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SECY. HUGHS: Good morning, everyone. We're going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. It looks like we've doubled the number of participants since 8:00, so thank you for being patient with us as we give our friends a few minutes to join us here this morning.

I am Texas Secretary of State Ruth Hughes, and I want to thank you for joining us via videoconference for our ninth Border Trade Advisory Committee meeting of the year. I hope everyone had a safe and restful Thanksgiving holiday.

As always, it's an honor to serve as chair of this important committee, and I'd like to begin by thanking our partners at TxDOT, starting with recognizing our distinguished Commissioners, Alvin New and Laura Ryan, for their service. Thank you for joining us today.

I'm not sure if they're on the call yet, but I know they always participate and will be with us and are following this work very closely, and I very much appreciate their support and participation. And thank you to both of you for your commitment and ensuring that Texas's trade relationship with Mexico grows even stronger.

The instrumental work of this committee would also not be possible without the tireless efforts of
Caroline Mays and her team at TxDOT, and I thank them for their work in helping to plan and ensure that our meetings are run smoothly and that the plan moves forward accordingly. We're beyond 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, and members of this committee have provided invaluable feedback towards this plan.

This committee has discussed the unique challenges that COVID-19 has presented to cross-border trade that led to mutually agreed upon travel restrictions between the U.S. and Mexico. These restrictions have affected traffic as well as supplier operations, but this committee has continued working, and 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 sectors as a result of the increased wait times at the border, and we've stressed
the importance for us to make our efforts better known to the public.

We've highlighted and welcomed the announcement that TxDOT has acquired access to the Texas Transportation Institute data, TTI, to help measure border crossing wait times, supplementing the existing methodology used by CBP. This development has helped us to more accurately estimate the economic impact of wait times and better convey its 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 to help complete this plan. We need each and every committee member to be fully engaged and actively participating in the committee discussions to help TxDOT and HDR further revise the plan and the executive summary to ensure that both are an accurate reflection of our state and your area's needs.

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 is vital that you do.
so now and speak up to share the needs and concerns of your communities. The completion of this plan is nearing at the end of this month, and your feedback is invaluable and will have an immense positive impact in helping to draft and present its final version.

I want to take a moment to recognize the representatives from each of our four Mexican border states who are again joining us today: Anna Alvarez, Binational Affairs Coordinator 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, Noé Garza, the CODEFRONT Director, and Manuel Farías, the General Coordinator of Promotion and Projects, CODEFRONT for Nuevo Leon; and from Tamaulipas, Carlos García González, 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 García, the Director of Intermodal Projects at Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transportes, SCT; and of course, Consul General of Mexico here in Austin, Pablo Marentes, as well as Jorge Salcido, the Consul for Political and Economic Affairs who represent...
the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Welcome, everyone, and thank you all for your continued commitment in helping to create a brighter future for all on both sides of the border.

Please keep in mind that although the plan is almost fully completed and this is the last scheduled BTAC meeting of the year, the work of the committee is not done. We will continue meeting next year to further our discussions about how to best use the completed version of the Border Master Plan to pursue assistance and resources to complete the projects listed in it, and I'm sure many other related issues.

In fact, as another step in that process, Caroline and I will be briefing the TxDOT Commission about the Border Master Plan, using the executive summary as a reference. We will begin a discussion with the commissioners that will eventually lead to them voting for approval of the plan at a future meeting.

This meeting will take place next Thursday, December 10, if you would like to mark your calendars. On December 10, we don't have the agenda yet, but the meeting will start at 10:00 and our presentation about the plan we believe will take place at around 11:00 a.m.

Our TxDOT friends will be sharing the information to join that meeting virtually once it is
ready, and we invite you and really encourage you and ask that you join this meeting, and during the related public comment section please speak up and take the opportunity to highlight the importance of approving the plan and how it benefits the border region and our entire state. So that is a bit of homework or a request. If you're able to participate and provide public comment next week, that will be very helpful to our efforts.

As you all know, it's taken years to get to this point, and although not a final one, it marks an important transition point in the work of our committee. I commend TxDOT and HDR for all their efforts to successfully get us here and thank all the BTAC members for their consistent engagement in our meetings and discussions. Members, your participation on behalf of your region gives this plan a voice that truly represents the needs of your communities.

Thank you all for allowing me the time to provide this introduction. I think we are ready to finish up this plan, and with that, I now will turn it over to Caroline Mays.

Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Thank you very much, Secretary, for those opening remarks. And again, welcome BTAC members this morning. Appreciate everybody being here today.
So I have a couple of TxDOT leadership on the line and I see Commissioner Ryan. Commissioner Ryan, would you like to say hello to BTAC?

COMMISSIONER RYAN: Good morning, everyone. Happy to be here again, I appreciate -- and I just want to express that I truly appreciate the time and the commitment that the committee has made, Secretary Hughs, also under your leadership to better the plan that we have.

I'm looking forward to the presentation next week and looking forward to moving everything forward. But mainly just want to say good morning and that I am appreciative of all the work that's gone into this, and we will work hard on our end to put it into action.

Thank you.

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

I don't see Commissioner New, unless he called in. But we'll go to Marc Williams. Marc is our Deputy Executive Director. Do you want to say a few words to BTAC?

MR. WILLIAMS: Only just to echo what Commissioner Ryan said and to just thank you and all of the members of the committee and Secretary Hughs for your continued great work. There's a lot of terrific
information in this plan and looking forward to carrying it with the Commission in the days ahead.

So thank you all very much.

MS. MAYS: Thank you.
And Brian -- our chief, Brian Barth.

MR. BARTH: Thanks, Caroline. I'll just echo everybody else's comments. I really appreciate the work of the many and I too am looking forward to the discussion next week with the Commission and future potential adoption of this master plan.

So thanks, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: Thank you very much.

And last but not least, the person that supports us and makes this happen, Jessica Butler, our division director. Jessica.

MS. BUTLER: Thank you, Caroline. Good morning, everyone. I also will consistently echo everyone's comments. I'm grateful to everyone for their time and their efforts and all their energy on this work and look forward to the next steps.

Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Thank you very much, Jessica.

Secretary, we'll go into the roll call. I think we have a good crowd with the BTAC members, so do a roll call now.
Francisco, you're handling that? We're doing it a little bit different, so we have actually all of you online and we can see who is here and who's not, so Francisco, are you the one doing it?

MR. HAGERT: Good morning. I'm going to do it, Caroline.

Good morning, Secretary of State Hughs, TxDOT leadership and distinguished members of the committee. My name is Eduardo Hagert and I'm going to be conducting the roll call this morning, so I'm going to start.

Rafael Aldrete?

MR. ALDRETE: Good morning. Rafael Aldrete present.

MR. HAGERT: Jon Barela?

MR. BARELA: Good morning, everyone. Present.

MR. HAGERT: Luis Bazán, or someone representing the Pharr International Bridge?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Eduardo Calvo?

MR. CALVO: Good morning. Eduardo Calvo is here.

MR. HAGERT: Eduardo Campirano?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Andrew Canon?

MR. CANON: Good morning. I am here.
MR. ROSAS: Excuse me. Francisco Rosas present. Thank you.

MR. HAGERT: Francisco Rosas from where?

MR. ROSAS: I am from Escayen [phonetic] in Mexico.

MR. HAGERT: Oh, okay.

Sergio Contreras?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: David Coronado?

MR. CORONADO: Good morning, everybody. I'm here, David is here. Thank you.

MR. HAGERT: John Esparza.

MR. ESPARZA: Good morning. John Esparza here.

MR. HAGERT: Juan Antonio Flores?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Dante Galeazzi?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Josue Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: Good morning. Present.

MR. HAGERT: Cynthia Garza-Reyes?

MS. GARZA-REYES: Good morning. Present.

MR. HAGERT: Jake Giesbrecht?

MS. MAYS: Jake is not here. He sent an email that he won't be able to attend.

MR. HAGERT: Jane Harkins?
(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Ivan Jaime, or someone representing Union Pacific Rail?

MS. MAYS: Tyson, are you on?

MR. MUELLER: Good morning. I'll be on for a couple of hours here.

MS. MAYS: Thank you.

MR. HAGERT: Lisa Loftus-Otway?

MS. LOFTUS-OWAY: I'm here. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Secretary.

MR. HAGERT: Marga Lopez?

MS. LOPEZ: Good morning, everyone.

MR. HAGERT: Bruno Lozano?

MR. WOJNOWSKI: This is Matt Wojnowski, city manager of Del Rio, on behalf of Mayor Lozano.

MR. HAGERT: Stan Meador?

MR. MEADOR: Present. Good morning, y'all. Thank you.

MR. HAGERT: Juan Olaguibel?

MR. OLAGUIBEL: Good morning, everyone. Present.

MR. HAGERT: So somehow we missed Juan but we need to mark him present for the Anzalduas Hidalgo Bridge, so that's an additional member, Kelli.

Vincent Perez?
MR. LANDEROS: Good morning. This is Jose Landeros with El Paso County on behalf of the commissioner this morning.

MR. HAGERT: Jesus Reyna?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Pete Saenz?

MAYOR SAENZ: Good morning, everyone. Yes, here present.

MR. HAGERT: Gerry Schwebel?


MR. HAGERT: Megan Shea?

MS. SHEA: Good morning, everyone. I'm on.

MR. HAGERT: Luis Sifuentes, or someone representing the City of Eagle Pass?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Tommy Taylor?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Sam Vale?

MR. VALE: Yes, present.

MR. HAGERT: Cameron Walker?

(No response.)

MR. HAGERT: Warren Erdman?

MR. ERDMAN: Good morning. Warren Erdman present.
MR. HAGERT: How many members, Kelli? We have quorum.

MS. MAYS: Okay.

MR. VALE: Whoever is in control, I'm having trouble muting my mic.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Secretary, we'll turn it over to you for the next agenda item.

SECY. HUGHS: Wonderful.

