consul for Political and Economic Affairs who represent the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I know we have other friends joining us from different entities in Mexico on today's call, and I appreciate all of your interest and listening in and being a part of this discussion.

We appreciate very much the in-depth presentations that our Mexican border state partners presented at our last meeting and conveying their needs and projects to us as we work to complete a plan that benefits both Texas and Mexico.

We are thankful for their unwavering participation and engagement in all of our meetings. Our collaboration and consistent communication strengthens our state-to-state relationship and helps us to develop plans
and strategies that truly benefit our region, such as this Border Master Plan.

So with that, I want to welcome everyone. Thank you all for your continued commitment helping create a brighter future for all on both sides of the border. Thank you for allowing me this time to provide an introduction. And with that, I will now turn it back over to Caroline.

MS. MAYS: Thank you very much, Secretary, for the opening remarks. Before we jump into the next agenda item, I see Commissioner Ryan and Commissioner New on the call.

Commissioner Ryan, any few words?

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Just quickly good afternoon, and appreciate being a part of the group. A lot of work that was done, and I'm excited about the final product. So again, just here in support, anything we can do specifically, please let me know. And if I don't get another opportunity, I want to wish everyone a happy Thanksgiving, and please be safe.

Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Commissioner Ryan.

Commissioner New?

COMMISSIONER NEW: Hello. Just a pleasure to be on the call and to listen and learn and try to use the
information to do our work. So thank you, everyone, for all that you do in this, and I look forward to hearing the feedback.

MS. MAYS: Thank you very much, Commissioner New.

Roger, I see you on the line, so I'll call on you since I don't see anybody else from administration. Roger, you're on?

MR. BEALL: Yes. Thank you, Caroline, and thank all of you for being on this call and your heavy lifting and hard work so far, and we're almost to the goal line, so appreciate everyone's hard efforts in this, and like the Secretary of State has said, that we need to finish this out strong and need everyone's comments and input to make this a great plan.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Roger.

Secretary, we'll move into the roll call, and, Eduardo, you're going to handle that before we go to the next agenda item. Thank you. Eduardo?

MR. ALMANZA: Hi, Caroline, this is Francisco. I think Eduardo is having some connection issues, so I'll take over the roll.

MS. MAYS: Okay, awesome. Thank you.

MR. ALMANZA: I'll begin with Secretary of State Ruth Hughes.
SECY. HUGHS: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Rafael Aldrete?

MR. ALDRETE: Present, here.

MR. ALMANZA: Thank you.

Jon Barela?

MR. BARELA: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Luis Bazán?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Eduardo Calvo?

MR. CALVO: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Eduardo Campirano?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Andrew Canon?

MS. MAYS: I don't see him.

MR. ALMANZA: I don't see him either.

Sergio Contreras?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: David Coronado?

MR. CORONADO: I'm here.

MR. ALMANZA: John Esparza?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Juan Antonio Flores?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Dante Galeazzi?

(No response.)
MR. ALMANZA: Josue Garcia, Jr.?

MR. GARCIA: Good afternoon. Present.

MR. ALMANZA: I see Luis Diaz is here on behalf of Andrew Canon.

Cynthia Gaza-Reyes?

MS. GAZA-REYES: Good afternoon. Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Jake Giesbrecht?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Ivan Jaime?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Lisa Loftus-Otway?

MS. LOFTUS-OTWAY: Here, present.

MR. ALMANZA: Good afternoon.

Marga Lopez?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Mayor Bruno Lozano?

MAYOR LOZANO: Present, here.

MR. ALMANZA: Stan Meador?

(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Commissioner Vincent Perez?

MR. PEREZ: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Jesus Reyna?

MR. REINA: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm present.

MR. ALMANZA: Mayor Pete Saenz?
MR. ALMANZA: Gerry Schwebel?
MR. SCHWEBEL: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Megan Shea?
MS. SHEA: I'm on. Good afternoon.

MR. ALMANZA: Luis Sifuentes?
MAYOR SIFUENTES: I'm here, guys. Good afternoon.

MR. ALMANZA: Tommy Taylor?
(No response.)

MR. ALMANZA: Sam Vale?
MR. VALE: Present.

MR. ALMANZA: Cameron Walker?
MR. WALKER: I'm here. Good afternoon.

MR. ALMANZA: And a representative from Kansas City Southern?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes. This is Warren Erdman with Kansas City Southern, present.

MR. ALMANZA: Okay. We have 16 members in attendance, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: You have 16, I have 18, not including SOS, so you're missing somebody.

Mr. ALMANZA: Okay. I see 18 with the representatives.

MR. LOZANO: Sorry. This is Eduardo Lozano.
I'm here.

MR. ALMANZA: Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Thank you.

So, Secretary, I think we do have a quorum to adopt the minutes.

SECY. HUGHES: Wonderful. So that being the case, I don't know if we're moving to the agenda page, but we'll go ahead if everyone has had an opportunity. I know you've provided the minutes to the members and if everyone has had an opportunity to read them, do we have any questions or comments about the minutes?

MR. CALVO: This is Eduardo Calvo. Motion to approve.

SECY. HUGHES: Thank you, Eduardo.

I have a motion to approve the minutes. Does anyone second that motion?

MR. WALKER: I will. This is Cameron Walker.

SECY. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Walker, appreciate that.

So I have a motion and a second. Is anyone opposed to passing the minutes at this time?

(No response.)

SECY. HUGHES: All right. By silence I will assume everyone else is in favor, and so with that, the minutes are passed. Thank you -- and approved.
MS. MAYS: Okay. Thank you, Secretary.

We'll go quickly over the agenda before we go to our next agenda item.

Kelli, can we have the agenda?

As always, we have the agenda laid out. Today it's a little bit more of a truncated agenda, but really critically important, as the Secretary mentioned earlier. We already did the minutes.

The next agenda item we'll give you an update, a recap of the last meeting that was held last month, and then we'll jump into the discussion of the Border Master Plan, focusing primarily on the executive summary that you received, and hopefully you had a chance to look at it, and then also have a discussion on the presentation to the Commission that will take place next month.

And then quickly we'll go over the full final report. We did have a high-level discussion with you last month, so we really want to give you a chance to add anything or ask questions related to the full plan report, as we're looking to put that out for public comment, you know, as well.

So with that, Secretary, I'll turn it over to Giacomo to give the recap of the last meeting. Thank you.

MR. YAQUINTO: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Giacomo Yaquinto with the Texas Department of
Transportation. Thank y'all for joining us.

I'd like to give a recap of the last BTAC meeting on October 22. I'll be focusing on the comments we received and how we responded. When I'm done I'll turn things back over to Carline Mays and Secretary Hughes.

The last BTAC meeting had three goals. First, we needed to provide a final look at Chapter 11; second, we needed to provide an overview of the BTMP final report; and finally, we needed to present a preliminary look at the BTMP executive summary and the presentation to the Texas Transportation Commission.

Next slide, please.

At the start of last month's meeting we presented an overview of Chapter 11, the Implementation Plan, to outline the blueprint for implementing the strategies identified in Chapter 10 in short, medium, and long terms.

We were asked what we meant when we said that any project seeking federal action must be included in the BTMP. We explained that that was a CBP request related to projects seeking federal action, especially those not currently included in any plan, and we noted that local projects that do not need federal or state action do not need to be listed in the BTMP.

We were asked if there's a clear definition
between border crossing projects and corridor projects in the chapters. We've noted that the distinction is based on the physical location of a project, and we'll work to clarify the two categories in the final report.

We also heard questions about the accuracy of the project list, and on a related note we were asked if we could share the project list. We responded that we were updating the list with the latest revisions and that we would present the final results during the next BTAC meeting.

Toward that end, we presented updated project numbers at the three BNRSC meetings last week. We sent out the current draft of Appendix 10-D, the project list, yesterday afternoon, and we'll see the revised project numbers a little later today.

Next slide, please.

To facilitate the review of the final report during the last meeting, we broke up the chapters into four groups. We presented Chapters 1 through 3 in the first group as part of the data overview. We didn't receive any comments on these chapters.

Next slide, please.

We presented Chapters 4 and 5 as part of the network designation and needs assessment overview. In response to Chapter 4, Binational Multimodal
Transportation Network, we heard that we need to convey an overview of how rail and highway networks connect at the border, as well as some insight into what happens south of the border. We responded that we will articulate the vision for connectivity in the chapter, including the Mexican plans that we saw during the last meeting that outline the border states' goals to connect to the Texas-Mexico border from both coasts of Mexico using multiple modes.

In response to Chapter 5, Current and Future Issues and Needs, we received two related comments. Both explained that because Texas is such an important trade platform for North America, border representatives and advocates need information that can be used to better educate elected officials on why funding POEs benefits all of Texas and beyond, not just the border communities. We responded that we'll highlight the need for improved educational outreach in the chapter and in the executive summary.

Next slide, please.

We presented Chapters 6 and 7 as part of the forecast and economic analysis overview. In response to Chapter 6, Future Forecast for the Texas-Mexico Border, we were asked to clearly explain that the forecast is unconstrained, meaning that it shows what will happen if
nothing is done. We responded that we'll clarify what we mean by unconstrained forecast in the chapter.

We didn't receive any comments in response to Chapter 7.

Next slide, please.

We presented Chapters 8, 9 and 10 as part of the strategies identification and evaluation, stakeholder engagement and recommendations overview. We didn't receive any comments in response to Chapters 8 or 9.

In response to Chapter 10, Recommendations, we were asked if we can include funding sources in the chapter, specifically private versus public sources.

We responded that we're listing funding information as it was provided to us by the project sponsors, however, we will include a section summarizing the funding sources reported to us.

We were also asked what funding definitions we used. We responded that we'll include the definition of funding categories used in the BTMP. There are three: fully funded, partially funded, and unfunded.

Next slide, please.

In response to the preliminary overview of the executive summary in the Texas Transportation Commission presentation, we heard about the importance of considering the different audiences that will see the executive
summary and how that might affect the message that needs to be conveyed.

We also heard about the need to provide an overview of the how the U.S. and Mexican highway and rail systems connect at the border and how what is planned for the Texas side of the border fits with activities on the Mexican side of the border.

We heard that this would be a critical point to make when the BTMP is presented to the commissioners. We noted that we would look at how to incorporate that information into the executive summary and the presentation to the Commission.

That concludes the recap so I'll go ahead and turn the meeting back over to Caroline Mays and Secretary Hughes.

SECY. HUGHS: Thank you. We may have lost Caroline temporarily but just wanted to see if there are any comments from anyone in the group at this time based on what was just presented before we got to the next session.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Secretary. I was double muted. Sorry.

If there are no comments, we will move into the next section, and I would like to kind of underscore and preface what Secretary mentioned earlier, that really your
input to the executive summary is probably one of the most critical roles each of you will play in terms of helping us articulate and compress what you all have been working for, some of you probably for more than two years, on this plan and it boils down to this condensed version of the plan.

So really the next, you know, 45 minutes, maybe an hour or more is we're going to go through a turn-page of the executive summary. This is what everybody will see at the end of the day, so as Secretary mentioned, what matters, graphics, the messaging, all of that we really want to hear from you.

We've crafted a draft today and really want to hear from you did we get it right, anything missing, anything we needed to add or how we're couching things. So want to spend a little bit of time on this. I know sometimes we feel it's a little bit tedious but it will pay off in the end by getting your input.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Donald to lead the discussion.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you very much, Caroline. Can you hear me okay today?

MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Excellent. Yeah, we're really excited to walk through this with you today. This
is a long time in coming, and this is a culmination of your efforts and the efforts of the other stakeholders, and this is really the tangible element that the general public, the Commission -- and I recognize that we have two commissioners on with us today -- as well as business and political leaders will absorb in English and in Spanish in Mexico and the United States and really is intended to distill and convey the key findings of the Border Master Plan.

So as Caroline mentioned, the idea today is to do a page-turn. We hope to have great participation today. Caroline and I may call on different members of the BTAC to provide specific input on things.

The first thing I wanted to do before we started was basically pause for a moment to see if there was any general overall feedback. I know that this was sent out to the BTAC by Caroline via the Dropbox link ahead of the meeting and wanted to just pause and see if there were any initial reactions, and then if not, then we will go kind of on a page-by-page basis.

And as we do that, we'll be asking you some questions about specifically some ways that we can improve this and whether this is really conveying the most impactful message.

So with that, are there any initial comments or
reactions as you absorb the executive summary?

    MR. CALVO: Hey, Donald, this is Eduardo.

    MR. LUDLOW: Thanks, Eduardo.

    MR. CALVO: My initial reaction in looking at this late last night was that, I mean, there's a lot of information, a lot of graphic information, charts and maps and all that, which is great, but even as an executive summary, I'm assuming that there will be a little more text. Right? Especially for somebody that is not familiar with the border and all that, I think we need a little text, not to make it, you know, extremely wordy because then nobody will read it. Right?

    MR. LUDLOW: Right.

    MR. CALVO: But I think, you know, it requires a little more guidance, more explanation of what the charts mean and making the key points that need to be made, you know, for each chapter or for each segment. That's just my initial impression.

    MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Eduardo.

    Caroline, were you going to ask him something?

    MS. MAYS: No. I was just saying that that's a great comment. That's what we want to hear from you, and then I think later on we're going to ask for all those graphics, you know, what should that key message be.

    I think that's really the fundamental thing
here, so be thinking about that: of these graphics that are in here, what should that key message or messages be. But great comment overall, yes.

Any other comments from anybody else?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel. I do have a comment. I just want to make sure that the rest of the committee zoomed in on this. Most of us in the BTAC are part of the border; that's why it's called Border Trade Advisory Committee.

And I notice on page 27, and I've highlighted this in the past, made this observation, where we talk about 652 border-wide projects on that page 27, it's important to highlight that border crossing projects are only $4.9 billion of 135, versus corridor projects.

And I think wherever we go tell the story, that we need to make sure that people understand that this is not just a border infrastructure improvement plan but it encompasses the rest of Texas, and the majority of the money is going to be corridors based on these, looking at the whole list that we're going to discuss later on.

I think people need to keep that in focus when we roll this thing out, because we probably will be the ones that will be sharing at the local levels along the border, and we want to make sure that we don't get politics involved: Well, why did you have more for the
border than other parts?

I just want to make sure that we all stay focused on how we go out there and roll this out there to the public and that we have our talking points in order whatever period of time we have to do this. Okay? Especially when it comes to if any of us are involved at the legislative side, you know, submitting recommendations or talks or testimony.

MR. VALE: That's an extremely important point, Gerry. That's a very important point that you're making.

MR. LUDLOW: So, Gerry, I agree that's an important point. One kind of follow-up question, as we are describing that difference between the border and the corridors and making that a key argument that these investments in the corridors are really to provide better connectivity and seamless movement through the border, is there any other nuance that you think would be helpful here?

I mean, specifically I'm thinking that the distinction between kind of these last-mile connectors especially that are reaching the border that we've identified throughout this process as being particularly important, that those are still considered corridors, but they are literally the corridors at the doorstep to the border. I don't know if that's a particular argument or
point that you think we should try to emphasize further.

MR. VALE: Well, the corridors are used by everybody in the state; they're not just used by stuff going to and from the border, so part of what we have to sell to the legislature is they benefit from the corridor too.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Sam.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yeah, that's the message, that's why I'm bringing it up. Like I said, some of us, this is not our first rodeo, and therefore, a lot of times it's not just the information you want to share but how you say it, how you present it, and who you present it to.

And the last thing we want is for the conspiracy theorists and all the anti-everything people grabbing ahold of a plan that we worked on for so long and may not understand what we're doing and turning it against us.

And so I think the FAQs will become key for all of us in the BTAC and making sure that we relay it to our local public officials and we educate them and then all the way on up through Austin.

MR. VALE: Right now, Gerry, they have a huge project being developed in Austin to widen the main highway through north and south. That benefits the border, it benefits Austin, it benefits the State of
Texas, so it's an everybody-win kind of deal.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Another point I thought I would make is that I know that Consul General Marentes has been on these calls, but I think it would be also -- and I know that some of the other consul generals along the border communities participated in the stakeholder meetings.

But I also think that we've got to include them, perhaps get them more involved, the consul generals of Mexico on the U.S. side, and vice versa, the consul generals of the U.S. on the Mexican side, and making sure that we share and that they are engaged from El Paso to Brownsville.

We have in total, I think, eleven consulates in Texas alone -- I may be wrong here, off by a couple -- but along the border we know the consulates are key information disseminators on both sides of the border, and I think we should have probably gotten them more engaged early on, and maybe some got more engaged than others, and I know there have been some changes, but I just also make that recommendation.

MR. LUDLOW: Great. Thank you very much.

MS. MAYS: Yes. Great comments, Gerry and definitely Sam.

And while you were speaking, one of the things that occurred to me is that really I think what is always
been missed when we talk about the border is the corridor discussion.

Everybody jumps to think that the border is just about the border crossings. To facilitate trade, to facilitate the movement of people, you have to have the corridors to be able to move it away from the border, so that's really key.

And with what you just mentioned, it shows that the needs of the corridors are far greater than just the needs of the border crossings themselves. So I think that a key message that came, you know, out of what you were saying is we can't just talk about the physical border crossings. That's one element of moving people and goods across the border, but then there's the multimodal corridors, rail, highway, pipelines and others, airports, like we discussed last time, so thank you for those comments.

Donald, would you like to continue?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. So just kind of going once, going twice, are there any other major overarching comments, initial reactions before we go into the page-turn?

MR. ZAPATA: Hey, Donald, this is David Zapata.

MR. LUDLOW: Hey, David. Yeah, sure, go ahead.

MR. ZAPATA: I was just going to piggyback on
what Sam and Gerry said and just kind of like make the point. I do remember that during one of the economic development importance of the border, just of the plan in general, we mentioned how Dallas plays a role in kind of like being the storage and kind of like where everything spreads out from Texas to everywhere in the country.

So maybe there's a way we can just highlight that obviously this plan starts at the border but it ends up benefitting in that sense, like Gerry said, like the whole state.

You know, like everything connects ultimately -- when everyone of the border but everything connects ultimately with the rest of the state through this corridor. So again, maybe raise some of those points that they mentioned may be easier to emphasize in the summary with some of the graphics that you already have in those previous chapters. I just wanted to at least mention that.

And then for Gerry, he mentioned the other consul generals in Mexico. I know that we have a pretty good relationship with Consul Marentes, so we'll bring that up in some of our future conversations with him to see how we can work on that, you know, spreading out that information as well through their office with their help.

MR. LUDLOW: Thanks, David. I particularly
like your suggestion on Dallas, just because I think that's the kind of narrative that helps emphasize the statewide connection and impact of the border.

And you are right, Dallas has become, in many respects, the Chicago of the mid-south, really serving this incredibly important distribution function, not only for domestic trade but for international trade and linking a lot of what flows through Texas and reaches the rest of the country. So I think that's an important story to convey.

And overall, I think the message from each of you is that there needs to be a greater emphasis on statewide importance of the projects and policies that are being recommended.

Caroline, do you have anything else to add before we jump right in here?

MS. MAYS: No, that's it. Go ahead.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So Kelli, can you advance us to our first page here?

So the way we're going to do this is we're going to go to each page. I'm going to just briefly tell you the general strategy for what is presented, and then we're going to pause and just kind of see what you have, and the team will make note of those comments, and then that enables us to go back and quickly iterate revisions
to another version taking into account the things that you're suggesting.

So as a reader opens this first page, of course, there are visuals of the border, demonstrating both rural and urban segments of the Texas-Mexico connections, and the other thing that this initial piece does is it quickly introduces kind of the purpose and background of the plan, what it is, what it's intended to do, and why it's important.

The other key part of this first page that you open up is this map that illustrates through the broad arrows some of the key corridors -- it's obviously not all of them but some of the key corridors that connect the three USMCA countries, and really emphasizing that this is a holistic approach that takes into account this very important and major part of this border between our countries.

So this is intended to be visual, it's intended to be introductory. Eduardo, I think this probably is one of the parts where we do have some text that is storytelling, and I think that that's something we'll look to strengthen, since at this point this executive summary is probably graphics heavy.

Are there any initial reactions to this beginning, including the decision to kind of paint the
picture of the border and especially of this economic connection to the rest of the country and the continent?

MR. SEPULVEDA: This is Pete Sepulveda.

My only comment, looking at the map, is that you do not show I-37 going from San Antonio to Corpus, or you do not show I-69E going to Cameron County or I-69C going to Hidalgo County.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Pete. We will take that into consideration and get back to the cartographers to emphasize at least some of the -- label some of the connections there down into South Texas.

MR. SEPULVEDA: Now, then the other one is Interstate 2 from Harlingen to Mission and from Interstate 2 in Harlingen to the Port of Brownsville you have connectivity through I-69E and Interstate 169.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Great. Thank you for those comments.

Are there other comments about this initial information that’s presented?

MR. NEGRON: Yes. There was a little bit of discussion at the last I think it was a BNRSC meeting about the tension between quality of life and community and the major infrastructure transportation systems as conduits for commerce.

And I would suggest in the last sentence of the
first paragraph adding after "local economic
competitiveness," "and quality of life."

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Sito, great suggestion.
We will integrate that. And that also is reflective of
some of the key goals of the Border Master Plan, as well,
that are focused on stewardship and improving quality of
life in border communities.

Any other initial comments?

MR. ANDRADE: This is Salvador Monroy from SCT.
Maybe it's just a detail, but I think maybe it
would be better to speak in present, this plan identifies
transportation needs, not as a future topic because
actually it is doing so right now.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So, Salvador, you're
suggesting looking at changing the tense just a little
bit.

MR. ANDRADE: In case it doesn't move the whole
scope of the first paragraph that states that "we'll
identify transportation issues," and in fact, it is a
matter of something that has already done, so maybe it
could be in present, yes.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Salvador. I think,
Donald, what the first sentence says "will identify," what
Salvador is saying they were identified, so I think there
we need to change that from "will" to "the plan has identified."

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you. You're exactly right: We've all collectively done this work, it has happened. Thank you, Salvador.

Any other comments on this first page?

MR. BARELA: Very quickly, this is Jon Barela, here in El Paso.

It may seem a little esoteric, but the map might have a stronger graphical image if we had those green arrows also emanating to the I-10. There's a whole lot of traffic that goes from at least our area to the Port of LA, Long Beach, so that may be a stronger graphic if you were able to get your cartographers to do that.

MR. LUDLOW: Thanks, Jon. Point well taken.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and Jon, those edits are on the way. I already pointed those out, so I just want to make sure that, yes, it's on because we are missing -- if we don't have that, I-10 east-west is really critical to trade if you look at it because it's coming from El Paso and going west, but also going east from El Paso as well.

MR. BARELA: Correct. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Any other comments? These are great comments, and you know, we'll not only reflect these on the first page but throughout, and that's the general
approach here, so we really appreciate that. It's not always easy doing something like this as a group, but I think it's really important to have the consensus of this group together.

All right. Well, let's move to our next page then.

I'm sorry. Eduardo, did you have something to say?

MR. CALVO: Well, Donald, this is still a very generic comment that I was going to make regarding the overall Border Master Plan, so you know, I'm still trying to have a clear idea of where this border plan ends and where perhaps the next phase of the border plan begins. Right?

You know, I'm assuming that this Border Master Plan ends with the identification of all these projects, programs, and policies that have been compiled and that's pretty much it. Right? There's not going to be a major prioritization process as part of this Border Master Plan version. Is that correct?

MS. MAYS: Yes. And I can answer that, Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MS. MAYS: Yes. What you see now is what the plan has from Chapter 1 all the way to Chapter 11, so the plan has identified projects, policies, and programs; the
plan has identified implementation plan on what timelines you, the project sponsors, have provided for when those projects would be implemented, and then the policy and program recommendations are not necessarily a very strict timeline there, but once that's compiled, the plan is approved and adopted, then the implementation begins.

But when it comes to the project implementation, each of the project sponsors will be responsible for facilitating the implementation of their programs. What we will do at TxDOT, we will continue to help facilitate, through BTAC and other stakeholder groups, the implementation of the policy recommendations, the implementation of the program recommendations. Some of the high-priority ones we'll continue to facilitate the implementation of those.

So to your question, yes, the plan itself is not an end, you now, what's done, then you pick up the next phase, which is multi-pronged with several people involved.

Does that answer your question?

MR. CALVO: Yeah, this is very helpful. So maybe precisely what you just said, and of course, in a condensed version, maybe that also needs to be part of page 1, you know, so that the reader knows what this document is and where it ends. Right?
So maybe a statement summarizing what you just explained would be useful here at the very beginning of the executive summary.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Yeah, we can do that. We were trying to capture that in the last page of the executive summary, Call to Action, so take a look at that and see, you know, if it fits back there or it fits in the first page.

Certainly one of the comments we've always made very clear is that this plan is -- TxDOT is not the entity that will implement everything about this plan. If anything, our portion is very small because you have binational, you've got Mexico, you've got Texas, you've got U.S. Federal, state, local, regional, you know, all involved in this process.

So you know, let us know if you'd rather see in the first page or the last page -- again, just let us know.

MR. CALVO: Great. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Eduardo.

Let's see, Kelli, can we advance to the next page?

So as we kind of turn to this page, and we framed most of the executive summary around answering FAQ-style questions, so this first page is: Why does the
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Texas-Mexico border matter? And again, it goes into explaining this is a common border, it links U.S.-Mexico trade, it sustains economic benefit and it is sustaining and driving incredible population growth, and it is a strategic national asset, both to the U.S. and Mexico. And then, of course, some of the details are outlined.

Mainly the intent here is to explain clearly, especially to somebody who may not be familiar with the argument, that the border is absolutely critical to our commerce, our international commerce in communities, to orient them.

And then it moves into on the next fold the goals of the BTMP and kind of noting those with icons, very simple and straightforward. Obviously somebody would need to sit and read this and kind of absorb it, but kind of taking this all in, why does the border matter and what are the goals of the plan. So that is the next bit of content, and let’s see if there any specific reactions or suggestions from BTAC members.

And I know we may, like we did with our last BNRSC, call on some of you just to kind of get your feedback and general reaction, not only to those pages but to the whole thing.

One person who immediately came to mind was Jon. You commented a little bit earlier just in terms of
framing this from an economic perspective. Jon Barela, do you have any specific comments on this part or anything you've see so far?

MR. BARELA: No. I think it looks really good. Thank you. The only very minor comment is by the time we publish this, I hope to have 2020 numbers out about U.S.-Mexico trade. I know we have 2019 numbers, I know that's the latest we have, but we must might want, if we have the latest numbers, to include that. But otherwise, looks great.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Thank you, Jon.