Well, Sam, since your mic is not muted, I may take this opportunity to ask if everyone has had a chance to review the minutes. Are there any questions or comments on the minutes before I entertain a motion?

MR. VALE: No, but I'll defer to Gerry Schwebel. He's more detailed than I am.

SECY. HUGHS: All right. Any comments, concerns?

MR. SCHWEBEL: I make a motion that we approve the minutes as presented.

SECY. HUGHS: Thank you, Gerry. Good morning. I have a motion to approve the minutes. Is there a second?

MR. CANON: Second.

SECY. HUGHS: I think Andrew Canon seconded the motion. Is that right?

MR. CANON: Yes, ma'am.
SECY. HUGHS: Thank you. Good morning.

All right. There's been a motion and a second to pass the minutes. Any objection?

(No response.)

SECY. HUGHS: Hearing no objection, the minutes are passed and approved. Thank you.

Caroline.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Secretary, and thank the BTAC members for being here. We'll walk through the agenda quickly and then we'll jump into the discussion this morning.

As you can see from the agenda online, we are going to be having continued discussion on the executive summary. As you'll recall, the last meeting we did have a lot of discussion with you on the executive summary and you provided us a lot of feedback then, so we're going to continue that today. And then also we'll do a quick walk-through on what we plan on presenting to the Commission, the PowerPoint.

And then, you know, one of the other main things that we will be discussing with you today is really the next steps and implementation. As Secretary talked about, we heard from a lot of you on kind of what next, to start thinking about that right now. The plan is not done yet. We still have, you know, time ahead of us to refine
the plan before it's finalized, but at the same time, really start talking about kind of what's next from you all's point of view.

So we have some questions and things, interactive session we have planned for you and during that time talking about next steps and implementation. And then, of course, you know, we will go to open discussion, and then adjourn the meeting today.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Giacomo to provide a quick recap of the last meeting.

SPEAKER: Can you please increase the font so we can read? Thank you.

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

I'd like to give a recap of the last BTAC meeting on November 12. I'll be focusing on the comments we received during that meeting, but unlike previous recaps, the consulting team will discuss how we've responded to them after I'm done.

The last BTAC meeting had three goals. First, we needed to present the BTMP executive summary; second, we needed to discuss the BTMP presentation to the Texas Transportation Commission; and third, we needed to do a walk-through of the draft of the final BTMP report.
Next slide, please.

During last month's meeting we presented the draft of the executive summary for the BTMP. Please note that the page numbers I'll be referencing are based on the November version of the summary, and due to the revisions we made in response to the comments we received, don't match the page numbers in the current version.

Starting with the top of the report, we heard that there needed to be more narrative and explanation without being too wordy. We were told that we need to highlight the fact that most costs are related to corridors and not border crossings, and that we needed to make this distinction as part of the effort to stay focused on how we roll out the BTMP to the public.

We were asked to involve the consul generals on both sides so that they could be more engaged throughout the entire Texas-Mexico Border to disseminate the message. We were asked to highlight that the plan starts at the border but benefits the entire state and beyond. We heard that it would be important to articulate where the BTMP planning phase ends and the implementation phase begins.

We heard that we needed to include the IH-37 corridor from San Antonio to Corpus Christi, the IH-69E corridor to Cameron County, the IH-69C corridor to Hidalgo
County, as well as the IH-12 corridor from Harlingen to Mission and to Port of Brownsville. We received a suggestion to improve the map by adding an additional green arrow along the IH-10 corridor.

We were asked to include -- let's see, are we on the second slide of this? Okay, go to that one, please.

We were asked to include the phrase "quality of life" at the end of the summary's opening paragraph, and we received a recommendation to change the tense of certain elements from future tense to present tense.

Pages 2 and 3 addressed why the border matters and the BTMP goals, and we were asked to include 2020 numbers, if they're available before publishing.

We heard that the discussion about unified cargo processing presented in the executive summary is fair and accurate and that these are high priority facilities for the railroads.

We were asked to change the heading on the right-hand side of page 2 from 26 highway crossings to 26 border crossings and we were asked about the discrepancy between the 26 crossings and the subheading noting 29 of 39 crossings.

We got a suggestion to include the word "community" in the description of the stewardship goal and
we were asked to rename the goal to "Stewardship and Sustainability."

We were asked about the figure showing 7 million jobs and whether the number was low compared to other sources.

We also received a suggestion to include disruptors related to cross-border trade and the misalignment of protocols to the description of the cross-border resiliency goal. We were also asked to start the description of that goal with wording like "eliminate, reduce or mitigate."

Pages 4 and 5 addressed stakeholder engagement, and we heard that the executive summary could benefit from additional written content. We also heard that this section is the most important in the summary because it shows how widespread stakeholder participation has been and that participants represented a cross-section of all stakeholders.

Pages 6 and 7 addressed population, income, and employment trends for the Texas-Mexico Border past, present and future. And we heard that some BTAC members were surprised by the employment block shown for the RGV, and we were asked if those numbers matched what's being presented in the chapters.

Pages 8 through 11 addressed trends for moving
people and goods for the Texas-Mexico Border past, present and future. On pages 8 and 9 we received a suggestion that we make a distinction about the types of buses that cross the border, whether they're local, regional, or long-distance.

If we can go to the next slide, please.

And we also heard that we should also include an explanation about why the volume of crossings declined after 9/11.

On pages 10 and 11 we heard that we should revise a moving goods bar chart or create a different scale for commercial vehicles since their numbers dwarfed the others to the point of illegibility. We also received a comment that page 10 was the most important in the summary because it showed the large amount of trade that crosses the border every day. We were told that we need to tell the story about trade and the associated jobs for workers on both sides of the border.

We were asked to clarify whether the Hidalgo port of entry is the same as the Pharr port of entry, and we were also asked to clarify that border crossings and ports of entry aren't necessarily the same thing.

Pages 12 and 13 addressed trade trends and supply chains for the Texas-Mexico Border past, present and future, and we didn't collect any input during the
last BTAC meeting on these pages.

Pages 14 and 15 addressed cross-border supply chains and we heard that the information on cross-border supply chains was detailed, comprehensive and cogent. And we were asked to consider choosing the top five supply chains as a representative sample.

Pages 16 and 17 addressed the designated network and we heard appreciation that the designated network map showed how non-interstate highways enhance accessibility to the interstate system. We also heard that the map was valuable because it showed connections between the interior of Mexico and Texas, which is valuable for long-term planning efforts considering cargo origins and destinations. We got a recommendation to update the map title to "Texas-Mexico Multimodal System" and a recommendation to move the map up in the executive summary.

Regarding the north-south movement element on page 16, we were asked for clarification about the pairing of Interstate 10 and Mexico 45, as well as Interstate 35 and Mexico 85, and why we’re showing Interstate 69 connecting to Laredo instead of Interstate 35.

Pages 18 and 19 addressed Texas-Mexico Border issues and needs and we were asked about including information on the value of border crossing delays that
were presented in a separate report that IBC Bank commissioned.

We heard that we need to include staffing shortages as an issue or need. We were asked how we could include information related to the environment and the community impacts of health issues that affect people and trade.

Pages 20 and 21 addressed current and future crossing times, and we heard appreciation for using INRIX data to create the graphics showing current and forecast crossing times. We were asked if the graphics were showing actual hours. We heard that the message the graphics conveyed is powerful because they showed what will happen if nothing is done, and we also heard that the summary was missing an explanation that the forecasts are unconstrained.

Next slide, please.

On pages 22 and 23 we addressed the impact of border delays and the economic importance of the Texas-Mexico Border, and we were asked how the BTMP figures compare to the number in the IBC-commissioned report mentioned earlier, and that we should explain any differences. We were also asked to confirm the locations of the pictures in the summary and that all of them were in Texas.
We heard that the key message needs to be how important the border is at the state and national levels in addition to the local level. We also heard that many people don't understand the border's larger importance and that the BTMP needs to deliver the message correctly. Specifically, people need to know that what happens at the border affects many regions far from the border. In response to that comment, we heard that that particular message should be at the top of the summary.

Pages 24 through 29 addressed policy, program and project recommendations. And we heard a recommendation that Mexico consider creating a donation program similar to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection program, as well as other public-private partnerships to help expedite the development of border crossing infrastructure and improve operations.

We heard about the need for better border wait time data generated by programs like BCIS because additional data will provide insight into the actual amounts of delay.

We received an observation that the estimated project costs for all three regions was nearly identical, and we got a recommendation to review the project list again to ensure the estimated costs are accurate.

We were asked to include a pie chart showing
the percentage of projects that are funded and unfunded
and whether funded projects are partially or fully
funded. We heard that including this information would
highlight the need versus available resources at the local
level. We also heard that it would be helpful to show
which Mexican projects are funded and their progress to
date. We heard that knowing that information could affect
priorities on the Texas side of the border and that it
would help avoid asymmetrical connectivity.

We were asked to confirm that we'd included the
final list of projects from the State of Tamaulipas,
including Bridge Number 5 in Laredo.

Pages 30 and 31 addressed the implementation
plan, and we heard that every region in the state is
looking for funding, but that if the border regions have
good data then they can raise the priority of some of the
projects in the BTMP. We also heard about the need to
scrub the entire project list and the total project costs
because the BTMP sends a message that there are priorities
for investment and not a generic wish list.

We were told that the executive summary needs
to articulate that there are huge needs along the border,
but that the regions are aware that they will not receive
funding for everything. Projects have different
priorities and different impacts, so the regions will be
requesting funds for the key projects that benefit the state and the nation.

The last page, page 32, included the call to action, and we were asked to reemphasize the benefits of planning and investing in the border regions to close the loop on the narrative.

If we could go to the next slide, please.

Finally, a discussion about the executive summary. You may recall we did a very quick walk-through of the final draft report, but we did not collect any additional comments on the chapters during the last meeting.

And so with that, I'll conclude the recap and turn the meeting back over to Caroline Mays and Secretary Hughes.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Giacomo, for that comprehensive summary.