Are there any mayors on the BTAC who have any comments up to this point?

MS. MAYS: I'm going to call on my friend Mayor Lozano.

MAYOR LOZANO: Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Go ahead.

MAYOR LOZANO: I currently don't have any additional comments right now. I just want to say that this is an important segment. And I did hear some of the earlier comments, but as of right now I don't. Thank you all, though.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, great.

MS. MAYS: Can I pick on a couple of people? I know we have our railroad friends here, I know we have KCS
and UP and BNSF. From a rail perspective, what's the message, why does the border matter? What would you want people to know from your perspective?

MR. ERDMAN: this is Warren Erdman with Kansas City Southern.


MR. ERDMAN: I believe in a later slide we talk about the importance of a unified processing center for rail border crossings, and that would clearly be a high rail priority, and I thought it was presented fairly and accurately.

MS. MAYS: That's great. Thank you.

Megan, any comments from BNSF?

(No response.)

MS. MAYS: If not, I see Tyson with UP Railroad. Any comments?

(No response.)

MS. MAYS: No comments from Tyson? We can't hear you.

Well, if not, Donald, we'll go back to the mayor. I know the mayor of Eagle Pass is also on the line, so we're going to call on some elected officials. Mayor Sifuentes, why does the border matter from your perspective?

If you're trying to speak, please unmute your
line, and if you're on the phone, I think you press star-six, right, star-six to unmute your line.

    (No response.)

    MS. MAYS: Okay. Donald, we can keep moving. I know Tyson is trying to talk, but he says he's having issues with the connection.

    MR. CORONADO: Hey, Caroline, this is David Coronado, Bridge System of El Paso.

    Do we want to change in the center of the page, in the top center, do we want to change 26 highway crossings to border crossings, or is that what you meant to say?

    MS. MAYS: It's border crossings, not highway crossings.

    MR. CORONADO: And then on the bottom left you have 29 of the 49 are in Texas. Is it 29? I'm doing the math here.

    MS. MAYS: I think 29 is adding Santa Teresa.

    MR. CORONADO: Right, but then you have the 26 border crossings plus the six rail crossings plus the ferry, so is it 29? I don't know what went into that number.

    MS. MAYS: Yeah. We'll double-check that. Alejandro and the team, can you help with that, answer that right now?
MR. SOLIS: Yes, Caroline. So what we have is the 26 highway crossings plus the two dams plus the one ferry. That's the 29 that we're mentioning there. We were not counting the rail crossings in the 29; those are only for highway crossings.

MR. CORONADO: Okay.

MS. MAYS: We'll just make that clear in there, and then also change that from high crossings to POEs.

MR. NEGRON: Another comment along the lines of the first one that I made under stewardship, can you add the word community, so "manage environmental, community, and agency resources."

MR. ANDRADE: This is Salvador Monroy from SCT again.

I was wondering for the same square to add, if it is not too ambitious, stewardship and sustainability, just for reflection could work, I don't know.

MS. MAYS: No. Actually, that's a great comment. Yeah, somewhere we can add that.

BTAC members, any thoughts about that? Anybody against it being added?

MAYOR LOZANO: I'm for the formality of stewardship because it is a relationship for both sides and that reflects what this is all about. This is Mayor Lozano.
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MS. MAYS: Donald.

MR. BARELA: Excuse me. This is Jon Barela.

Sorry to interrupt one more time.

On the economic forecast for the job growth, it says "trade through Texas-Mexico borders support 7 million jobs in both countries." I know you can use different data points and different sources, there have been some estimates much higher than that and I'd certainly want to be accurate. Where did we get that 7 million from?

Because, for example, the U.S. Chamber will say it's more than that. There are some people who say that just in Texas alone it's 3 million, so want to make sure we're accurate and certainly the higher number the better, if it's accurate.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. Alejandro or Chris Williges, do you have any reaction to Jon's suggestion.

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Jon, we'll go back and take a closer look at that too. Obviously, you know, use the number that is the most all-encompassing with respect to trade.

MR. BARELA: Okay, great. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: You're welcome.

Any other comments on this set of pages?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel. On the
What are the Goals page?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah.

MR. SCHWEBEL: There's a section there on cross-border resiliency, where it talks about -- you know we had talked about continue operations after disasters and emergency events. I think in general what we need to look at is any disruptors related to cross-border trade. You know, we my have bomb threats, we may have strike blockades of our ports of entry. I don't know how we could -- that would be the place to incorporate any of those disruptions, including a misalignment of protocols like we're having right now as a result of COVID. You know, where do we put that? Or eliminate or reduce or mitigate what I just described, it's under resiliency, I don't know.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, I think it goes under resiliency, and I like the fact that you brought up kind of these what are called man-made disruptors, you know, bomb threats, demonstrators -- because a couple of times, you know, they demonstrated on the border on the Mexican side mostly in the last couple of months that has happened. How is that addressed. I think that's part of the resiliency, and like you mentioned, the protocols, the misalignment, how do you address that, so I think it might fall under resiliency because that's how we're going to
create a resilient border, you know, crossing or resilient systems and to understand that disruptors are not just COVID or [INAUDIBLE], et cetera, you know.

So Donald, let's think about how we capture what Gerry just raised.

MR. LUDLOW: I agree. We will work on some new wording in this area and we may run that by you specifically, if that's all right.

Okay. If there are no further comments -- and this has been a great discussion, we really appreciate the input so far. This just tightens things up ensures that we're getting kind of more of a full consensus coverage from the BTAC on the material.

Kelli, can we advance, or Hannah?

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And while we're advancing the slide, I really want to encourage people, this is a BTAC, Border Trade Advisory Committee member meeting, so the comments are reserved for committee members. The general public, you can type your comments in the chat box, so only committee members can really unmute their phones and speak up. We want to maintain the integrity of the advisory committee. So just wanted to make that very clear: if you're not a committee member that your name wasn't called, you're not a part of the roster, please provide your comments through the chat box. Thank you.
MR. LUDLOW: Thanks for that clarification, Caroline.

So this next section really hits on how the stakeholders were engaged and there's a bit of narrative here to explain that this was an unprecedented process involving over 2,500 stakeholders in both countries, emphasizing the role of the different committees, including BTAC, JWC, BBXG, talking about the monthly meetings and intensified coordination between TxDOT and SSFA and also our key Mexican border states, and the deep involvement of our Mexican and Texas partners through the process. It talks bout the BNRSCs and then it illustrates the regional differentiation in the BNRSCs, where those are located, how they're comprised.

The next page walks through the stakeholder input and highlights that it went well beyond the border region, the Texas-Mexico border region, and extended well into the United States and Mexico, involving and engaging many different people and organizations from both countries and illustrating that with a map. One of the key messages here is that there were over 19,000 interactions with the different members of the groups that participated throughout the process.

So again, this is the story of who helped develop the plan, how they were engaged, and emphasizing
the geographic reach of that engagement.

Are there any questions or comments?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Maybe we can call on a couple of our additional public officials who might not have commented earlier. I don't know, Commissioner Perez, if you have any comments so far?

MR. PEREZ: I don't have anything right now.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you.

Is Mayor Saenz on the phone with us today? I wondered if Mayor Saenz had any comments or a representative from Laredo. Maybe Mayor Saenz is not with us.

MR. SCHWEBEL: I don't think he is.

MR. LUDLOW: He's not on today, Gerry? Okay. Jake from Presidio, do you have any comments so far?

MS. MAYS: I don't remember seeing Jake on.

MR. LUDLOW: No Jake? Okay.

What about was Cynthia Garza-Reyes with us today?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: I may be maybe not calling on the right people today.

What about Josue Garcia with Cameron County?
MR. GARCIA: Yes, Donald, this is Josue.

You know, I think I echo what Eduardo said at the very beginning, and I think that as we look at the stakeholder being engaged, as we look at the one particular items of what made everything work, I think this is a good representative of what happened. And like someone said earlier, you know, we need to have a little more meat, but then if you have too much then people won't read it. So having said that, I think this looks good for my eyes.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Josue, we appreciate that.

I think in the interest of time, unless there's any other pressing comments, let's move on.

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel. I've got to say this because to me, this to me is the most important page of this plan, where others are going to evaluate funding, approvals, buy-in, support, you know, this will dispel many of the other challenges because this did include everybody and anybody who wanted to have anything to say and we added even people who needed to be at the table. So most of the other projects that have gone before, all local, federal, state authorities, always, well, so-and-so was not included, so-and-so was not included, well, what does this other person say? This
to me it tells you that, look, all of these people, everyone had a chance, everyone participated, we have a cross-section of everything, and quite frankly, you know, to me it's the most important message.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you for that, Gerry.

And we'll get to a certain point a little bit later where we talk about the sequence of the messages that we have in here and whether we shift around anything in terms of order, but that's much appreciated.

David, were you about to say something?

MR. ZAPATA: Yeah, and I hate to maybe call him out, but I know that Stan Meador from Texas Pacific mentioned in the chat that he was available so I know that he lives in San Angelo but also is familiar with the Presidio area, so I thought maybe giving him a chance if he's around still in the meeting to say something about the plan from that area's perspective.

MR. LUDLOW: Fantastic. Stan, if you are available we'd love to hear from you either right now or at any point during this discussion. Did you want to provide any feedback right now, Stan?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Well, Stan, when you are ready, let us know and we will listen to you and appreciate your perspective.
Let's move on to the next page.

So this next page we start to get into some of the statistical background and making sure that we have enough material here, that we're telling the right story. I'm actually going to go a little bit faster through some of the next few pages, but this one is essentially answering the question what are the population, employment and income trends. And I think this group is quite familiar with most of this material since it's been presented multiple times. So are there any pressing comments on this page?

MR. CALVO: Donald, this is Eduardo.

The only comment that I have, especially on page 7, is again, I did not go back and check the data on these tables versus what has been presented in prior chapters, but I mean, the differences -- like for example on the top horizontal bar chart that shows Texas-Mexico employment by region, you know, the growth there in RGV in 2050 looks, I mean, super, it looks huge. Right? So my initial reaction was like, okay, is this true. I mean, I know that all the regions are growing. Right? So my overall comment is just make sure, double check that the numbers are consistent.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you. We will do that. We've used various sources, including forecasts.
So thank you, Eduardo, we will definitely look at those things that seem extraordinary.

    MR. CALVO: Right.

    MR. LUDLOW: Any other comments on this page?

    (No response.)

    MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Let's move to the next. So after we go through the border population trends, we really start to look at the trends for moving people and goods, and again, this is all material that you've seen before. These maps are broken out by specific POE by region that kind of highlights the historic, current and future flows. And the intent here was to make this local, to make it real and to enable somebody to kind of look at this and understand exactly those trends in the regions for people and for goods.

    Are there any comments or questions this page, of course, beyond those which Eduardo had offered previously?

    MR. SCHWEBEL: Just an observation, in regards to the buses, and I don't know if we have very much on the bus traffic in the ports of entry. When you talk about people on these buses, most of these buses are 30 to 36 seat buses. You know, what buses may mean to people, they think it's just a bus crossing, or how could we elaborate more expanding that these buses are taking people from ...
Mexico into the interior of the united States, will the reader understand it?

MR. LUDLOW: I think the question you're asking, Gerry, is will the reader understand why we've got bus in here, why that's important, and it's not transit bus per se but it is intercity bus, it's providing connections. We'll note that and see if there is a clarifying statement that we can make to tell that story a bit better on this slide while maintaining economy in our words.

MR. CORONADO: This is David Coronado. So I think we discussed this a couple of months ago that some of the crossings declined after 9/11, you know, and there was a clear break in the way that people and good were inspected and processes, you know, clearance documentation, all that stuff, and I think that will help explain the decline in crossings from 1990 to 2019. I think we've got to say something about the fact that, you know, 9/11 was a major shock to the system and that this decline it's not because folks don't want to go back and forth, it's just, you know, the state of the border crossings.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, David. I think those are great points you make. That's another point that if we're adding some additional narrative, some short
narrative, this is what we're looking for from you is just making sure that we are hitting some of those key messages. Again, this is a balance between the graphics and capturing the reader and providing that narrative, so that's much appreciated.

The next two pages are essentially the same thing except for goods movement so that was people movement and then this is goods movement, so telling the story in a very similar way, this time essentially focusing on the multimodal network for goods and really at the crossing level focusing on commercial vehicles and rail cars.

So again, if there are any questions here, if any of our friends from the railroads would like to comment on this, this is the story that we're kind of telling and showing significant projected growth across the modes in the future.

MR. ERDMAN: I don't have anything to add to what you presented here.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Warren.

MR. WOJNOWSKI: This is Matt. Can you hear me?

MS. MAYS: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. WOJNOWSKI: My only comment is on the bar graphs on the top left, CMV is huge to the left and then all the ones to the right of it are so small. I don't
know if it would be beneficial to have two different ones so you could actually see the difference between freight rail, aviation, pipeline and marine time to have a bigger scale to see the difference in that or if that's what you're trying to show that all those ones to the right, freight, aviation, pipeline and marine time are so small compared to CMV. Does that kind of make sense?

MR. LUDLOW: Yes, thank you.

MR. WOJNOWSKI: That's all. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Any other comments here?

MR. GARCIA: Donald, this is Josue.