So we will actually now go into the executive summary. If you recall, the last BTAC we did kind of a page-turn, and this morning we're going to do some more and show you what additions we have added to address the comments that Giacomo just went through.

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

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you very much,
This is Donald Ludlow of CPCS with the HDR team. I'll walk you through visually some of the changes that were made to the executive summary, also giving you an opportunity to see the updates in a visual way.

So on this first page, let me point out a couple of things. At the top of the page, Giacomo mentioned that we had changed the tense to reflect the comments. We've also added the arrow to indicate the trade flow to Veracruz, and also the connection up into Canada, Calgary and Edmonton, which is reflective of some of the Ports-to-Plains economic connections. We also at the bottom moved the text box down just to promote the visual appeal of the page.

Before I move on, are there any other questions or comments on page 1?

MR. VALE: This is Sam.

When you put the final report together, can you have some maps that are folded so that they can open up and be bigger to look at?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. Thanks for that suggestion, Sam. I think we can certainly look at that. Now, are you talking about the final report or the executive summary, which one are you thinking?

MR. VALE: Well, anything that we're using for
educational processes.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. I think that's a good -- there may be a -- sorry. Go ahead, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: I'd say yeah, definitely we can do that. We've done similar for other projects. I remember for Ports to Plains some of those requests were made as well, so we'll do that. Not a problem.

MR. VALE: Okay.

MR. LUDLOW: Thanks. Any other thoughts on this first page?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Let's advance to the next two pages.

Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

MR. CONTRERAS: This is Sergio from the RGV Partnership.

In relation to what Sam mentioned and Caroline, are the maps to include connectivity alongside both sides of the border?

MR. LUDLOW: Correct. I mean, the general aim of this map is to indicate some of the broader corridor and economic connections. It's not completely comprehensive, it's just showing some of the major flows.

MR. CONTRERAS: Thank you.

MR. VALE: I think -- this is Sam. I think we
need to be showing what -- that we have the need for roadways paralleling the border so that trucking companies and others can reposition equipment from one port to another because that makes it much more efficient. Because they may have equipment in Brownsville that they need in Laredo, or vice versa, so all of these things need to be looked at, all the way up to El Paso.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Sam. We'll take that into consideration as well.

SPEAKER: Is it possible to increase the font -- I'm sorry -- a little bit bigger, the slides.

MR. LUDLOW: Kelli or Hannah, are we able to go to kind of full screen on that view? A little bit more there.

SPEAKER: Much better. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. So we'll start with page 2. Here we changed this format so that the blue boxes answer the question: Why does the Texas-Mexico Border matter? And made a few other strategic changes.

So you see each of the blue boxes makes a point about why the border matters, which is something we wanted to make -- an argument that we wanted to make right up front. In addition, you'll see in line with some of Giacomo's comment and summary, we changed "vehicular" to "roadway" to avoid confusion. We added a note right here.
on the rail border crossings, included those.

Under the providing benefit across North America, we corrected the GDP impact to not only show commercial vehicles but total GDP impact. Also, moved the designated transportation network to the front of the executive summary, so we'll go over to that page with the map on it in a moment, so that that's one of the things that people can see immediately.

You'll also note at the bottom that we added foreign trade zones. This was a comment that we heard this week from the BNSRC committees that we needed to make sure to include the foreign trade zones as well.

Are there any comments on page 2?

MR. WOJNOWSKI: Yes. This is Matt with City of Del Rio.

In the blue boxes, all of them start with "It" so I think for redundancy I'd just take off the "It" and why does the Texas-Mexico Border matter, just say: longest international border, supports a growing population, provides -- it might be a minor thing but I would just -- my preference would be to remove the word "It" on those blue boxes.

And then lastly, on 29, you have “roadway border crossing,” and probably put an S at the end of crossing so it will say rail crossings, seaports, the
plural.

Minor things, but just wanted to point it out.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you very much, Matt. All right.

So let's move over to page 3. Are there any other comments on page 2?

MAYOR SAENZ: Yes. This is Mayor Saenz.

At the last meeting that we had with the Texas-Mexico folks, I brought up the issue of the impact of tourism, especially along the border. You know, our economy in Laredo is easily 50-60 percent driven by the Mexican shoppers.

Is that something that we can show or at least, you know, indicate some way?

MR. LUDLOW: Yes, certainly. And we appreciate your comment at the BNSRC meeting, Mayor Saenz, just a couple of days ago on that.

So Caroline, did you have any response to that? I think that the team is working right now to kind of include some language that indicates especially the economic impact of that, both tourism and the daily cross-border flows between the border communities.

MS. MAYS: No. Absolutely. And I think that is really why I think Mayor Saenz's point is we should incorporate that in here, why the border matters. You
have the daily, you know, not just commute but tourists going back and forth, so I think let's try to see if we can incorporate that here.

MR. VALE: This is Sam.

Remember, a lot of the products that are sold in border stores are not manufactured on the border, they come from different points in the United States or Canada.

MR. LUDLOW: Good point. Thank you for those suggestions. That provides, I think, further support to this argument, why does the border matter. And so we'll integrate those.

Are there any further comments on page 2, before we move over to this map? We'll blow the map up and talk about this for a moment.

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Kelli, if you can kind of zoom in on the map, that would be great.

So this map has undergone a few changes. First of all, we've renamed it at the top to the "Multimodal Transportation Network" instead of the "Designated Network" just to make that more clear and readable. And then as we mentioned previously, there have been a few changes here.

There was a section of I-20 that's been highlighted which was not highlighted previously in West
Texas. Also, the connection between the Port of Veracruz and Mexico City has been highlighted as well.

And just wanted to see if there are any other questions. One of the questions I would ask of the BTAC is, based on your earlier comments about wanting to make some maps more prominent, is this a candidate map that you think could potentially be expanded? Just given the fact that it really is focused on explaining the multimodal network.

MR. VALE: I would say yes. And we have to remember that when we talk about some of these things from the Texas side, there's a similar process that goes on on the Mexican side. So that all ought to be taken into consideration with the skilled people that you have from the Mexican side.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, sure. Thanks, Sam, and we do very much appreciate the comments from the Mexican partners, including recent comments from SCT about some of the changes to the map.

MR. MEADOR: Donald, this is Stan Meador with Texas Pacifico.

And thinking about kind of after publication of the paper document -- and if this exists, excuse my ignorance already -- but I'm thinking of kind of an interactive type map that's, you know, something that
could be referenced in the report to go online where you can get a lot more detail than what you can put on a paper, printed version of something. Where you could scroll over and have more detail about rail crossings, about any kind of level of detail that can't be crammed into a map on a piece of paper.

MR. LUDLOW: Stan, that's a great idea and something that's very technically feasible to do.

Caroline, did you have any comment about that as something that we may want to add in the next few weeks to the portfolio of materials?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, certainly. You know, in the end product of the plan, because all of this is going to be online, so certainly, Stan, we can work on that. Because, again, the map has a lot of information, and an interactive one I think would be very, very helpful. So we'll work on figuring that out and make sure that it's incorporated as part of the final product.

MR. MEADOR: Yeah, I know that's no big deal, right. Just do an interactive map real quick. Come on, Caroline.

(General laughter.)

MR. MEADOR: That could be a massive undertaking, I realize, but I think it could be very rich in detail, that you can't get --
MR. VALE: That's an excellent idea and also build in updates.

MR. MEADOR: Yeah, it’s easy to update. Exactly.

MR. LUDLOW: Stan, you joke that it may not be that easy, but we do have a very comprehensive set of binational multimodal data that's been assembled for this project, so we have a good platform to start from and we can make it pretty accessible.

A note here, Jake -- excuse me -- Pete Sepulveda says the map does not show interstate I-69 to the Port of Brownsville, so perhaps we need to look at that again just to make sure that we have made that prominent.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, I think it does but -- because there are the border crossing symbols on top of it, so I think it does. We'll double check.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. All right. Are there any other comments or questions at this point?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Thanks, Stan, Pete, Sam, others for your insights on this part of the executive summary.

I think we'll move on to the next set of pages and walk you through some of the changes there.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING
(512) 450-0342
So this section is on the economic importance of the border, and one thing is we moved this page up toward the front of the executive summary. Previously this page came after border crossing times.

But we've restructured this page so that the GDP impacts of the people and the goods movement are at the center of the page, both the vertical charts are added and we've also added commercial vehicle and rail car volume trends at the bottom -- if you scroll down there just a little bit, Kelli -- since these are important trends to highlight at the beginning of the executive summary.

So again, the big change here is just the sequencing, that this economic argument was promoted up toward the front. It's just a few pages in when the reader starts to see this. We've also added additional narrative under both of these bar charts that you see right here. And the idea there is to summarize the state of the current GDP and job impacts and future impacts in 2050, so there's a narrative talking about just those economic relationships and importance there.

So we hope that's satisfactory and meets the aims of the BTAC, your comments previously in terms of sequencing this and getting this argument up toward the front.
Are there any comments or reactions to the changes we've made on 4?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. We'll move ahead then. We'll go to page 5, and page 5 is really about the goals.

We've reformatted this page to the dark blue color. We added also the purpose of the BTMP to this page instead of on page 1, just to kind of synchronize that. We also made a few changes to the goals based on some of the feedback that we received previously, and Giacomo mentioned this idea of sustainable funding is now included in the description. It also includes financing.

We've included some verbiage on cross-border resiliency so the description states "system disruptions" instead of "disasters." "Stewardship" was retitled to "stewardship and sustainability" and the description emphasizes community as well as environmental or agency resources.

So I know we had a very rich discussion about the goals last time and wanted to make sure that that was reflected in the new wording here. We tried to keep it streamlined and simple so it's easy to absorb but reflects the suggestions of the BTAC.

So are there any other comments or questions
here?

Kelli, could you zoom out just a little bit so we can see. I know some people said it was too small but just so we could see that full page. There we go. So this is kind of the full page for you right here.