Gerry said a few minutes ago, you know, about the one slide that was most important to him. Well, to me this is the most important, and I say this because here we're talking about the goods, about the trade, and you know, there's a billion dollars of trade that cross every day so that's really telling the story of the border and what we are looking for and why this plan came to be, you know, past, present and future. And I think it's very important that we tell the story about the trade and all the jobs that we've talked about and what that makes available not only to Texas but throughout the whole United States and a lot of the Mexican states as well.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Josue. We may be able to add a couple of points there to tell that
story. It seems like for some of these paragraphs we're just missing a few of these key points, and we appreciate you pointing those out and getting those integrated.

Anything else here?

MR. BRROUWEN: This is Fred Brrouwen from the City of Pharr Bridge Department. We have Hidalgo POE, that's Pharr POE. Right?

MR. LUDLOW: Alejandro, can you clarify? I believe so.

MR. SOLIS: Yes. So we're listing the POEs as the aggregate of the border crossings, we're listing basically by the CVP breakdown. But yes, it is included, I believe, in that POE.

MR. BRROUWEN: In Hidalgo and you have buses, crossing in buses, I know all the buses regularly cross through Hidalgo Bridge. But when we talk about CMV, that's Pharr, Texas, that's Pharr. You might want to put Pharr-Hidalgo to distinguish that it's Pharr. You're talking about Pharr. Right?

MR. SOLIS: Well, in this case I think we're talking about border crossings that are included in Hidalgo. It might be the case that only Pharr handles CMV, so that's why the number is equal, but in reality, again, we're using the nomenclature or the aggregation that CVP lists as POEs and each POE can comprise one
border crossing or more, in most cases it is more than one.

MR. BROUWEN: So the you're talking about Hidalgo as included in Pharr? Because it is confusing.

MR. SOLIS: I need to double-check on why it's exactly that way, but I can get back to you on that.

MR. BROUWEN: Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Unless there's anything else pressing, let's move ahead to next.

Eduardo, did you have something else to say here?

MR. CALVO: I was quickly just going to emphasize that, I'm looking at a note that's already here, but I think to that point I think it's important to clarify that, you know, border crossings and ports of entry are not necessarily the same thing. Right?

Just what you were explaining, but I mean, many of us in the past used them interchangeably, which is obviously not correct. Border crossings are individual crossings; POEs could be aggregates, but I think it would be important to make that definition somewhere so that the reader understands what's going on.

MR. LUDLOW: Thanks, Eduardo. We've noted that.

Caroline, did you have anything else to say or
are we going to move on here?

MS. MAYS: We can move on. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Hannah, let's go to the next.

So continuing essentially the border goods movement and trends, this one is really relating to the supply chain, focusing on the expected 234 percent growth in cross-border trade value and illustrating that with the map, making a few key points in the boxes and really showing the linkage between border trade and the rest of the United States.

I guess we could potentially call this out but Michigan is the second most reliant upon the border trade by value after Texas, but showing those connections, and also deep into Mexico.

Any comments or questions here?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. I think we will continue to move. Let's go to our next. Hannah, can you zoom out just a little tiny bit here so we can see the top? Okay, there we go. Thank you.

So again, we're going into more depth here. These pages are intended to describe some of the key supply chains that link the border, where they're at right now, where they were in the past, and where they'll be in the future, really showing massive changes in motor
vehicles, high technology and other commodities and highlighting some of these.

This is all coming out of the forecasting that the team did, and then some of the maps are really illustrating some of the flows for the top three supply chains.

And this, again, is to really illustrate and make it more tangible which goods are most dependent upon the border and then linking those back to this kind of broader story about the dependency of the states in the U.S. and Mexico for this cross-border flow.

There's a bit to absorb here. This is one where you have to kind of grab a cup of coffee or something, but there's a lot to enjoy. If you like walking through more economist type graphs I feel like it's a very --

Are there any comments or questions about this?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Caroline, did you have anything in particular you wanted to ask the group here?

MS. MAYS: Not really, but I think, you know, just want to make sure that, again, committee members, this is your chance to mold the message, and I realize you got this document fairly late, but overall have we captured the message, especially in terms of supply
chains. I know that's something that the committee early on really talked about and wanted to make sure it's articulated.

And you know, Jon Barela, you can probably explain this more, different regions have kind of unique supply chains, El Paso, Laredo, and also the Rio Grande Valley. Does this capture that?

MR. BARELA: Caroline, from my perspective -- this is Jon -- it sure does. I mean, I think Donald's point was very well taken. It's kind of one of those you need to sit back and relax and enjoy and drink a cup of coffee or tea or something else.

It looks really comprehensive and quite detailed and comprehensive, yet cogent, I might add. So it looks good.

MS. MAYS: Okay. From the Laredo side, does this capture -- and then also we have our Mexican friends on the line, does this capture -- this is not a one side of the coin, this is a two-sided coin, so I want to hear from you all as well.

A lot of the comments being made here from your perspective on the other side of the border, does this represent well?

MR. LUDLOW: Carlos, anybody from our Mexican friends who would like to comment here?
MS. MAYS: I know we have our friends from CodeFront, but if not, Donald, we can move to the next pages.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Want to move on?

So the executive summary pivots at this point from background and setting the stage to studying the needs of the physical infrastructure, and really the rest of this is dedicated to the physical infrastructure, it's conditions and needs, and then we go into the projects and policies.

So this first piece is about the designated networks, what are these networks that we're talking about, how do they function, it identifies the east-west and north-south corridors, interstates, federal highways in Mexico, and kind of quantifies it and puts it on a map.

This is a refreshed map that the team has put together for this purpose, so I wanted you all to react to this and see if there is anything that is missing or that is jumping out of this that we may need to adjust.

I think the key here is that this is the network that we're looking at, the multimodal network that we're focusing on for the plan.

MAYOR LOZANO: This is Mayor Lozano, Del Rio, Texas.

I just wanted to say that his network and the
way the map illustrates is important, because it's very impactful to illustrate the U.S. interstates but also some of the other components of that system that enhances the accessibility to the interstate system.

And I think the way that this projects and really illustrates the interior part of Mexico as it connects into Texas is valuable, and it's very valuable for long-term planning especially, and the interconnectivity that showcases where the cargo comes in from and where it leads to. I just want to emphasize that the map really does illustrate that.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Mayor Lozano.

Are there any other comments from BTAC members about the way this is depicted? Again, on some of these pages it's, you know, grab a cup of coffee, chocolate, whatever you happen to enjoy, and need to kind of take this in. But the importance here is just really seeing this overall connectivity.

MS. MAYS: And I wanted to add to Mayor Lozano's point, I think building the network was really informed by what our Mexican counterparts have communicated and presented.

If you remember last month, a lot of the presentations showed connecting the seaports -- let's say Matzatlán, Altamira, and others, connecting those seaports
to the Texas-Mexico border crossings and beyond.

So I think that's really key to be able to articulate that message that the connectivity is so important, because everything is headed our way from Mexico, and to understand that all of this needs to work together, you know, for really when you look at the growth that we're projecting of goods, if we don't, you know, what's in our infrastructure in Texas or the U.S. when our counterparts have very grand vision and plans, that could become a bottleneck on our end.

So again, this is kind of an eye-opener that, you know, we can't plan in a vacuum; we need to understand what's going on on the Mexican side that can inform the decisions that are made on the U.S. side or the Texas side.

MR. LUDLOW: Great.

Erika Garcia, did you have any comments about this?

(No response.)

MR. SCHWEBEL: Secretary, this is Gerry Schwebel. We're missing the north-south corridors, if I read it correctly here. You're putting I-10 and then Highway 45, is that the Mexican Highway 45? Is that what it is?

MR. LUDLOW: Alejandro, do you have any insight
on that?

MR. SOLIS: I believe it's 85, but let me
double-check.

MS. MAYS: Yes, MS85, the one coming to Laredo?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yeah.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, that's 85.

MR. SCHWEBEL: So where is that?

MS. MAYS: It's in the middle of the map.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yeah, but I'm talking about over
here in the column where it says five corridors and then
it says six corridors, and then there you see I-10/FH-45,
I-27/FH-57, I-35/FH-85 Brownsville, and then you have
Laredo I-69 which really Laredo is I-35/I-69, you know.
And then actually, the Pan American Highway, but that's
Mexico through the middle; it really starts in Laredo.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Kelli, you see where it says
I-35 Port of Brownsville, Laredo should be 69, that
should -- Laredo should be 35, and then that should be 69,
so I think we marked the highways up.

MR. SCHWEBEL: You know, Laredo has I-35, it
has I-69, and Mayor Bruno and Mayor Sifuentes and Mayor
Saenz over at I-27 as well.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Gerry. We will take
care of moving those appropriately in the graphics.

Any other comments? And, Chris, you have
comments in the chat box as well, all very helpful.

So let's move, Kelli or Hannah.

Okay. So after introducing the infrastructure, this next section moves into answering the question what are the border issues and needs, and we've gone through this, again, many times in the past and just very recently through the last BTAC and BNRSC meetings.

But page 18 goes through the cross-cutting themes and the associated needs, and then page 19 goes into the specific system performance issues and needs. And again, there's quite a bit to absorb here. We tried to use text to call out some of the specific needs related to each of these categories.

The idea is to, again, balance the comprehensive view with what we have found with relatively brief so this is digestable.

Any comments or questions here?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: And, Caroline, in general, I think with respect to the BTAC you're probably looking to get comments back on this as well if they want to submit written email comments to you in the coming days. Correct?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely, but I think the goal here is to just have an open discussion with the
committee members, everybody together to hear the discussions from the committee.

So I don't want to throw the can down yet right now; I would like to continue to engage BTAC on these to make sure that, for instance, you have talked issues and needs, you know, have we captured that right as the key ones, did we miss anything, and how we state it.

And I really appreciate the conversation. We're going to have to go back to the drawing board on some of these things to make sure that we articulate it better, so in this case any comments here on the needs and the key issues, anyway, the top three?

MR. BARELA: Caroline, Jon Barela, and I'm going to involve my good friend Gerry Schwebel on this discussion.

He and I think his employer commissioned a report that quantified in very stark terms the dollar value of these delays, and, Gerry, I'm going to let you weigh in on this, but there's definitely a dollar value that was absolutely stark and that I would include somewhere in the verbiage here. It's good research. I think the Perryman Group did it, I think.

MR. SCHWEBEL: That's correct.

MR. BARELA: I would plug some of those numbers in there on border delays. It was very stark, billions of
dollars are wasted each year. I forgot the exact number but, Gerry, I was really impressed by that report. I quoted quite a bit of it, you'd think I would know it off the top of my head.

MR. SCHWEBEL: You're correct, Jon. This is Gerry Schwebel again.

That report we commissioned shows both local impact, dollar impact, state dollar impact, and national dollar impact in regards to these delays at our crossings and our ports of entry. I'll get that to you all; I have it saved. Do I send it to you?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, Gerry, if you send it to me. Thank you.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Jon.

MR. ZAPATA: This is David. I think here we also need to include as an issue or a need staffing levels. I know the focus for this plan is construction projects and infrastructure, but we can't manage it with staffing shortages at all ports of entry.

MS. MAYS: That's important because, David, that's goes into the operations and management of the actual border crossings and definitely then the infrastructure, so great point.

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry. Where do we have in here environment and community impacts, COVID or other
health -- how about health. I mean, there's no border for a virus, obviously, but shouldn't we be looking at something in regard to a health scenario.

Up at the northern border they're doing a lot of weird stuff up there at the northern border, I don't want see it down here at the southern border, but you know, should we be looking at what the future would look like for health issues that impact the flow of people and trade?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, certainly I think so because, again, we're looking into the future. If you can anticipate future needs based on kind of what we see now, you know, what if another COVID happened, how would we deal with that?

Is this time a one-time event or will it happen again, or maybe in a different form, it might not be COVID, it might be something else that we are not prepared for.

But like you mentioned earlier, Gerry, do we have protocols in place to be able to respond to any of these disruptors. I think that's really the underlying issue here. We cannot predict the disruptors, but are we prepared?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yeah. I mean, I was in a meeting yesterday with all those Canadian border folks,
and they're making people get tested and come in with their test results before they even come across the border, and all kinds of stuff like that, or they test them there at the border, you know, before they let them into the country, or vice versa. I said, God help us if we do that on the southern border, geez.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. These are great comments. Are there any other issues that really you think need to stand out?

We've got border delays; obviously that's the one that comes up again and again. Gerry, thank you for citing that report so in a couple of pages we'll highlight the numbers that Chris Williges and his team calculated for current and future possible delays, connectivity, safety, pavement, the condition of the crossings.

Is there anything else that we really need to highlight here? Anything that we're missing?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Caroline, can we move on?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, let's move on.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So we'll move to the next. So the next couple of pages are really expanding on this issue of the border crossing time delays, and here we're looking at some of the changes that are forecast to occur between now and 2050.
This is a very dramatic graphic showing these flows and kind of what we're looking at by region, and again, this is one where it takes some time to absorb it, but it does comprehensively show the entire region and what the average border crossing times are for personal vehicles on the left and commercial vehicles on the right.

I know that this was something that was very important to the BTAC to be able to account for these crossing times, and again, this reflects on kind of the hybrid use of using where it's available the TTI crossing time data and then a process that we developed using the INRIX data to cover the rest of the crossings for north and south bound.

So are there any comments or questions to this?

Again, the story is that there is significant growth forecast in the future.