Actually, I'm seeing a comment from Jake from Presidio and this is based on the previous page, so we could just flip back there really quickly to cover this. He said on page 1 of the map it says Chihuahua City and Camargo, Chihuahua, are not connected to Presidio, Texas. So let's note that, and Jake, we can talk to you offline as well just to make sure that we're showing some of those connections that need to be made to highlight Presidio's place on the West Texas border. So thank you for that.

All right. Let's proceed. So if there are no questions on 4 and 5, we will advance to pages 5 and 6 where we go through the stakeholder engagement.

And there were not a lot of changes to this particular section. The main thing I wanted to highlight here was that this page was refined, page 6, to list each of the different stakeholder groups, how they were engaged, how many meetings were held with each group.

Previously this section elaborated much more detail on the BTAC, the BNSRC and the Secretary of State and SCT engagement, but it didn't cover all of these
groups that are now listed. So that was the recommendation that we heard from you last time and we hope that this more succinctly summarizes who, what, when, where, why, and kind of how much in more detail.

Are there any comments on this page? Again, these are not dramatic changes on this page, I think just clarifying comments. And there were no changes, at least that I've flagged here, on page 7. Page 7 again is the map showing involvement, a summary, kind of this bar chart here showing involvement by group.

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. We will proceed. So the next set of pages, pages 8 and 9, are about the Texas border past, present, and future. The main takeaway here, we reformatted these two pages.

Previously there was only one sentence included for population, employment, and median income, and more room was dedicated to the graph. So in response to your comments, a narrative of the changes were added to allow the readers to understand both the terms visually and through text.

So essentially, this used to be more graphic heavy and now there's a bit more visual and a bit more narrative to really tell the story of these key trends in the U.S. and Mexico and in the regions.
Any comments or feedback here?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Caroline, is there anything else you or your team would like to point out on any of the changes we've made through page 9, or should we proceed?

MS. MAYS: I think the main thing was that we needed a little bit more information on each of these socioeconomic indicators and I think we provided that, and so hopefully that addresses our comments from the last BTAC meeting. But if there are no further comments, we can move to the next one.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, let's move ahead.

So similarly, these two pages, and this is again on the Texas-Mexico Border past, present, and future where we structured previously the three people-movement modes were included on one chart without text narrative explaining the trends. So we've added narrative based on the chapters that explain the significance of the border for movements of people and how these trends have changed for each mode.

We also emphasized the types of buses in the region, that bike and pedestrian movements have increased especially as POV, personal vehicle border crossing times have increased, and that personal vehicles have declined from '96 to '19, and that the border is important for
daily crossings for access to daycare facilities, schools, hospitals, retail, employment, and also tourism and recreational activities.

Another key change is we've added some additional footnotes at the bottom to indicate the definitions of personal vehicles and port of entry. Wanted to make that clear. There was a question about that previously.

On the map in the upper righthand corner, we've separated on the maps the regions and narrative explaining the trends in each region in the text so that there's information on people movements, growth in people movements, and analysis for each region.

So I think if there are no questions, we can advance to the next page where this continues. It moves into the Laredo region and then also the Rio Grande Valley region. So essentially these next two pages, 12 and 13, are in the same format as the previous two. So it's altogether a four-page deeper dive of those people movement trends, influences, drivers, connections and daily life.

I'll pause for a moment. Gerry mentioned that we also need to include educational cross-border crossers. So thank you, Gerry. We'll make sure to do that. I know that's really important in most of the
border communities.

Are there any other questions or comments here on this series?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. We will move ahead.

So continuing here we switch to moving goods past, present, and future.

Previously these graphs were combined to one graph, and due to differences in scale, each mode was separated in its own graph. So we've also made some additional narrative changes below that go into some detail to explain some of these. So hopefully this is more clear in terms of providing those past, present, and future trends for each of the distinctive modes.

You’ll see also, we added a sentence on the importance of airports and the contributions of foreign trade zones. That's at the bottom of page 14. That was another ask by BTAC previously.

If we scroll to the top of page 15, to the blue box, just wanted to note that although the commercial vehicle and railcar growth trends were moved to the beginning of the executive summary, we did add a text box here providing the overall Texas-Mexico Border-wide trends for both of these modes prior to providing the general regional breakdowns.
So you'll see that on page 15 and then on pages 16 and 17, as we move to those in a moment, we've mirrored the same approach that we took to the people movements, where there are regional breakdowns describing the key trends by major mode.

One last note here, similar to the people movement sections, we've also amplified the narrative. And I guess a question for this group is whether there's anything else that we should consider adding to these pages.

As we look at pages 16 and 17, please note that they mirror the same kind of format and approach as 14 and 15 and as the people movement sections. But I think a key question for BTAC is whether there are any other key messages on the goods movement side that we need to consider adding. I'll pause for a moment and see if there are any suggestions.

MR. CALVO: Hey, Donald, this is Eduardo in El Paso.

MR. LUDLOW: Hey, Eduardo.

MR. CALVO: I believe on page 14 where we have the individual graphs, I don't see a reference saying that these are in constant dollars, and if there is, I don't see it firm.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you. And that was a
question that we have about a few other dollar figures and we will make sure to provide that note and that consistency.

MR. CALVO: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you very much.

Anything else on this section on goods movement past, present and future?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right, let's move on. So the next pages 18 and 19 go into more depth, this time on supply chains.

So one of the comments that we're still addressing here is making sure that we change Mexico instead of "municipalities" to "municipios," so that hasn't been changed yet but we will. We also added the starting and ending values to the second sentence under Border Trade Trends. We were asked previously to demonstrate that growth in the narrative.

On the graph we corrected the starting year to 1994 to be able to show the impact of NAFTA trade. Previously it was showing '96. We also removed the top region border crossing text boxes that were previously on this page and instead provided a paragraph on the economic impact of trade.

In the map on the top right of page 19, we
exchanged the International Trade Values map with the GDP map to show the significance of border trade on every state in the U.S. and Mexico. This is also something that's featured prominently in the Transportation Commission presentation. And accordingly, we also added a narrative to this page reflecting some of those deep trade connections with the GDP impact on Mexican and U.S. interior states.

So Kelli, Hannah, if you scroll down a little bit there on this page, some of those key statistics indicating connections to the interior states as well.

Are there any questions or comments on this supply chain and economic connections section?

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry.

Just a general comment, and I don't know where on this page we could highlight the fact for purposes of the reader to remind everyone that Mexico is Texas' number one trading partner. So why are we working on all this stuff, because we want to keep Texas as the number one exporting state in the country and the importance of Mexico to the State of Texas.

And I don't know how we could, I guess, highlight it more where it would say it. It's understood for this committee, but I don't know -- for the other readers, you know, for people to remind everybody why are
we doing all of this stuff, you know.

MS. MAYS: Well, that's a great point, Gerry, certainly, because this is the biggest story to tell. And I think -- I don't know if we have -- in line with Gerry's, maybe, Donald, we can add number one trading partner but also, you know, some language on the USMCA.

MR. LUDLOW: Right. No, I think that's a very appropriate place for us to talk in more depth about USMCA and its foundational importance and connections on the supply chain side.

MR. TRUBAN: Just a thought on that too, if you want to mention number two and number three trading partners and the magnitude of difference between how it drops off, number two state and number three state might be interesting.

MR. LUDLOW: Right. Thank you. And who was that who just made that comment?

MR. TRUBAN: I'm sorry. It’s Paul Truban from TxDOT.

MR. LUDLOW: Oh, thanks, Paul.

MR. VALE: This is Sam.

One thing I would caution us against is trying to make it unimportant to be from California, Arizona, or New Mexico, because that puts our federal officials into conflict.
MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MR. VALE: It's fair to say we're more important, not to say they're not important. And then the other states that I believe have been brought up, Michigan and others, that have huge impact on what we do on the border.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good. Thank you for those comments.

Are there any others at this point?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Why don't we move on to the next two pages, 20 and 21, which basically break down some of the key supply chains in more detail.

We moved the top three supply chains to the top of the twelve supply chains instead of to the left. So this was just some spatial rearrangement to make this more visually appealing, but the top three obviously are high tech, motor vehicle and machinery.

The map illustrates some of those connections between some of these key supply chains. And also, we had a fairly intense bar graph showing the trends and instead converted that to a line graph and simplified it to illustrate some of the growth that's expected in the future, and really exponential growth on the high tech side. Obviously, the other supply chains are growing.
quickly as well.

And then we moved some of the text boxes below. We had some additional space due to some of the changes by removing that massive graph and simplifying it to the trend lines to provide some additional narrative at the bottom. We think this reads a lot better and tells a story that's a lot easier to comprehend than the previous version.

Any comments or reactions here to those changes?

MR. WOJNOWSKI: This is Matt with Del Rio.

I think on the high tech, that comment there at the bottom in the middle, I don't know if it would be more prominent if it was the first thing mentioned or the last thing. Just an idea. Thanks.

MR. LUDLOW: Go ahead, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: I was just confirming, Kelli got it.

MR. LUDLOW: Got it. Okay. Thank you, Matt.

Anything else?

MR. SCHWEBEL: I’m trying to understand -- this is Gerry. Going back to the question earlier about high tech, what are you referring to high tech?

MR. LUDLOW: Well, I'll start out there, and Alejandro could potentially chime in. But this is kind of the grouping of computer processing instruments and other
components related to high technology, so really it's kind of the hardware, Gerry, that is being produced on a cross-border kind of binational basis.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Okay.

MR. LUDLOW: So it's fueling a lot of other industries, some of it's components that fuel other industries.

MS. MAYS: It includes electronics as well, and you know, high volume manufacturing.

MR. SCHWEBEL: So when you talk about durable goods, it's the hardware stuff, not so much the digital trade as --

MS. MAYS: No.

MR. SCHWEBEL: I got you. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: This is tangible goods.

MS. MAYS: Tangible, yup.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Tangible. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Gerry, for asking for that clarification.