MS. MAYS: Any comments from committee members? If you were to make a 30-second elevator speech on this, what would that be, have we captured it?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel again. We've had plenty of discussions down here in Laredo and Nuevo Laredo on the commercial traffic potential times for crossings, and I know that -- I don't know if he's still on. Jorge Lozano was on the meeting earlier.

But this is very a major eye-opener: If
nothing is done in our infrastructure, the effect of these hours of crossing for commercial vehicles is the most impactful thing that we are all worried about down here. So again, making sure that the validity of the values in the INRIX system versus the BTS are both there, but that INRIX really created an eye-opener.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Gerry.

Anyone from the Rio Grande Valley or El Paso would like to comment on this?

MR. BROUWEN: This is Fred again from the City of Pharr Bridge Department.

On the hours, is this actual -- these are the actual hours that we have that we're showing? I'm seeing zero hours slowing to eight hours that we have to the left, and then the right we have zero to 14 hours.

MR. LUDLOW: I believe so.

Alejandro, do you have any insight on that?

MR. SOLIS: Yeah. They're both northbound total crossing times, and the ones on the left-hand side correspond to passenger vehicles. The ones on the right-hand side correspond to commercial vehicles or trucks.

MR. BROUWEN: This is the actual hours?

MR. SOLIS: It is actual hours of total border crossing. This is kind of the change we made towards the end of the study when we changed from delays to total
crossing times. These represent total crossing times.

    MR. LUDLOW: In a no-build scenario where nothing is done.

    MR. SOLIS: Correct, with a no improvement into the future scenario.

    MR. BROUWEN: No projects.

    MR. LUDLOW: No projects. Correct.

    MS. MAYS: So for the rest of the committee, what should the message be to summarize this? If you were to take this in your own words, what would you say?

    MAYOR LOZANO: This is Mayor Lozano, and I just want to convey sort of the same sentiment, that this is impactful because it really is visually impactful as far as far as being to convey the message that if nothing is done today, border crossings and commercial truck crossings will be delayed, and it will further impact the GDP for the state and the country.

    And I think this really illustrates how time is money, and this gives a clear message for all of us along the border to convey that message to leadership to ensure that investments are still coming to the border region and that we have that solid unified message of how time delays impact ultimately the GDP and trade.

    I think this is a great illustration and very eye-opening for all.
MS. MAYS: Thank you for those comments, Mayor Lozano. Absolutely. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Well, why don't we move on, and we're going to go into a bit more detail on some of the actual delays.

Eduardo, did you have something to say?

MR. CALVO: Yeah. I know we've mentioned it many times in the past, but I don't see a note here in the executive summary that these forecasts are really unconstrained. Right? I mean, they are [inaudible] and all that, but at the same time, you know, somebody can say, well, nobody is going to wait 14 hours to cross. Right? I mean, no business, no truck is going to wait that time. But to make sure that it's understood that these forecasts are unconstrained.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, I think that's really important, Eduardo. Thank you.

Caroline?

MS. MAYS: I was just going to say, yes, we'll definitely make sure we incorporate that into the narrative.

MR. LUDLOW: Great. Okay, let's move on to the next page.

So here we go into the impact of the delays, and again, this page provides the current and future
estimate of the delays and the cost of delays associated
with the border delays going from 1.1- up to $75 billion,
and also from Mexico the team estimated this for Mexico as
well, so that it's very much a Texas-Mexico binational
perspective.

Also, this illustrates the potential loss of
jobs and the delays specific to goods movement, so
obviously about $68 million in economic productivity loss,
so going through each of those kinds of statistics, which
are very telling.

And then on the other side we answer the
question what is the economic impact importance of the
Texas-Mexico border and kind of showing that story as
well, the contributions to GDP both now and in the future,
I think tying that back to the whole issue if there
continue be border delays, if the crossing times grown, it
really does have just a reverberating economic impact in
both countries.

So is this telling the story adequately? These
are some eye-popping, eye-opening numbers again that under
the unconstrained scenario if nothing is done, that there
is a really significant impact.

MR. CALVO: Donald, a question here. These
numbers, how do they compare to the Perryman report that
Jon Barela and Gerry were mentioning a while ago? I mean,
I don't know if they have been compared yet or looked at to see if they can complement each other, but this would be the place to really compare them.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. I'll defer to Alejandro or perhaps Chris Williges to see if they've looked at it.

MR. SOLIS: Yeah. Thank you, Donald. We have done a high level comparison of them. They are different, our numbers are relatively lower than the Perryman report, and there are methodological differences to what they are calculating and what we are calculating and it has to do with kind of value-added.

My understanding -- and Chris can correct me if I'm wrong -- the Perryman report is using total values of trade, whereas we are using only the value-added to impute the cost, you know, not the whole value of the product that moved, it was what really kind of is generated on each side of the border.

So we're using slightly different methodology, and that's why the numbers are different, but we're focusing on our study used a more standard methodology that relies on value-added created on each side of the border to estimate the cost of those delays.

MR. CALVO: And, Alejandro, I think that's fine as long as we can really explain the differences. Not to say that one is more accurate or more correct than the
other. I mean, they're just, like you said, different methodology, different assumptions, but I think it's important to be ready to explain why they are different.

    MR. SOLIS: Certainly. Thank you, Eduardo.
    MS. MAYS: Yes. Certainly we'll do that.

Thank you.

    MR. LUDLOW: Any other thoughts or comments on the economic impact? If not, we'll pivot into recommendations.

    MR. WOJNOWSKI: This is Matt again from Del Rio.

    A minor thing, if the pictures on the left are from actual places in Texas, which hopefully they are, just maybe a note on where these pictures were taken.

    MS. MAYS: Okay. We'll double-check and make sure the pictures are from Texas. We have a lot of border crossings, so we want to make sure it's one of ours.

Thank you.

    MR. SOLIS: The top one on the top right, that's El Paso looking into Juarez; bottom left, I don't know.

    MR. WOJNOWSKI: As we know, pictures are worth a million words.

    MS. MAYS: Absolutely. We'll do that.

So Donald, just wanted to say before we move I
really wanted to ask the committee on page 23, the economic importance of the Texas-Mexico border, if we're going to be confronted in the discussions, and I want to make sure, one, you know, Eduardo, your point that we need to add more narrative here is well taken in the entire executive summary, but I'm looking for a 30-second elevator speech on economic importance of the Texas-Mexico border.

Gerry, Jon, Eduardo, all of you, if the legislator asked you tomorrow, what would you tell them that we need to include here in terms of a key message?

MR. CALVO: Show me the money.

(General laughter.)

MS. MAYS: You're showing them how much money the border generates. Right?

MR. CALVO: I mean, kidding aside, I think this is really one of the key messages. I'm not sure exactly how to craft it but, again, showing -- I think Gerry was talking about it very passionately at the last BTAC meeting, and I agree, you know, this is the really the key message, how important the border is not just for us here locally but for the State of Texas and for the country.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. I think that's why I wanted to kind of just hear from you all. You guys have talked about this being a really key component of the plan. I
didn't want us to gloss over it.

Gerry, Sam, Jon, anybody else?

MR. SCHWEBEL: I'm sorry; I had to step out to wash my hands.

And thank you, Eduardo, because this is what it boils down to, again, how we deliver the message, you know, the importance.

Let's face it, folks, you know, a lot of people, none of them are on this call -- when I say this, there's a lot of people who really don't pay attention to the border because they don't understand it, they don't want to understand it.

So we need to deliver that message correctly: the role we play to everyone else, so this becomes the most important element about how do we present the case of the role of the border to other parts of the border outside the length of the border.

So I like it, but the value of this becomes increasingly more and more important for the overall success of the plan.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely.

Anybody else? RGV, you guys have been a little quiet.

MR. CALVO: Caroline, this is Eduardo again. You know, just following the same train of thought, you
know, shouldn't this be page 1 of the executive summary? I mean, even for, again, the executive summary you're already summarizing, right, the humongous report, but maybe this is page 1 of the executive summary.

You know, this is what we're going to tell you why it is so important.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Good point, very good point, I agree with Eduardo, yes, gotta be up there in the front.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Because I know if you remember we had why does the border matter? So would you all want this to be moved closer to that? Maybe we could talk offline about it but look at the executive summary kind of how we laid it right now.

Remember, I think it was one of the couple first pages where we said why does the border matter.

MR. LUDLOW: You know what we may want to do, Caroline, just an idea, is within that "why does the border matter," take the top part and really emphasize that economic connection on the first half of the page and then perhaps leave this as more detail to kind of move the storyline. That's just one possibility. But I think the point is well taken that this needs to come right up at the front.

MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. LUDLOW: If somebody is saying why does the
border matter, well, right now we have a common border and then we have U.S.-Mexico trade and those are important, but maybe the very first thing is that it has this incredible economic importance to both countries.

MS. MAYS: Yes. We'll go back to the drawing board, Eduardo, and then see how we can better incorporate it at least in the beginning.

MR. SCHWEBEL: The jobs message, yeah. That's how we sold USMCA to other parts of the country, you know.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. I think we'll move on then, if there are no other questions or comments.

And let's move into recommendations, and we'll spend our next 15 minutes on these particular parts of the executive summary.

So the first part, what are the recommendations. Over the next few pages the policy recommendations, program recommendations and project recommendations are presented.

We spent a lot of time with BTAC going through these. Are there any here that really need to stand out? Again, these are color-coded, but on page 24 system-wide policies, so covering the entire system, these are cross-cutting policies, then there's border policies and then there are corridor policies.

Caroline, do you have anything specific that
you wanted the BTAC to think about on the policy side?

MS. MAYS: Again, you know, really articulating, I think, the key message again. You know, we crafted all of these policies that in a nutshell what does that mean or how can we better communicate it here.

Why are these policies important or why should anybody pay attention to the policies? Why are they needed and why they should be implemented? I think that's really what I'm looking for here from the committee. You all helped craft this; a lot of it came from you all, from your experience, from the analysis that has been done.

Any comments with this?

MR. CALVO: Caroline, I'm looking here at the policy recommendations, and I apologize if I'm missing the point here but I see a lot of, you know, at the policy level stuff between Texas and Mexico, Texas and Mexico.

But a lot of the policies really involve the federal governments. So I'm not sure if maybe we should specify here, because I don't see language here that asks the federal governments also to participate.

I mean, they are part of the policies. Right?

You know, that at the highest level policies, you know, Washington, D.C. and Mexico City play a huge role. When it comes to programs it's a little bit less, and when it comes to projects, you know, it's more local. Right?
MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. CALVO: But you have policy recommendations maybe -- I'm looking at it right now for the first time, and it seems like it's missing that flavor that we need to involve the federal governments as well.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely. I think we might have stated it if you read the first paragraph, but I don't think it articulates the way you're wanting it articulated, because it says, you know, this will require active participation of federal, state, regional, local and private partners to implement. They're talking about the policies, but the actual description of the policies in the executive summary doesn't state that.

But in the report -- Donald, correct me if I'm wrong -- in the report it actually states federal, state, local entities. Right, Donald?

MR. LUDLOW: Correct, Caroline. There is some differentiation in the report, but for brevity's sake it was more of a blanket statement up front that it requires all of these different groups to be active, but it doesn't specify on any given policy responsibility.

If there are some policies that really need to be called out as something that's federal level, I think we could consider doing that.

Eduardo, were there any that you thought really
need to be emphasized at the federal level? I think we're just trying to find a way to adjust your point of view here and to make sure there's that federal flavor, as you mentioned.

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel. Can we strengthen what we discussed, I think at the last couple of meetings, which would be the private sector funding. You know, in the future there's going to be a lot more private sector, private partnership, private funds, and the federal and state governments really partnering to allow and permit and open themselves up to allow, you know, all of this growth and potential needs to include, you know, thinking out of the box to allow this true participation of the private sector.

I think we need to strengthen that messaging that sometimes, you know, it takes more than the state or the federal government to be looked at. But they also need to look at us as the private sector to say, hey, we're willing to put up, we're willing to do this. There is a willingness if they'd just let us.

I don't know how you would redact that or you would put it into words, but I think that for the future we all recognize that there's not going to be enough money out there for these billions of dollars of needs that we have, and we're going to have really incorporate a model
for private funding of some of these projects.

    MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, thank you, Gerry. I think we need to go back to the drawing board and see how we can frame that in there better beyond the statement that we have up at the front that introduces the different types of projects.

    If there's some additional language we need to emphasize that this is not something addressing these recommendations, it's not something that is going to be possible with public dollars, public infrastructure dollars alone, that there's a lot to be leveraged through the private sector, not only for the infrastructure but also to technology deployments and data improvement and all of the other many things that are mentioned here.

    MR. SCHWEBEL: I think our friends in Mexico are ahead of us on this private funding for some of these infrastructure projects, so we need to open ourselves up too.

    MS. MAYS: As Donald mentioned, we'll go back and see how we can incorporate that message in there, and I think, Gerry, if you have any thoughts, please send it to us so we can incorporate that in the messaging.

    MR. CORONADO: Hey, Caroline, I don't know if here we can add -- I know that I brought it up early on how at least in my opinion Mexico should have P3 programs
between the federal government and private entities or local governments to be able to fund projects with private funding, same as we do with CDC in the City of El Paso or Laredo, I think for construction projects, things like that.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Thank you for those comments. Any other comments here?

MR. LUDLOW: I was just going to say, Caroline, if there are no other comments, we can move on to our program recommendations and start to get into projects.

MS. MAYS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. LUDLOW: Hannah, advance us, please.

So here we go through the program recommendations. There are 182. This page essentially outlines some of the key examples. We didn't include everything, but we highlighted the need to expand potential with the BCIS program so that we are indeed having a comprehensive means of correcting consistent real data in north- and southbound for all crossings, UCP expansion, which Warren Erdman mentioned earlier, data collection, traveler information apps and Mexican driver training programs.

So again, there are 182 programs that we've recommended ways to improve the operations and success of border transportation, but we've only highlighted four of
them.

The question is are these the right four? Are there other programs that you all have recommended or that we have developed in the material that you would like to see rise in opportunity to this page to state as limited examples?

So if you had to go in to the legislature in Austin and ask them and say, We need you to fund four programs that are going to help us operate a more effective border, are these the four?

And we're not prioritizing here, again. These are examples that this is what would be most visible to those who read the executive summary.

So are there any of our bridge operators here on the line, members of BTAC, who might have an insight on this, or would you like to validate this or suggest something different?

Caroline, I don't know if there was somebody specific you wanted us to call on here, and then we can move on to projects.

MS. MAYS: I think Warren from KCS mentioned the unified cargo processing for rail, and I think that's an element that was included in the program recommendations, you know, looking at unified cargo processing for rail but also for the other border
crossings as one element.

And then, of course, the BCIS, we use that data to do border wait times, that was one of the data we used. Right now we only have it at seven border crossings, so how do we expand that?

So those are some of the things in the program recommendations, so I think I want to hear from the committee if you had to pick, is this kind of representative samples here in terms of program areas, you know, to expand or some of the shorter term things we could start doing, what would those be?

I know from TxDOT's side we are committed to expanding the BCIS program throughout all the border crossings. We don't have a timeline yet for doing that, but we've seen the benefits of the data it's provided, but also filling the gaps that we then have, including things like INRIX data, we're working with INRIX on that.

So I want to hear from the committee on the program side kind of your top two or three.

MR. ERDMAN: Well, Caroline, this is Warren Erdman again, and I would just echo my earlier comment that the language regarding rail congestion and the unified cargo processing accurately describes what our top priority would be, and so I really have nothing further to add to that. I think you captured it very accurately.
MS. MAYS: Okay. That's great to hear.

MR. GARCIA: Caroline, this is Josue.

On the border delays obviously from talking as a bridge, you know, those are extremely important to us as far as everything we've talked about, and you know, the BCIS expansion and everything that's coming into play.

I think anything that can shed light on the amount of time that is spent -- I mean, in Cameron County we have daily crossings of 10,000 cars. Imagine all of 10,000 cars, you know, 10,000 pedestrians coming daily as well, but you know, cars sitting in line.

I mean, if you see any social media, anything you see is always pointing to the fact that there's too much traffic waiting in line.

MS. MAYS: Yes, absolutely. Thanks for the comments.

MR. LUDLOW: Well, thank you very much, everyone. That's really helpful. Thank you, Josue and Warren, for those comments and helping validate this a bit more.

On the project recommendation side, the next few pages go into this in more detail. I'm including this one, this first page is the introducing citing 652 border-wide projects that have been identified and at a cost of $39 billion, estimated.
They are segmented by border crossing, corridor in the U.S. and Mexico by cost, and total number of projects and also prioritized. So this is really the introduction. This is an eye-popping number.

As Gerry said earlier, there's no way that there are enough dollars to fund all of these needs and project recommendations. So this is the intro to this piece on project recommendations, and then in a moment we'll go to some of the subsequent pages that go into a bit more detail.

Are there any initial comments on the project recommendations? And if not, we'll move to the next two pages where we go into a bit more detail describing by region and by type.

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, Caroline, if nothing else then we'll move to these next two pages to continue the discussion.

MS. MAYS: Yes, absolutely.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So here we basically depict the project distribution by priority and by region and also by issue and need.

And again, this is information that you've seen before. I think some of these latest pie charts that are illustrating the allocation by issue and need for the
whole border by region are especially illustrative and interesting. The allocation across these different categories, safety, multimodal, connectivity, mobility and reliability across the entire Texas-Mexico border, and then again, breakdowns on the funding.

So this is a lot of information, it's organized in a way that I think the intent here is to enable BTAC members and others who are providing this information more broadly to summarize how this looks across the whole border and the specific needs in the regions.

So let's open this up. Are there specific comments or reactions to this? I know this is a very critically important kind of the real meat of the Border Master Plan as we're getting into the actual infrastructure projects that are needed.

MS. MAYS: Any comments on these pages? Key message here? And I have some thoughts on it, but I'll let you all chime in first.

MR. CALVO: Donald, Caroline, this is Eduardo. You know, my initial reaction when I saw this, well, first of all, we're still reviewing the project list, the latest one that was attached as Appendix 10-D, or whatever it's called, and there are still changes so these numbers will probably jump.

I mean, these are by no means the final numbers
as needs for the El Paso region. So where they're going to go up or down a little bit, that's probably going to happen. Right? And I don't know if the other regions are in the same situation where they're still reviewing the list, but in our case I did some duplicates that we need to clean up.

But overall I think if the numbers don't change very much, it is so interesting that the dollar figures for the three regions is almost identical, you know, $13.1 billion -- well, $13.2- for the Rio Grande Valley. That was really interesting that they ended up being the same dollar amounts.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely. And Eduardo, your comment about the project list, this is as close as we are; we're not saying that it's 100 percent. But I think we're as close as we are now and certainly there's going to be some tweaks.

But I think what we were looking for here is the message, one that you just brought up that the dollar value for each of the three regions are fairly close, so that's very interesting.

But I think for me what is more interesting -- which is probably on every plan I've been involved in -- is that there are far more projects that are not funded than projects that are fully funded.
We have a lot more projects that are either not funded, partially funded, compared to projects that are funded. And then you have far more projects on the corridor side than you have on the border crossings.

So you know, just kind of looking at the dynamic there, it's like we have this amount of need, but if all of these come under high priority needs, then they're unfunded right now.

So that's kind of where I wanted to jog you all's thought process here: What should the message here be? Yes, we have all of these graphs, we've got a lot of government data, et cetera, but what should the message be from you guys, from BTAC?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry Schwebel, Caroline and others. I think one of the things that I'd like to see -- and I was looking at it in the appendix of the projects that were listed here, and I also kind of saw what was just highlighted, 13, 13, 13, gosh, people are going to zero in on that very quickly, you know. Lucky 13, I don't know if it's lucky 13, or what it is, you know.

But I think we need to really look at these numbers and be able to support them, and I'm not questioning the validation, but I think we need to go back and just do a review.
I was looking at our list in the appendix, and I don't know if we're going to get into that discussion or not, but there may be some old data in there that we need to go back and review for some of us in our respective regions.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely, I agree we would definitely do that, and I think the team has been working nonstop to validate as much as we can with project sponsors and eliminating duplicate projects and then also making sure that the information being provided is the most current information possible, because the unique challenge and complexity of what this exercise was is that we got a ton of projects sponsors from all levels, and then we add the binational aspect, where we're getting projects from our Mexican partners, so trying to bring all of that and mesh it together was very interesting but also very complex.

But definitely, like you mentioned, things boil down to we just want to make sure we validate and make sure that we check to make sure that whatever we're providing here is the best -- might not be perfect but this is the best that we've tried to put together.

MR. CORONADO: David Coronado.

And I'm with Eduardo, we need to go through the list and just review one more time, and then we'll get
back to you on that.

But here I think it would be very helpful if we can have one pie graph that essentially just shows the percentage of projects that are funded against unfunded, whether it's partially or fully funded, at least have that breakdown just to show the need for resources that we have at the local level.

MS. MAYS: Okay. That's a good comment. We will do that. So a graph or a pie chart that shows the priority projects that are fully funded, the ones that are partially funded, and then the ones that are not funded.

MR. CORONADO: Yes.

MS. MAYS: Do you want that by region?

MR. CORONADO: I think in the summary just total, I think, in my opinion. I mean, if you have space it would be nice to have it by region, but at least total.

And the previous page at the top you have 652 in the text and then 650 in the infographic. So a minor correction right there on page 27.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Got it. We'll double-check those numbers.

MR. SCHWEBEL: I have a question. This is Gerry Schwebel.

Would it help -- this is for our committee -- would it help the committee to also be made aware of those
projects on the Mexican side that are funded or completed or at what stage they're at?

You know, we saw some good presentations the last couple of weeks from our friends in Mexico, but if we're trying to talk about connectivity and the success of going out there, reaching out funding for this plan, that the Mexican component is a critical element in regards to prioritizing.

So if you have a project let's say on the Mexican side that's fully funded but you don't have it on the U.S. side, at all even on the map or on the plan, then does that priority move it up for that or does it help?

I think it helps to have that data, and I don't know if that data would be able to be provided by our friends from Mexico, Chihuahua, Nuevo León, Coahuila, Tamaulipas.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, Gerry, we do have all the project information from our Mexican counterparts, and we included the information, we tried to match it as we can with the layout of how we reflect the projects, and we do have information on that.

And I think -- Alejandro, am I wrong? I think more projects on the Mexican side are not funded compared to the projects on the U.S. Texas side. Right?

MR. SOLIS: Yes, that's correct, Caroline. The
majority of the projects on the Mexican side are unfunded. They follow a slightly different funding process -- and Erika can explain to us if she is around -- but normally they are funded on an annual basis; they don't necessarily fund it for the long term. So we have a handful of projects in Mexico that are funded right now, the majority of them are unfunded.

MS. MAYS: But the key there, Gerry, is that their funding cycle is not like ours. For instance, at TxDOT we have a 10-year UTP and you know kind of what projects are funded, et cetera. But in Mexico, you know, right now you have all these projects that are unfunded, come next year a lot of them could be funded and the dynamic could change.

And I think that's a unique thing that we started discussing from the beginning, is that the processes in Mexico compared to the processes in the U.S. or Texas are slightly different, and this is one of them. You know, how things are funded in Mexico is far different than how things are funded in the United States.

MR. SCHWEBEL: All right. You know, for our friends from Mexico I just want to make sure, you know, we've learned a lot from the '80s and '90s to today on these binational infrastructure projects that we don't continue to make similar -- I won't call them mistakes,
but quite frankly, you heard me voice my concerns about in
the Laredo region, our Colombia Bridge, you know, we had
all the funding on the U.S. side but we haven't gotten the
project completed on the Mexican side to its full
capacity.

So I want to make sure we don't forget about --
we don't repeat some of those mistakes where it's used
against us, you know.

MR. GONZALEZ: This is Ernesto Gonzalez from
Tamaulipas. Can you hear me?

MS. MAYS: Yes, we can hear you, Ernesto. Go
ahead. Welcome.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you. I didn't see the
final list of projects that Tamaulipas is working
currently, but also, I don't know if it's more as a need
but how the commercial area is growing, and we also
recommend for the Laredo region the 405.

Just a comment, because I didn't see that list,
but I'm thinking that we showed the projects that we are
working currently as needs for our future for all these
projects.

MR. CALVARIO: This is Francisco Calvario.

MS. MAYS: Yes, go ahead, Francisco.

MR. CALVARIO: Thank you, Caroline.

The majority of projects on the border is
financing by concession, so we need to negotiate with our
concessionaire to do that. So for example, at the
Colombia-Laredo Bridge, we are working with that with a
concession, because it's already to the end, the
concession, so we're working now on a modification to
enlarge the term of the concession for another 30 years,
as an example.

For example, in Ojinaga in Chihuahua, we are
also working with a concessionaire, but in this case it's
CAPUFE, and they are working on the second span of the
bridge.

So we are in the border, the majority of the
projects, bridges mainly, in this case are by concession.
The other projects like the Laredo Colombia, for example,
we are working on maybe a new concession or we are
exploring with the State of Nuevo Leon how is the best way
to build the Laredo Colombia. So it's unfunded because we
have not the clarity of the resources now, but we're
working on them.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Francisco and Ernesto, on
your comments.

Gerry, does that address your comment?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yes, it does. I just wanted to
make sure that we're all understanding. I think Ernesto
and Francisco have been such important contributors to
this plan, all of our friends from Mexico, Erika, everybody, all of our states, and we've all continued to work every day more. But so that we'd all understand both sides of the border and even the Commission, you know.

Having listened to the meeting today, it's important that we weigh in the message that the commissioners also have to face in regards to our funding limitations and looking at the overall picture of Texas that everybody is asking for more money, but whether we have more good data of what will raise the level of priorities to some of these deals when we get to that point that we understand clearly the connection between the Mexican side to the U.S. side and we prioritize accordingly.

SEXY. HUGHS: Gerry, this is Ruth Hughes. I just wanted to indicate that I completely, wholeheartedly agree that it's going to be very important to have that coordination and collaboration, and that's why we have had the meetings, the separate meetings with each of the Mexican states that we share a border with, and I would say that one of the main take-aways is that they too need to secure funding on their side.

And so these group efforts to identify these priorities and to lay them out will hopefully be helpful to both sides where we'll end up with a document that can
point to the need and point an interest in that coordination and collaboration.

So I think Caroline and her team have done a great job of gathering that information, and then we just need to make sure it's reflected in our document, because it not only helps us, but I think it is a tool that they may also use with their own government to secure funding on their side of things.

And I also agree with you, of course, on the private-public partnerships. Hard to say how they're specifically reflected in this plan, but certainly that will be an important component to consider in terms of projects going forward. So very good points and well taken and hopefully will be reflected.