The next part of the executive summary really moves into the issues and needs. So up to this point the first 21 pages have been background. They've been setting the stage, they've been describing current conditions, some of the key industries, the economic conditions, and the remainder of the executive summary focuses on the
border issues, needs, projects, programs, policies.

So this first part, there haven't been significant changes here. There's been some formatting changes. Really, we removed multimodal from the cross-cutting theme just based on some comments from stakeholders and TxDOT, streamlined this a little bit.

On the next page, on 23, we changed the format of this page by shortening and simplifying the text in multiple places, while keeping the original intent. So they're now in the green color scheme instead of orange bolded text.

So these are mostly visual and formatting changes that were made to highlight the key performance issues and needs and overall issues and needs, including cross-cutting themes. So, again, not a lot of substantive changes here, mostly formatting and visual changes to this layout.

Any comments or questions here?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, let's move on. So the next series of pages really address the crossing times.

Obviously there's a number of different performance metrics that are contained in the chapters, but due to the high interest in the crossing times, this was something that is featured prominently in the
executive summary, and the focus -- and a lot of what happened here, the changes that were made here was to add a paragraph narrative on how north- and southbound times compare and also to add the number of commercial motor vehicle crossings northbound to justify why the times have increased.

So there's a bit more information here. A lot of individuals have asked for additional clarification. We think that the paragraph and the footnotes help provide some better context, so this is more easily understandable and also so that it's contextualized given the number of crossings in the future.

So on the left-hand side you see the time in hours, and on the right-hand side you see the annual number of crossings, so that it makes maybe more intuitive sense that if there's a significant increase in crossings there may also be a significant increase in that crossing time, not always a one-to-one relationship but typically some correlation there.

Are there questions or comments about this slide? Obviously -- excuse me -- this set of pages as well as those that continue, you know, there's a lot to absorb. And we made a similar set of changes on the following pages as well.

MS. MAYS: I think the really big difference
was we heard from a lot of you that we were presenting
kind of a one-sided story on the crossing times or border
delays, but we're not really presenting kind of why and
you know, the volumes, to really show a correlation
between how it's going to grow in terms of volume in the
crossings, the truck crossings.

So let's just take Mayor Saenz, if we take
Laredo, World Trade Bridge, does the growth in the volumes
match up with, you know, the possible projected growth in
wait time. So that's the story, that we had to add the
volume that is here on your right-hand side. So when
somebody is looking at this, you know, there's some
comparative perspective that they can see.

And again, this is kind of do-nothing on the
wait times, but when you look at the volumes, it's going
to grow regardless of whether the wait times are what it
is today or will be in the future. The volumes are going
to continue to grow. So that's the attempt we're trying
to do here to provide that perspective.

And I think we had comment on this yesterday
when we met with RGV, and then others, I think Laredo,
there were comments in Laredo as well.

MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry. My comment, and
you've already the question in some respects, but it was,
as we looked at the harder-colored versus the shaded
areas, if you just took that model when you look at that, Pharr is really the one that has the most needs right now based on that current scenario, versus the shaded area which, of course, with no activity would definitely, you know, far exceed the 13-hour deal.

But I just want to make sure that we did not mix apples and oranges between, I guess, clarification whether they're BCIS or BTS numbers versus INRIX numbers in comparisons. That's always worth clarification.

But the whole issue of saying northbound crossing times are 30 minutes on average, but that's when the bridgehead -- they come on to the bridge. You know, we're talking about delays, the long lines up to two hours, and I know that we've had that discussion. You know, and are working, but we need to make sure we don't get any confusion in what we present to this.

To me these are very critical charts to present our arguments. You know, some other committee members have any opinions on that?

MS. MAYS: And Donald, maybe you guys can talk a little bit about on the commercial vehicle side we do have, you know, not on all of them we'll have BCIS, but you know, we also did use INRIX data. This doesn't reflect CBP data.

So Donald, if you guys want to talk a little to
Gerry's point?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, Gerry, maybe that needs to be clarified further. At the bottom we have a footnote that says BCIS and INRIX data 2019 and BTMP queuing models were used, and the southbound border crossing time information was unavailable due to data limitations.

So that comes on some of the subsequent pages we have now included southbound, at least for current crossing times, for the first time. So I don't know if that's clear enough, but I think that we continue to hear from this group and from other groups that there's a need for greater clarification to confirm that we are not using the CBP wait times, that this is crossing time. So essentially for every crossing where BCIS is available, that's what was used; when BCIS was not available, the INRIX approach was used, including for southbound.

So it seems like we need to work on that messaging to make that more clear for those who are really familiar with the border region, and I'm hesitant to use the CBP wait times because they're only reflecting part of the total crossing time. I think that clarification may need to be made more apparent.

Does that make sense, Gerry?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Yeah. Just important -- keeping in mind who the readers are going to be of this report,
you know, at all levels. You know, if you look at, like I said, well, what's 30 minutes. Sounds like it's nothing, you know, but it is if there are another 50 or 100 trucks behind you.

MR. LUDLOW: Right. And obviously these pages are focused on average crossing times. The 90th percentile are obviously a lot higher, and there's information on those in the report in the chapters themselves.

So it sounds like we need to work on this messaging a bit more on the narrative here to make this more clear, where did the data come from, what do they mean. You know, just making sure that this speaks more clearly and succinctly to both the people who understand border operations as well as lay readers. So it seems like we've got a little work to do on this page.

MR. BROUWEN: Good morning. Fred Brouwen, director of operations, City of Pharr, the Pharr Bridge.

Definitely this is very good for us, but definitely we need to show the worst case scenario and the best case scenario by adding the projects. As you know, each city, each entity has projects.

We do have a $40 million project right now underway inside the import lot, just to remind everyone, and we're working to build a second spot. But definitely
we need to have a best case scenario -- I mean, the worst
and the best, including the projects. That way you could
have a better knowledge of our operation for the next 30
years.

Definitely we need to have another scenario
with projects that each city, each region is working on --
on their bridge, on the city. That way we can give more
understanding of the next 20-30 years on the wait times.
Because with this, you're going to confuse people, whoever
you're going to present to, or it's going to divert
investors to go somewhere else.

MS. MAYS: If I may, you know, certainly, Fred,
your comments are well taken. What we're trying to paint
the picture here is, again, Donald mentioned average
crossing times, and I think we need to add the word
"average" here. Because when we were doing this analysis,
we didn't have the projects, you know, to be able to run
the analysis.

So what we did here, we just took as it is
today, what that would look like in the future, you know,
with the do-nothing. And of course, that's really what
you're talking about is, I think that's kind of the next
step in the implementation when we're going to go back and
say, okay, now that we have all of the projects
identified, if they were all implemented, this is what it
would be. This is what would change.

But unfortunately, when we were doing this analysis for the purpose of the Border Master Plan, the plan right now, we did not have -- we're still working through the projects. But certainly I think this shows you what it is today, the 2019 crossing times. That's your average actual today, and then we're kind of painting a picture in the future.

So what you're asking for is kind of in the middle whereby you put the projects in, and then you kind of see what that would look like. And I think that's an exercise that, you know, can certainly be a follow-up. Once we get all the projects in, we can look at that and see what that looks like and share that back with the committee.

MR. BROUWEN: Exactly. Just like you started right now to make a comment, this is without any projects. Definitely with good projects, the scenario will change.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely. It will be somewhere, like I say, in the middle. So we have the actual today, we have 2050, and then with the projects it will kind of be kind of a middle scenario.

MR. BROUWEN: Exactly.

MAYOR SAENZ: Caroline, this is Mayor Saenz.
May I say something here?

MS. MAYS: Yes, go ahead, Mayor.

MAYOR SAENZ: Yes. We also tend to forget that what contributes to delays is not necessarily border crossing times obviously over the bridges but also the border patrol stations, the inspection stations that we have away from the bridges, but also so important for northbound traffic going more internally. So we need to some way footnote that or, you know, that's all part of the process here.

MS. MAYS: Yes. There's a lot of variable kind of causes to the delays, and again, this is some of the things we didn't do a lot of analysis on the causes, but I think that's something that we do have as one of the programs to come back and look into and understand, what are some of the main causes of border wait time delays.

Like you mentioned border patrol, a lot of discussion about staffing and other things, you know. In border crossings where you have multiple modes, people, trucks, bicyclists, there's a lot of conflicts created there and some of that creates the delay and, you know, expands the crossing times.

And the challenge is border crossing by border crossing. Not any one or two border crossings are alike. So that's going to be kind of an exercise that we
work with you all bridge owners, border crossing owners to
furnish that understanding better. Because otherwise we
can make broad assumptions, like you mentioned, you know
that for sure but is that the same in other regions
throughout the border region.

So certainly, we'll look at that.

MAYOR SAENZ: But my point was at the 29-mile
marker we have a border patrol check station and all the
traffic is forced to stop there and again be checked, and
that's really the point I was trying to make. Thank you.

MR. VALE: And Caroline, this is Sam.

The mayor is correct and so are the prior
comments, but we kind of have to separate infrastructure
versus federal regulatory processes. Because you can have
the widest highway and still have a regulatory process
that's more cumbersome.

So we always want to support the unification of
the processes between Mexico and the U.S. And that's
something that is not directly a TxDOT thing, but it is
something that affects the infrastructure of TxDOT.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Sam.

Caroline, I think we have a few comments to
catch up on in the chat box here. Sito mentioned, how do
the politics of security influence crossing times, so I
think that we've mentioned that, and you know, I think
that we have that in the narrative in a couple of places in the reports, but we just need to maybe make that more clear here.

We do have some white space on this page and the subsequent pages where we can include some additional clarifying notes and narrative. We had planned to maybe describe some of the broader changes here.

One other possibility that maybe also partially addresses Fred's points is possibly having a text box that foreshadows the policies, programs, and projects as solutions to these projected wait times, making that tie into the rest of the executive summary. So there's, I think, several different things we could consider doing here to improve that and to improve this flow.