You know, as we read this document, if that isn't a take-away that we end up with in terms of the priorities on Mexican side from this data that's gathered, then let's revisit that and talk about it, even if it's not during one of our meetings, because we are at the final stages.

So thank you.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Secretary.

MR. CALVO: So Caroline, this is Eduardo. If I could also make a couple of comments on this section here.

So you know, first of all, we definitely need
to scrub the list, and I know the numbers will change, but
what I think is very important is that we send a message
that, whatever the numbers end up being, that the key
message is to show that there are priorities; in other
words, that we're not just throwing everything on the wall
and see what sticks. No.

We are identifying the key priorities, and yes,
most of them are unfunded, but I think the message needs
to show that we've looked at it and that we have given it
a lot of thought and coming up with the top priorities.
Right?

I think that's somewhat a very generic comment,
but it has to be part of the main message, because if not,
people are going to see here decision-makers, the people
that make decisions on funding they're going to say, well,
these guys want everything, and very easy to blow us off.
So that's one thing.

But then the second thing really goes back to
the initial points I made about, you know -- and like
Secretary Hughes just mentioned, at some point this report
has to end somewhere. Right?

So I think it's important to find a really good
solid stopping point, and perhaps it's not perfect, but
maybe for the next stage that's when we can focus a little
more and identifying and getting more into the details of
the projects that have solid components on both sides. Right?

You know, right now I guess we maybe identified the priorities perhaps maybe at a higher level, not to that level of detail, but then the next step will be let's get into more into the details, more into the weeds, and perhaps even more into project development. But at some point, you know, we need to come to a good solid stopping point. Right?

MS. MAYS: No, no, absolutely. You know, again, this is a long-range plan with short and medium time components, and certainly for that to be realized, like you mentioned, you know, this is high level.

For the plan to be realized, when you go into implementation, project development, doing a lot of the coordination and that is where I think the rubber is going to meet the road. You know, this is a roadmap, it's a blueprint, it's not the end all, be all; it's a guiding document for you all, for all of us, to collectively go back and move our portions forward so we can, you know, show progress on all of these projects that have been identified whether they're funded or not funded but how can we do that.

Some of them are just conceptual. Ernesto mentioned 405; that's still conceptual at this point.
What will it take to develop that into a project, you know. Or La Gloria, Francisco mentioned what will that take.

So that's where the rubber meets the road, that's kind of the next step beyond this plan. This plan in the next few months is going to be done and what next, you know, and really going to be a collective effort to move that forward.

So try to articulate that in this plan that, you know, this is a high level and then there's still going to be a lot of things that need to be done. You know that. For an MPO you've got the long-range plan, and if you go to the TIPs and then you go to the project development to realize, you know, implementing those projects.

MR. CALVO: Excellent, great. Thank you.

MS. MAYS: You're welcome.

Any other comments from committee members? I know it's an afternoon meeting, and we're running a little bit behind, but wanted to make sure we don't short-change anything.

(No response.)

MS. MAYS: If not, Donald, we can move to the next pages.

MR. LUDLOW: Yes. Thank you, Caroline.
Let's advance to the last -- not the last two pages; we have one more page after this which really has kind of the charge for the future. But these two pages segue from the projects and describing what's out there into more of the implementation plan language.

And, Eduardo, your comments are well received with respect to delineating better where this ends and where future implementation begins, but this piece is intended to really kind of identify some of those initial steps on implementation, including which projects would be implemented in the short, medium and long term.

And it presents that based on the prioritization, based on time frame and funding status, and then the country where those projects are identified. So this a little further along toward what is most feasible with respect to implementation given existing funding levels and current, medium and long-term feasibility and priority.

And I just wanted to see if Alejandro had anything else to add on this particular section.

MR. SOLIS: No, Donald. I mean, I think that the only information also worth highlighting is the funding gap that you can see towards the right-hand side of page 31.

We broke it down by term of the time frame,
short, medium and long term, so that you can see that even in the short term there are some significant unfunded projects. I think that would be one of the, I guess, highlights of that page.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. But the major goal here is to really illustrate, based on this higher-level assessment of all of the different projects, what is most feasible and practical based on those parameters over the next few years.

The question for this group is whether that's the right message or whether this potentially needs to be taken a little bit further; does this need to be delineated differently.

And obviously, Eduardo, your earlier comment about where does the plan stop, it needs an end and a beginning. I think this is a natural place to kind of indicate that, but we'd love to have your comments and perceptions of what you're seeing here and how this kind of sets up TxDOT and its partners and Mexican partners for the next phases.

MR. CALVO: I think, Donald, what I said before I think is important that in the executive summary and in the report it has to be articulated clearly the need is huge, right, but that all of us are aware that we're not going to get funding for everything. Right?
I mean, we are prioritizing. and we understand that there are different projects that have different priorities and different impacts. Right? And whether the number is $9.2 billion or $8.8-, you know, it doesn't matter.

What really matters is the fact that the need is huge and we're underfunded. In other words, not focus too much on the exact detailed figure but it's more the concept that there's a big need and there's a lack of funding but we are prioritizing.

You know, what we're asking for is really focusing on the key projects. Right? We don't have all the answers after this report, but what we have right now has a lot of analysis, it's well thought out, and this is a realistic need, not only for us here on the border, but like what we were saying earlier, for the State of Texas and for the country.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely, Eduardo, point well taken, you know, that yes there's a vast amount of needs, but within that there are some clear priorities from the border region on what those look like and really why those are so critical.

So I think if you and others can help us articulate that message -- because I think that's really important. If somebody looks at the number and it's like,
oh, wow, this is so big, that's really a comprehensive identification of all the needs, and then let's now look at a realistic subset of that.

And I think we've been able to articulate in the plan here by using -- you know, fitting the projects through the lens of the goal areas and really looking and really looking at how many goals those does this project achieve, could achieve, and what could the potential impacts be.

So I think, yes, you're absolutely right; there's been some level of prioritization from that lens as well, but also you all have prioritized these projects, otherwise you won't be working on them.

Any other comments from committee members?

Otherwise, Donald, move to the next one.

MR. SOLIS: Donald, you are muted.

MR. LUDLOW: Oh, I'm very sorry. Hannah, can you advance to the next? And could you potentially zoom in for us a little bit here. The last page is obviously one just we can blow this up a little bit.

So the last page is essentially a call for action, and I think the team will be working on stylizing this a little bit differently, but again, it's really kind of reframing the message of the Border Master Plan that it's critical for continued economic prosperity, talks
about the number of projects, policies and programs, continues to emphasize the role of the BTAC in moving this forward and that the BTAC will be guidance and oversight as this plan is implemented moving into the future, really mentions this pivot to the implementation mindset and implementation phase, where there's much more of an emphasis on working with the actual implementers, the TxDOT districts, municipalities, municipios, estados, and working together to take this to the next step of realizing the projects, and then reemphasizing the important critical nature of the stakeholders, federal, state and regional partners.

So this is important, this the kind of takeaway, this is the charge; this is the what's-happening-next part. And again, we've heard from several of you, Eduardo most emphatically, about kind of articulating where this plan ends, what begins next, this is the first cut at that charge for the future.

So the question for you all, if you were explaining this to someone, to potentially a policy-maker or a business leader, a potential financing partner, is this providing a clear message? What else do we need to do?

I think you've given us some excellent ideas that we can use to recast this a little bit today, but I
wanted to end here and see if there were any additional
comments on what this charge should say and look like as
we summarize the Border Master Plan.

Maybe I'll call on a couple of folks we haven't
heard from who I know are on the line: Rafael Aldrete and
potentially Lisa, just, you know, as partners and
collaborators with universities and research institutions
in Texas.

We haven't heard from you today. I just wanted
to see if you had any comment here as we moved into this,
and then we can certainly hear from other members of the
BTAC.

MR. ALDRETE: I don't have any specific
comments on this page. I put a comment in the chat box
just regarding the question on ports of entry versus
border crossings.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you very much, Rafael.
Lisa, anything you'd like to add here as you've
taken all of this in?

MS. LOFTUS-OTWAY: I'm the same as Rafael, but
I think it's good to have a call to action to assist us in
moving forward. But you've done great work, and this is a
lot of information.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, thank you, Lisa. Maybe this
really needs to be absorbed with a glass of wine rather
than hot chocolate; I'm not sure.

All right. Other comments or questions? Are there other members of the BTAC who we haven't heard from yet today who would like to chime in here and help us understand whether we've framed this correctly?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Caroline or Secretary Hughes, were there any particular members who you feel that need to express some of their perspective here?

MS. MAYS: No. I think we got a lot of members speaking up, and certainly at the end of this meeting we're going to ask and urge the BTAC members to spend time reviewing the executive summary, the draft that we sent out, and providing us with some written comments, because that's how we're going to improve this document and make it a document that's yours.

This is your voice and voices for the border community, and when I say it's not just BTAC, it's everybody on this call, meaning our Mexican counterparts as well. So you know, we've already gotten the call to action on the executive summary is going to come later.

But we want to give people a few more minutes to provide any additional comment on the executive summary before we go to the next agenda item. I know we're running a little bit late, but this was important to have
this very engaging dialogue, and you guys have given us a lot of input.

Going once, any additional comments from those of you who have not had a chance to speak?

MR. ZAPATA: Caroline, this is David Zapata.

MS. MAYS: Yes, David, go ahead.

MR. ZAPATA: I'll be brief. So just one quick comment, I think it will be worth it to add to kind of close the loop on the last page of the summary. On the first two pages members pointed out that it was good to emphasize and explain, make the point of why the plan and investing in the border is good for the whole state.

It may be good to kind of reemphasize that again as the plan closes on the summary to kind of like, again, closing the loop on that argument to make sure that it's not lost as we're doing the final pitch with the summary. So just that small point.

MS. MAYS: That's a great point, yes. We'll do that.

SECY. HUGHS: And, Caroline, just for everyone on the call, you know, we certainly want to give you all the opportunity to speak. We know there are some regions that may or may not be as much in attendance this afternoon. That could be why they're a little more silent.
But if there are areas that are important to you or comments that you're not comfortable making in this more public forum, please by all means send an email, put it in writing, share it with us, because all of your input is incredibly important.

So we hope to see your best and brightest ideas, corrections, comments. In addition to being shared in this meeting, please feel free to submit them in writing so that nothing is overlooked. Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Thank you for those comments, Secretary.

MR. VALE: I have a question. This is Sam.

MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. VALE: How will we -- once whatever is approved by the Commission, how will we anticipate how to be able to give information to the various legislatures? And something going back to what Gerry had brought up, how do we make sure that people know this is not just something or the border; it's for the entire economic development of the state and a lot of the country?

We're going to have to strategize that so that we're all talking on the same page.

MS. MAYS: Yes, Sam. This critically important. Several things, and I'll try to be short.

Certainly the plan is going to be done, and it will be
incumbent upon you all, BTAC members, to help with educating folks and letting them know that this is not just one -- it's the Texas-Mexico border plan, but the significance for the entire country and all the states far beyond Texas and into Canada.

So how do you do that? You all use the information we're going to develop the executive summary, you go meet with the legislators. That's a good tool to educate.

But beyond that, I think what you're asking is BTAC needs to have that dialogue and discussion probably at the next meeting what that looks like from you all's perspective, because one of the things I mentioned that TxDOT certainly is pursuing funding to help with implementation of some of the recommendations and the strategies. I mentioned BCIS, so we're already working on that, and hopefully we'll be executing a contract sometime next year to be able to advance on these recommendations.

But beyond that, I think really this is something that lends itself to open discussion at the next BTAC meeting, and I'll turn it over to Secretary Hughes if you want to make some comments and address Sam's comments.

SECY. HUGHS: Well, I agree. We'll be discussing that once the plan is finalized, kind of talking about how we present it to legislators.
I agree that strategically it's important that we continue with the message, which is quite true that it is a benefit to everyone in trade across the State of Texas, across the country. We saw some of the earlier graphics that kind of showed the traffic across the country, so I think that's a message that we all agree we need to continue to share.

But we will be presenting -- is it the 10th that we'll go the Commission, Caroline?

MS. MAYS: Yes, we're tentatively on December 10th.

SECY. HUGHS: Right. So certainly we want to have things as finalized and with input from all of you shared as much as possible by that time when we go before the Commission.

After that there will still be a period of public comment, and then I think meetings after that will be focused on the implementation portion of exactly how we present this going forward.

I'm not sure that answered your question.

MR. VALE: Secretary, it's still in my mind because the last time we had some presentation to House committees in Laredo, Texas, we were totally floored by the lack of understanding of the committee members.

If we don't even have the committee guys
educated, how will we work the whole rest of the legislature?

SECY. HUGHS: Right. And that's where the plan is something that will be in writing that we can turn to and that can identify more cohesively what the priorities are, what the impact is.

I think that's why the discussion today that really talked about the impact beyond just the border is critical and very well taken. I'm very glad that that is going to be implemented in our executive summary as well because, I agree, those are conversations we're going to have to continue to have and continue to educate for those who have not had the opportunity to spend the time and see the impact directly that is experienced when you go to the other side of the border.

You know, you see the trade and you see the impact nationwide that it has. So I agree that that's going to be an ongoing important point for all of us to bring forward.

MR. VALE: Thank you.

MS. MAYS: And, Secretary, I wanted to add that, for BTAC members, BTAC does not stop meeting after the plan is approved. Your work actually becomes much more intense, and I'm speaking from experience.