Then finally, Jake mentions in Presidio northbound it is going to get a lot worse because we do not have two booths, so that every truck has to go to secondary. I'm not sure, Alejandro, if you or Chris wanted to comment on that. I know that we were discussing that internally.

MR. SOLIS: I think this goes back to kind of, what is the current infrastructure at each one of the border crossings and that's what we are assuming for these future queues. So anything that would improve on that is really not considered, so if there is a specific way that
a border crossing operates, that is what we are assuming for the future. That will, of course, change with the recommendations, but at this point, for the purposes of our Border Master Plan we assume the current operating conditions into the future.

MR. VALE: And the monkey in the woodpile is federal regulations can be interpreted with some flexibility or considerable flexibility by the director of the ports, both on the Mexican and the U.S. side.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MR. VALE: And that's something we can't control, but we need to be able to work on those issues. Maybe the private sector and the local communities would have a greater role there, but it's still something that affects TxDOT infrastructure.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Sam. What I'd like to do next, if there are no other further comments, is just walk relatively quickly through the next few slides since they are largely showing similar information and trends.

So 26-27 indicate the southbound side and we do not have this forecast for the future due to some data limitations and assumptions, but we are indicating the southbound wait times. And I think per the comments that we received yesterday in our conversation from RGV,
including from Sam, I think the idea here is to highlight
the fact that these are export flows, and make the
distinction that on the inbound, the northbound, those are
import flows and these are export flows in the narrative
to make that more clear.

Does that sound reasonable, Sam, based on what
you mentioned yesterday?

MR. VALE: Yes. We need to have people know
that because they have different operations. An exporter
is more interested in the southbound.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good, clearly.

Cynthia, were you going to say something?

MS. GARZA REYES: Actually, I did have a quick
question when we were talking about the data and it coming
from BCIS and INRIX. In terms of accuracy, how does that
compare to what CBP has that we can't get a hold of?

Is it -- would you say that it's pretty much
the same? I'm just curious about the accuracy.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, Cynthia, that's a good
question. I'll try to explain it really simply. We do
have all of the data from CBP. They were generous in
providing us with basically their observed wait times.

But what CBP is doing is they're measuring --
and they've got a methodology that they've used for a very
long time and it's very consistent -- but they measure the
visual queue of the traffic approaching the CBP station. They're not measuring the full crossing time, meaning they're not also measuring the time a vehicle might enter the queue north- or southbound to not only go through CBP, but to go through SOT [phonetic] or subsequent processing.

I hope that makes sense. So CBP is measuring a part. They're measuring the wait time for CBP inspection, but they're not measuring the full crossing time, which the BCIS data and/or the INRIX data do. So these crossing times are longer, but they are consistent and statistically valid, although in some cases we have fewer observations from the INRIX data than the BCIS data.

I hope that helps.

MS. GARZA REYES: Yes. That actually is very helpful because, again, as we continue talking about other stakeholders that aren't familiar with this, I was just thinking could they have the same possible question in terms of accuracy, and if we could somehow put that in the footnote that would probably be very beneficial to those outside of Texas.

MR. LUDLOW: Right. It sounds like there's some continued discussion and need to clarify the differences between the CBP data and the data that we're showing here just to make sure it's clear.

MR. VALE: And Cynthia, this is Sam.
One of the things that we all need from the ports of entry side is to know the exact time that something enters the import lot, and what time that truck gets out of the import lot because that is easier to measure and it's very accurate. It would be a through-put time.

CBP does have a goal of trying to reduce their through-put times, but those vary depending on who's on duty and how they operate. But those are critical things for the ports of entry.

MS. GARZA REYES: Completely agree.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good. Again, thank you for the continued comments. This discussion is really helpful to the team.

Obviously this section of the executive summary needs additional clarification in the narrative. It's already undergone quite a few changes since we last spoke but needs to evolve further. The next couple of slides --

MR. CONTRERAS: I have a question on this as well.

MR. LUDLOW: Sure.

MR. CONTRERAS: Thank you for this. And this may be to Caroline as well. This is Sergio again at the Partnership.

So we've seen the number of entities that
placed comments or messaging on to the entire report itself, and now that we're talking about wait times, do you have a sense of how much input has come in from industry themselves? Such as, in this case, outbound wait times. You know, we get that from CBP. We get that from the ports, but how much -- and not only in wait times but overall in the whole report, do you have matrix that shows 20 percent of the following came from industry themselves? Do y'all have that, do we have that?

MS. MAYES: Stephanie shared a little bit earlier -- I think, Donald, if you will go back to the stakeholder engagement page -- we have had unprecedented input from industry throughout this plan development. Tremendous -- a lot of the BNSRC, we had stakeholder workshops targeted primarily to private sector. We've held meetings in Mexico with private sector, before COVID, engaging them.

So I can assure you we've had tremendous input from the private sector in Mexico. You know, we have all the three Mexican states -- four Mexican states that have been involved and helping us engage industry there on a --

MR. CONTRERAS: Great. Thank you.

MS. MAYES: So absolutely.

MR. CONTRERAS: Thank you. Yes, and I meant private sector specifically, yes. Thank you.
MS. MAYS: It's private sector, yes.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you very much.

Again, great comments.

So the last two slides here, or the last two pages on the crossing times, are highlighting people, average personal vehicle crossing times, both northbound and then the number of movements now and in the future to compare and contrast against the changing crossing times. So it's a close analog to the information that was presented on commercial vehicles.

The next two slides contain the same information, the next two pages for southbound. Again, no forecast for southbound but current average wait times for personal vehicles for southbound are available right here, which this group and others have asked for inclusion.

Are there any additional questions or comments about this crossing times section? And again, some of this is brand new. We intend to integrate some additional narrative and clarifying notes following your comments today over these four pages.

MR. GARCIA: This is Josue here at Cameron County.

I think the same applies here to the POVs as the commercial projects going on within the different bridge systems, including ours, so that would be nice.
And thank you, Caroline, for including that on the commercial, and this will reciprocate here on the POVs as well. Thanks.

MS. MAYS: You're welcome. Thank you for your comments. I think you brought it up last time that we need to make sure we focus on the POVs as well, so thank you.

MR. CALVO: Hey, Donald, this is Eduardo. I think I made this comment also at the BNSRC here. I understand that the forecasts are unconstrained and there is really no equilibrium reached between the different border crossings. Right?

So I think it's in slide 24 for the commercial vehicles, where you're showing the Pharr-Reynosa Bridge at 13 hours while the other bridges are exactly -- other bridges have a forecasted four hours and so on, you know. Maybe the note about that these are individual forecasts.

In other words, that there is no regional equilibrium, you know, reached on this. Not sure how you guys want to address that, but I think it's important to mention that because someone who sees that draft may think, well, 13 hours and the other ones are only four hours.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and Donald, you guys can kind
of comment on that, these individual border crossings, and maybe, you know -- we tried to color code it by region so it can be easier to read, but maybe specifically focus on border crossings and not make it kind of regional. So that people don't think, like you said, you know, reading that, somehow they're all interrelated.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Yeah, thanks, Caroline, and thanks, Eduardo. We will definitely make a note about the equilibrium.

Chris or Alejandro, I don't know if you wanted to add anything further there, but I think the key point there is that these are individual unconstrained forecasts by specific crossing. And as we move into implementation, TxDOT will be examining some of those equilibrium effects of projects.

Chris or Alejandro, did you have any further comments in response to Eduardo?

MR. SOLIS: No. I think that you got it right. I mean, we just need to explain that there is really no equilibrium beyond the border crossing forecasts.

We're not reassigning flows, we're not doing any of those things. But we'll find a way to craft it in kind of more layman's terms in these stages.

MR. VALE: Well, you have -- this is Sam.
You have to remember that this also is a factor with the volumes. You know, the bigger the port is, the more volumes they have and the infrastructure at some point cannot be expanded, then that is where you have the problems.

Pharr has got some great plans for expansion; that's going to change a lot of stuff. But if I remember correctly, that 13-hour is in 2050, that's not today.

MR. SOLIS: And it is in a do-nothing situation. Correct. If nothing is done between now and 2050, that's what would happen. Correct.

MR. BROUWEN: Alejandro, did you base it on the crossings for each bridge exactly?

MR. SOLIS: The forecasting was done at the individual border crossing level. And again, it doesn't consider any reassignment to any kind of neighboring border crossings, nothing of that sort. It was a very simple forecasting process.

MS. GARZA REYES: Is there -- and I know that obviously the current coordination tells you if it's 2019 or 2050 numbers, but is there a way to maybe emphasize that a little bit more? Because honestly, the first time I looked at it, I jumped to the 13-hour and I thought, wait a minute.

I had to take a double look and make sure that
that was 2050. So if there is maybe a way for everyone just to emphasize that that is the 2050 projection and not current.

MS. MAYS: Yes. And I think, you know, we will go back to the drawing board a little bit on this draft and figure out, the consultant team figure out how best to reflect -- yeah, because you're not the only one, Cynthia. We've had other people comment.

I think yesterday you made similar comment and others have, so we're going to figure out how to best display this. It's very important to display it at 2019 so people can see today and then really, you know, the 2050 one. if there's a way we can do that, so we're going to try to figure that out so it's clear. Because if somebody is going to look at this for the first time and they can't discern what is 2019 versus 2050, it's going to be challenging.

SECY. HUGHS: And Caroline, at the risk of this not being the one we were talking about the other day, is this where we were just seeing in addition to times adding volume numbers to create a better picture? It's not just that there's a wait, it's just that there's such a growth in volume.

MS. MAYS: Yes, Secretary. We added, if you look on the right-hand side, we added the crossing
volumes, and it has commercial vehicles.

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. It's probably just me, for the other slides on the left I could zoom and this one I can't, and so they look like very tiny. Oh, here we go. It's user error. Okay, now I can see it. Thank you.

I see you added it, but it isn't one chart. It's two separate charts.

MS. MAYS: Yes, exactly, because the measures are different. You know, the volumes, we're looking at trucks crossing, and then the wait time is in hours. So we can't really blend the two together, so that's why we put it side by side. So at least the reader can see, you know, some of the things causing the wait time is the volume increasing, that's just part of it.

SECY. HUGHS: Sure. So for the committee members, it was only the first chart before so now we have the two charts. I guess I was hoping -- I can appreciate why you can't really blend it.

You'd have to take the time to recognize, okay, well, here are the hours that it takes and then also to appreciate the volume. So that helps but it sounds like we're still not -- it's a challenge because it's a lot of information, but I'm hearing that we need to do what we can to make it even clearer. So thank you for those efforts.
MS. MAYS: Yes, certainly.

MR. VALE: And we have to remember who our audience is, because these are ways to justify funding. These are not ways to try to get somebody to locate in your community. We're using these to justify additional funding, so I guess you can say some people would wish to have those numbers.

MR. CALVO: And Caroline and Donald, this is Eduardo again.

You know, I love these charts. I mean, I think they're great. I think all we're saying here is that we may just need to tweak them to make the clarifications of what it is that we're showing, but I think the charts are great. I mean, I love, you know, the way that we're conveying the information here. Just a matter of tweaking it, but these are excellent.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Eduardo.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, thank you, Eduardo. I think we're dealing with some of the most electrifying material in the document and it's just really a function of being able to package it and provide the supporting narrative that enables the readers to understand it in the appropriate context.

I think that's what a lot of our comments have been about today and that's going to be our challenge, the
TxDOT team internally, working on that over the next couple of days.

All right. If there are no other comments here, I think we need to move on, especially for the sake of time. So in the next portion of the executive summary I'm just going to summarize some of the changes we've made.

This next slide really summarizes the economic impact of the border delays, and we've added the GDP impact of the border delays for all border crossings based on your feedback, including a sentence specifically on the 2019 border delays. We've also reemphasized that this is under a no-build scenario and that the GDP impacts, these huge GDP impacts, are no-build but could be alleviated through the proper constellation of configuration of policies, programs and projects.

We added a paragraph, if you scroll down a little bit at the bottom -- excuse me -- actually not on this page. Sorry about that.

So are there any comments or questions on the economic impact?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, let's move on. So the next series of pages are about the recommendations, and the first thing that we mention here is that we reformatted
these two pages to the dark blue and green color scheme. Previously they were green and orange.

We removed them from boxes -- previously they'd been in kind of a tabular format -- to improve the legibility and we've added sentences related to the need for both public and private funds. We see that's prominent here at the bottom of the recommendations introduction area.

So again, this is the 22 policy recommendations. The subsequent pages will go into program and the project recommendations.

Any comments or questions here?
(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: I think this is relatively straightforward, so let's move on to the program recommendations.

Sorry, I think we're getting some feedback here. Can you just make sure everyone mutes? Thank you very much.

So a few highlighted changes here. We have corrected the number of projects, so of course this first page 36 is focused on the program recommendations and we changed the text box here to explain the purpose of the programs. Previously this provided the percentage of high impact projects, but we wanted to really note the
importance of the programs. And specifically at the bottom here under connectivity noted that the driver training programs are an example of regional connectivity in the region for the studies.

Another point here moving over to project recommendations, we corrected the number of projects based on new stakeholder inputs. This has continued to evolve as we've continued to receive additional changes to projects. We also changed the project funding status to a pie chart and added a narrative. Previously this was a table.

The intent here is to show really kind of the difference of funded versus unfunded, that about three-quarters of the projects identified remain unfunded. And then partially-funded is $2 billion and fully-funded is about $5 billion.

So are there any questions or comments on these two pages where we summarize program recommendations and project recommendations?

MR. WOJNOWSKI: Yes. This is Matt with the City of Del Rio.

There's a lot of numbers here, the 182 and 649. I think there should be a statement to show where they can find all 182 or 649 of these so that people would know where to reference or find those.
MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Matt. And this is a comment that's come up in the last few days in the BNSRC meetings.

There will be appendices that contain these in detail and actual references to the chapter. If this an electronic document, perhaps the best way to provide this is through a link, but we will take that into consideration.

MR. WOJNOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Caroline, anything to add?

MS. MAYS: No, no.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Anything else on these two pages?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. So let's move on to the next few remaining pages. The next two pages provide breakdowns and then largely these next few pages take into account the comments and suggestions that we received from BTAC and from others.

We tried to include percentages whenever possible and pie charts to kind of summarize the breakdowns by different types of projects, by funding availability and by impact. We have tried to make sure that this is provided at a regional level with the correct color coding to be able to tell those regional...
Any comments of questions here? Again, a lot of this is formatting and not necessarily substantive changes, but really just better storytelling and more regional focus.

(Pause.)

All right.

MR. CALVO: Donald, this is Eduardo in El Paso.

Just a comment that the numbers that you’re showing, at least for the El Paso region, are not the very, very latest. As you know, yesterday afternoon we were still tweaking our project list and all that, so I just want to make sure that, you know, the new numbers will be reflected by the time we take this to the Commission.

MR. LUDLOW: Absolutely, Eduardo. This is a snapshot as of, I think, 10:00 or 11:00 a.m. yesterday morning --

MR. CALVO: Right.

MR. LUDLOW: -- and this is already in the process of being updated from the additional information that you provided yesterday. So this continues to evolve. Thank you for your note. The latest iteration will be reflective of the latest numbers.

MR. CALVO: Excellent. Thank you.
MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Well, let's keep moving then. So the next series is about the implementation plan.

Really the main comment here was adding percentages based on stakeholder feedback. We also removed the table for implementation time frame by impact level due to space constraints. We reformatted the unfunded projects by implementation timeline to improve legibility. So again, mostly formatting here, stylistic improvements for readability and digestability.

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

On the arrow you have short term, medium on the left-hand side and long term on the right. I would rotate those pie charts to have the short term and medium term on the left-hand side and the long term on the right. Same thing with your labels there below the pie charts, if that makes sense.

MR. LUDLOW: Good call. Thanks, Matt. We will improve our consistency in that kind of visual sequencing. That's very helpful.

Anything else on these two pages?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right, let's move ahead. So this is the final page of the executive summary.

This is where we have restructured the call for
action to include three main themes: strengthening Texas-Mexico partnerships; engaging BTAC in implementation; and pivoting stakeholders from planning to implementation, and made a few slight changes to kind of the overall look and feel. The question for this group is really whether this messaging is correct for the call for action. Are these the three areas?

This is what we heard from you last time and we tried to synthesize it in a way that was simple and direct, but is there a different set of messaging? Is this complete and appropriate for the call for action, the call for mobilization? Any thoughts or comments here?

Caroline, did you have any specific follow-up questions for the BTAC on this call for action?

MS. MAYS: No, but I think, Donald, after we have the discussion on implementation later, I think we might have this section --

MR. LUDLOW: Evolve?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, evolve. So I would probably just table that until after that discussion.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, very good.

So last call for comments here. We really appreciate your advice today. From our perspective, this is moving in the right direction. And I think we've mostly got some significant work to do to make sure that
we get the messaging and the narrative correct around the
crossing times. Very much appreciate it.

Caroline, are we ready to move on, or
Secretary, are we ready to move on to our next part of the
agenda?

MS. MAYS: If we have any comments from BTAC.

And Secretary, do you want to take a break
now? I know we don't have a break till 10:15, maybe take
the break now and come back at 10:15 and then the next
agenda item?

SECY. HUGHS: That's fine with me. It depends
on how the team feels. I'm happy to do that. It makes
sense to not stop in the middle of one, so if this is a
good break time, let's just all agree to check back in at
10:10. Would that work?

MS. MAYS: Yes, awesome.

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. See you soon. Thank you.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, let's take a break.

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:58 a.m., a brief recess was
taken.)

SECY. HUGHS: Okay. Welcome back, everyone.

Hope you had an opportunity to have a little morning
break, whether it was a stretch or a snack or just
catching up on other emails, and at this time we will go
on and continue with the presentation.

Caroline.

MS. MAYS: Thank you, Secretary. And welcome back, BTAC members.

The next agenda item is really we're going to do a quick walk-through on what we plan on presenting to Commission. As Secretary mentioned earlier, next Thursday during the regular Commission meeting we'll be presenting the Border Transportation Master Plan to the Commission as a discussion item.

This allows the Commission to, one, we inform them and provide them with a status update on the work effort of the plan, and also talk about the key findings and then allow Commission to ask questions and provide feedback. So that's the intent of this.

We're not going to go into a lot of details, but we want -- and again, you heard some of this already at the last meeting, but more the message, what are the key messages on some of these key areas. Some of it you've already discussed in the executive summary.

So I will turn it over to Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you, Caroline.

So we're going to -- what we'll do is, I'll just walk you at a very high level through a few series of slides. We'll pause after each section just briefly to
make sure that we understand any key messages that need to be conveyed to the Commission. So this is not meant to be an in-depth page turn, rather a higher level exercise where we just walk through this Transportation Commission presentation which does contain a lot of the same content as the executive summary, just sequenced a bit differently for the Commission.

So let's go ahead and get started. The first slide should look familiar, it sets the stage for the master plan, demonstrates the overall connections. The next slide summarizes the purpose and goals of the plan.

The following side provides an overview of the Texas-Mexico Border, including top ports of entry, some of the key statistics that anchor the region. And the fourth slide, which is the next one in this first sequence, contains the map overview of the region and the key statistics about the system.

So this is intended to introduce the plan, to walk through the goals, the overview, and to set the stage for building into some of the additional information on the economic importance and the project recommendations.

Are there any key messages, as you've glanced through this quickly, granted, and as we were walking through the executive summary material, that you think needs to be elevated in this overview section?
MR. ZAPATA: Donald, this is David Zapata, SOS office.

MR. LUDLOW: Sure.