The Freight Advisory Committee continues to
help facilitate the implementation of the plan. Commissioner New highlighted some of the work efforts that the committee has been involved in the last two years or so.

The plan was completed in 2018. They have since advanced a lot of the recommendations in that plan. So you know, BTAC is going to continue to meet; you all are going to continue to help with strategizing but also chipping away on some of these recommendations, moving them forward come next year.

Any other comments from committee members before we move on to the next agenda item?

MR. CALVO: Hey, Caroline, this is Eduardo. So as you present this to the Commission, would it be a good idea for you all to have some BTAC members as well there to help you show and support the committee, or how do you envision doing that? Actually, it's a question for Secretary Hughs as well.

MS. MAYS: So Eduardo, you were at the Commission meeting today. I presented on the Ports-to-Plains Advisory Committee feasibility study. If you remember, after my presentation there were several members of the advisory committee that made comments, including Mayor Lozano and Gerry that are on the call today.

So certainly, you know, those comments are
welcome, BTAC members. It's going to be virtual, but the phone lines are open for BTAC members to provide their own take and in their own words what the plan means and what are the key messages in your own words. So yes, certainly you can definitely participate.

MR. CALVO: Great.

MS. MAYS: Any other comments?

(No response.)

MS. MAYS: Secretary, if there are no other comments, we'll move to the next agenda item fairly quickly because we only have a half an hour.

And Alejandro and Donald, maybe we focus on some of the key areas that maybe we need more input or things that have changed instead of trying to got through all 11 chapters, because we did that last meeting, because we only have about half an hour.

MR. SOLIS: I think that's a good idea, Caroline. So maybe we can just kind of pause on the chapters and just say literally the key message of the chapter and then move in that fashion just to make sure that we're hitting all of them and make this a very streamlined presentation.

So if everybody is okay with that, we can do that, just really show one key message per chapter.

So, Donald, you want to get us started on that?
MR. LUDLOW: Sure. Thanks, Alejandro. And this will be very brief. because I think we've covered most of this in the presentation of the executive summary, so if anything, it think we could maybe spend a little bit more time on 10 and 11, Alejandro.

So again, this is what the whole final report looks like. I think the thing to keep in mind is the final report is sequenced in one way, but based on the input we received today, the executive summary will be sequenced in a way that really emphasizes some of the key messages of the overall plan and doesn't necessarily follow perfectly the material that's in the exact chapters.

So we can move on, next slide. So again, Chapter 1 was more or less an introduction to the region.

If we can move on now to Chapter 2, Alejandro.

MR. SOLIS: Sure. So in this one we talked about the goals and objectives and the initiatives, and I think that the key message here that we see on slide 53, I think it is -- no, 54 -- is that it's a very complex system, there's a lot of institutions that are involved.

We heard from you today that there needs to be this coordination at will, so highlighted in the chapter that lack of standardized mechanisms to have that coordination happening, so that I think is the key message.
of this chapter.

So we can go to Chapter 3, Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: So Chapter 3 takes us deeper into the past and present of the border, and again, all of this material is in the executive summary, but it's essentially outlining those key themes and messages in significant depth.

And we can go to Chapter 4.

MR. SOLIS: Sure. So here in Chapter 4 I think there's only one slide, and what we want to highlight is that this is the network that we collectively identified as the network that supports the Texas-Mexico border.

We have a logic that we followed to do this; the logic is based on the movement of people and goods, and on the concept of integration, connectivity and accessibility. That's in a nutshell Chapter 4.

So Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Chapter 5 goes into current and future issues and needs, which we discussed at length today, if you recall.

Several full pages of the executive summary are dedicated to this with your insight on some of the needs that need to be most specifically highlighted in the material and in the executive summary.

So in the interest of time, I think we'll move
on to Chapter 6. Chris.

MR. WILLIGES: Chapter 6 shows the future forecast for the Texas-Mexico border, and if we go to the next slide, it shows the key message, which is when we get the forecast we expect demands grow tremendously, particularly for freight where they'll triple, and this will lead to delays at the border and greater congestion.

If we go on to Chapter 7. Chapter 7 we show the economic importance of the border, and the key messages here are that the border impacts the economies well beyond the border and that by 2050 we expect the impact to more than triple. In addition, the delays, if not mitigated, represent very large missed opportunities when it comes to the economy.

Chapter 8.

MR. SOLIS: Chapter 8, I think that the next slide tells the whole story. It lays out the process to identify and evaluate the recommendations of our plan, but the key element here is that bottom kind of illustration that says that the regional stakeholder workshops, and in general the stakeholder input on the two sides of the border was present throughout the entire process.

And that is the key element, and that's one of the key differences that makes this plan that much more comprehensive.
Chapter 9.

MS. WHITE: In fact, stakeholder engagement was so present and prevalent throughout the entire process that we are about to plan a tenth round, so I think the key message in this entire chapter is probably here on this slide, and it really is the comprehensive network of stakeholder groups and the types of stakeholders that we worked really hard to engage throughout the entire planning process.

The last two slides in this chapter we talked at length about, so that encapsulates the primary message, I think, of Chapter 9.

MR. SOLIS: Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Thanks, Alejandro.

So Chapter 10 goes through the recommendations, policy, programs and projects, and again, we went into some depth on this on our discussion of the executive summary, and I think the key here is making sure that we also have a feedback loop, which we will, between the final chapters and any of the new information that you have provided to us today, especially some of your recommendations on policy and program and projects and the way that we're framing those as we go forward.

Next I think we can go to Chapter 11.

MR. SOLIS: Yeah, thank you, Donald.
So one of the key changes in terms of the previous BTAC is in this Chapter 11, a little bit still into Chapter 10 that we saw, I think, in more detail in the executive summary. But in Chapter 11 we left the policy recommendations pretty much untouched, which is what you see on this slide.

The next slide is the program recommendations, which are also untouched. The main changes come on the project side, because we have that big difference, we went from 505 -- for those of you who were in the last BTAC, we showed 505 projects and then in the BNRSCs we showed 657, which is a slightly different number from this 652 that you see here, because we made still another round of revisions after the BNRSCs.

So this is the main change, this 652 projects that you see on the screen, that cost, that breakdown by the different time frames and cost.

And I think that the next two slides are the highlight of this chapter, which is when we start combining the time frames of the projects with their impact, we see that there's a lot of high-impact projects in the short term and in the mid term, and then on the next slide we actually further dissect this into the funding for the short, medium and long term projects.

So these are the two categories that really lay
out the implementation plan, and this goes back to what we heard from the committee, and Eduardo in particular, saying we are doing our job of prioritizing or evaluating these projects, we look at them by time frame, by funding, and then we just need to collate them on the two sides of the border, which all of that information we have it also in the chapter to make sure that we are aligning them correctly so that the implementation of this plan can be made successful in the future.

So that is basically the wrap-up of Chapter 11, and here we'll open the discussion for general comments, again, either from the executive summary material or from what we've just presented in this very, very updating fashion summary of the eleven chapters.

MS. MAYS:  Yeah.  So we'll open it up to BTAC members, Secretary, to provide any comments, anything they want to add.  And then I would really, again, a couple of days later is to stress that, please, BTAC members, review the full report and also review the executive summary and provide us with your input.

It's so, so very important.  Spend some time doing that.  That would be tremendously helpful in us being able to have a final report and a final plan.  Again, the presentation to the Commission is tentatively scheduled for next month, so we're looking to get your
input on all of this, the executive summary, the final report and some of you the project list because we need to have the final project list out so that we can finalize the document.

So we'll open it up for comments before we talk about our next steps. Any comments? A lot of the executive summary discussion really mirrored the chapters, but I wanted to make sure to open it up.

(No response.)

MS. MAYS: Okay. It looks like there are no comments, Secretary. We will move into next steps. As you see on the slide, we are here in November, we are meeting with you. We will not meet with the BNRSCs in November. As we know, Thanksgiving is coming up in about two weeks, so the next meetings we are going to meet with BNRSCs is in early December, but we are also looking to release the draft plan for public comment to allow the general public to be able to review the document and provide us with their input.

And then, like I mentioned, we do have a meeting with you all in December, and then we will be in front of the Texas Transportation Commission on December 10, presenting the study and the findings and the recommendations that are coming from the plan, and then with the hopes that by January of 2021 we will go back in
front of Commission to present the report for consideration and adoption by the Commission. So that's kind of where we are with next steps.

And then the next steps, the really kind of action items that I have in front of me is we did send you the executive summary, had a discussion today, very great comments, and like I mentioned, we're going back to the drawing board a little bit.

A key comment that was brought up is we have a lot of graphics but not text to actually be able to articulate the key messages in those graphics, so we're going to go back to the drawing board. But for you, as well, you do have homework to review the executive summary and send us your comments by next Friday; that's Friday the 20th.

The reason we do need your comments, because we're using the executive summary to develop the Commission presentation, so the sooner you can get us back your comments, the better.

And then we also talked a little bit about a draft project list, we did send that to you yesterday as well, and looking to get your comments and feedback no later than next Friday.

And then finally, the draft final report we're also looking to get any comments you may have, any
additional comments you may have on those documents, so
next Friday is kind of the magical date that we really
would like you all to be able to provide us with your
feedback on some of the key documents so we can meet the
key milestones of the plan.

So with that, Secretary, I think we're on to
the final slide, and I'll turn the meeting back over to
you.

MR. ZAPATA: Secretary, I just wanted to make a
quick point, because I know that the list of projects
certainly is something that's very important to everyone,
but I think we kind of get in a cycle where sometimes they
send you their projects, and you, Caroline, don't get a
chance to print them or include them in the information,
and then they don't see them at the next meeting and then
they get worried.

Would it be helpful at all -- and this is a
suggestion -- maybe if you give them a date specifically
for them to review the list of projects and send you what
they think it's missing so that you actually have time to
include them and update the list that you present to them,
and that way hopefully we take care of them not maybe
seeing those projects in the list at the next meeting
because they were not submitted on time, or something like
that.
So I'd just like to make that suggestion; maybe it helps with some of the concerns about the members that some of them don't see the projects that they want on the final list.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely. And I think really the key thing here is that, you know, we can follow up with the stakeholders to discuss project list discrepancies, and certainly we'll probably start with El Paso just to make sure instead of going back and forth, sometimes what we'll find is that a meeting to just have a discussion works wonders and we have things resolved during the meeting instead of back and forth emails. So great point.

MR. CALVO: Yeah, Caroline, this is Eduardo. I think that's a really good idea to have maybe call it a workshop with, you know, TxDOT and the City of El Paso and just scrub that list.

I think we're pretty close, but there are still some major -- well, I mean, I found some duplicates that are relatively high dollar value that will give you a better number. But I think it's easier if we just find, I don't know, an hour or an hour and a half window to do that.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. SCHWEBEL: And this is Gerry. I think that ours as well in Laredo, we could take those projects right
now and scrub them with our colleagues here in this region.

I'll meet with the mayor, I'll meet with the judge and the other stakeholders that are key to this and let us -- I guess the list that you sent us of these projects right now is a starting point so that we can be prepared to go to a workshop with, I guess, would be the additional scrub that Eduardo is talking about, you know, and be prepared and then maybe even weeding out or expand on it.

Is that what you're thinking, Eduardo?

MR. CALVO: Yes, absolutely.

MR. SCHWEBEL: We're with you.

MS. MAYS: Yes, and I'll have my folks for the respective regions to reach out to you all to set up maybe time next week sometime so we can go over this because we really need to get this finalized before Thanksgiving, because like I said, this is feeding the Commission presentation.

So Eduardo, Gerry, and others, we'll get in touch with you next week to be able to sit down and have those discussions.

MR. CALVO: Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Secretary.

SECY. HUGHES: Thank you, Caroline. So I'm glad
to hear that next week we'll have these workshops or try
to come up with a plan to have them, and then I think
having that scrubbed list before Thanksgiving will be very
important in making sure that all of the priorities are
accurately reflected and that we have time to put them
together before that meeting that we're going into on
December 10, understanding that we have Thanksgiving and
other challenges between now and then.

So thank you all for your willingness to do
that and to be even more available for more meetings
beyond this one with respect to those workshops. I think
that will be very helpful and will help expedite the
communication and then hopefully just the understanding of
having a good list.

So at this time I want to thank all of you for
your participation, also give everyone a chance if there
are any other comments that anyone would like to share,
let me just pause for a moment and allow for that.

(No response.)

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. Well, I really appreciate
having this opportunity and this time with all of you.
Your input is invaluable, and I know that we've all been
taking notes and really looking to make sure that these
things get integrated into the final master plan, so I
appreciate all of that input.
And at this time, if anyone would like to make a motion, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. VALE: So moved.

SECY. HUGHS: Thank you, Sam, for moving to adjourn.

Do I have a second?

MR. GARCIA: Second.

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. Was that --

MR. GARCIA: Josue.

SECY. HUGHS: Very good. Thank you.

All right, then with a motion to adjourn and a second, all in favor of adjourning stay silent, any in opposition speak up.

(No response.)

SECY. HUGHS: All right. And with that, we will now adjourn. Vaya con dios. Please be very careful out there, and I look forward to our next communications, which please do not hesitate to send an email, reach out, share your comments and thoughts after this meeting and next week after you've had more time with these documents. Please note that we are actively following the progress on this and we appreciate all of your time on it. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 4:19 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)
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