MR. ZAPATA: I just wanted to say a quick comment and just for the members' consideration. I will request if you guys have any questions, just like Donald said, to please comments, questions, please send them over this review because those will be very, very helpful for both Caroline and Secretary's preparation for presentation to the Commission.

So keep that in mind as we move forward. And if you have any comments or questions over these next few slides, please share them with us, because we can make note of that and that way we'll make a much better presentation for the Commission next week. So I just wanted to put that in for everyone's consideration. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Sure. Thank you, David.

All right. Well, if we don't have any immediate questions, let's go into the next section. The next section is two slides, and it explains the economic importance of the border, summarizing the importance of people movements, including the GDP impact of people movements, and also the next slide is the GDP impact of goods movements.
We heard earlier from Mayor Saenz. I think it may be helpful for the Secretary of State and TxDOT to consider Mayor Saenz's point earlier on the people movement, on emphasizing tourism, as well as some of the other things we pointed out.

Are there any other key messages that should be elevated to the Commission on the economic importance of border movement for people or for goods?

(No response.)

SECY. HUGHS: Secretary or Caroline, are there any specific prompts here or should we keep moving?

MS. MAYS: Donald, I think we can keep moving. But I think to David Zapata's point, BTAC, this is your chance to help us with the narrative, so that's what we're asking for here. But you can continue moving forward if there are no comments, Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you.

So the next two slides are focused on the stakeholder involvement in the development of the plan, and you've seen this graphic before. This basically demonstrates the organization of the stakeholder involvement and provides some key statistics about the numbers of different groups involved and the number of meetings and the extent of that engagement. I think this is also a key place to really emphasize the point that
came up earlier about the private sector involvement in
the development of the plan.

The following slide presents the map of the
United States, demonstrating the extent of U.S. and Mexico
involvement and another opportunity to emphasize the broad
binational cooperation.

Any comments on the stakeholder portion?

MR. ZAPATA: Donald, this is David again.

Just one question on the previous slide.

MR. LUDLOW: Sure.

MR. ZAPATA: Just for clarity, I saw it listed
five meetings with border states. Just for clarity, we
only have four border states, so does that refer to a
meeting -- we had a meeting twice in one border state, or
is that referring to something else?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. Stephanie or Alejandro, do
you have any clarification on that point from David?

MR. SOLIS: You're right, David. We're listing
twice the meetings with Tamaulipas. We had two meetings
with them and one with the rest of the border states.

MR. ZAPATA: Got it.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VALE: Did you meet twice with Tamaulipas,
both in the Valley and in Laredo, so that's four meetings,
two and two?
MS. MAYS: No. We had -- there were kind of several meetings that were going on. There was one that we had the Secretary of State facilitating those meetings but prior to that -- we had met with Tamaulipas prior to that on the project information prior to the meeting we had with the Secretary of State.

So that's why it shows five meetings, because we had an additional meeting with Tamaulipas.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thanks, David. Thank you, Sam.

The next series of slides in the Transportation Commission presentation present the past, present, and future socioeconomic indicators: climate, population and income, and making some of the key points about the dynamic nature of the border region.

The next slides go into detail --

MS. MAYS: Donald, there are comments in the chat box. I think it was on the economic -- Gerry has comments, I think it was on the economic influence of the border.

It says that it's important for Secretary Hughes to emphasize how border communities are economically dependent on each other. Most of us say that we are one community in two countries. So that's, I think, a previous slide.
MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you very much. I think Gerry is providing you and the Secretary with some good talking points, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. LUDLOW: And it goes on to elaborate that -- this goes to the point that the border closures or limitations for any reason hurt the movement of people and eventually goods, getting back to Mayor Saenz's comment. So thank you for those great talking points. I'm sure that's very helpful.

All right, moving forward here, slides 19 and 20 are about moving people. They summarize the recent trends, including the increase in bicycle and pedestrian crossings, the decrease in personal vehicle crossings. Slide 20 summarizes the future outlook for all the modes for buses -- actually, let's go to the next slide, please -- so summarizes the future for all modes on the passenger side.

Similarly, slides 21 and 22 summarize the recent and future trajectory for goods movement, indicating the 112 percent recent growth in commercial vehicles, the high predicted growth in the future. Similarly on the next slide, the trend line for rail, the tremendous growth recently, continued significant growth into the future.
And then the last slide in this series, on the next slide, provides this economic snapshot which we summarized in the executive summary with the connections, deep connections to the GDP of states both along the two countries’ respective borders as well as in the interior of both nations.

So just quickly, that concludes the background slides that Caroline and the Secretary will go into more detail on the border past, present, and future on socioeconomics, people and on goods movement.

Are there any themes or points that need to be elevated or that the BTAC would like to suggest for inclusion here?

MR. VALE: This is Sam. I think it's very important that we've got to look at the areas between major points that the infrastructure, the highways are going to be affecting. They will be beneficial even if, say, a rural community couldn't justify it on its own but by being on a corridor, they will get improved transportation infrastructure.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you, Sam. Caroline, does that make sense?

MS. MAYS: Yes, absolutely. And again, that's part of the narrative.

MR. VALE: What you've got is you've got a lot
of legislators that represent those areas and so they have
to be understanding this.

    MS. MAYS:  Yes.

    MR. SCHWEBEL: I was also going to add -- this
is Gerry Schwebel -- and I know we had the discussion in a
couple of the BNSRC meetings, and I don't know if we're
going to incorporate that somewhere in this
presentation. We kind of, we didn’t forget or fail to
include, but how we track the containers, the tonnage and
we talked about Houston, as an example, that they have the
super tankers.

    All these seaports are going to be doing all
this dredging to accommodate super tankers to come in.
That means more containers coming in from Texas ports, as
well as containers coming in from Mexican ports that
connect to the corridor and that lead to Texas.

    So I just want to make sure we don't forget to
kind of present that picture that we're not just talking
about trucks, we're talking about containers that are on
railcars and containers that actually do get on trucks as
well as an increase in volume of future flow of trade and
transportation challenges.

    MS. MAYS:  Yeah, and then, Gerry, we did hear
you loud and clear the other day and what the team is
doing, they're trying to uncover that. The challenge is
that the way the data is collected and presented -- on the maritime side they use TEUs, but on the border crossing side they use railcars and they use the trucks and then they use tonnage.

And so that's kind of the challenge there to try to marry the two, because the way they are collected and it kind of looks like they're a little bit different. Because a container comes from the Port of Houston and it gets to a railcar that crosses the border or vice versa, it becomes a railcar, a rail container. And then if it's on a truck, that is just counted as a truck and instead of TEUs now it becomes kind of tonnage and then value.

So that's kind of the thing there. So the team is trying to see if that's even feasible but chances are it will not be feasible.

For instance, Port of Brownsville, there's a lot of trucks and containers that come through the Port of Brownsville. But you know, it gets on a truck, but once it gets on a truck it's no longer a TEU when it crosses the border. So that's the difference there.

But we're looking into it and seeing if there's something that can be done, but we'll let you know.

MR. SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Caroline. I think it goes to my point and I think to Sam's point that
eventually when we're looking at going out there and lobbying for whatever, whether it's local level or county or even at the state level or even at the federal level, that we make our representatives aware or the key committee members aware that, hey, this plan goes beyond just trucks and railcars. It goes to the total volume and weight. A crane that is probably -- people do not understand and clearly all of these other factors that are involved.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you very much.

MR. VALE: It's called the economy. It's based on that.

MR. GARCIA: This is Josue. And you know, I think this presentation is to the TxDOT commissioners so it needs to be understood by them, which I know that they do, but you know, it needs to resonate in how they accept this proposal.

MS. MAYS: Yes. And, you know, quickly to Gerry's point, I know we have our railroad friends here from BNSF or UP and also KCS, you guys kind of want to maybe comment a little bit about, you know, the railcar component. I know you guys do some maritime stuff as well. I don't want to put you guys on the spot.

MR. ERDMAN: Well, Caroline, this is Warren Erdman at Kansas City Southern.
I think the way you describe it is accurate.
Certainly we move a lot of containers over the border and I believe the way it's been referred to and described is accurate. I don't know if there might be a specific question that you'd like answered.

MS. MAYS: No. It was just to Gerry's comment about TEUs, you know, talked about earlier from the maritime perspective that's how they track the movement of cargo. But I was telling him that once it gets, let's say, from the Port of Houston and it goes on rail, you know, it's measured or tracked differently than maritime does once it gets on rail. So I think that's what I was asking.

MR. SCHWEBEL: I was just going to say, I think it's ironic that as I speak Warren's train is going by my office right now with double stacking containers, you know. That's two containers on top of one railcar.

But all I'm saying is that if you count the number of railcars but if it's got two containers on it, a double stack, or if you've got a truck that's got a Bobcat on it, you know. That's what I'm saying is, it's a constant education of our readers, what we're trying to -- the message that we're trying to convey. As Sam said, it's just the total economy moves through Texas. There's just no other way of describing it.
MS. MAYS: Gerry, the double stack, that’s counted. Both of those are counted -- and my railroad friends can attest to that. Both of those are counted.

MR. ERDMAN: Yes.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Donald, we can keep moving.

MR. LUDLOW: All right, let's keep moving.

So the next section introduces the issues and needs. You've seen all of this before. I think this summarizes it well. The following two slides present the border crossing times, and we've had extensive discussion today about this, and I think the proposal would be to make sure that the changes that we’d make in the executive summary are reflected here.

The next slide summarizes the impact of border delays and congestion economically, and this is also consistent with the executive summary, making the point that really if nothing is done this has a dramatic negative impact. But if the policy, program and project recommendations are implemented and advanced, this story could be different, very different, and the economic competitiveness could be maintained and enhanced.

Are there any questions or comments on this kind of introductory section to the issues and the needs, highlighting the wait times, especially the crossing times, and their impact?
MR. LUDLOW: Okay. I think we went into this in some detail today, so why don't we move to the policy recommendations section.

So this first slide introduces the key policy recommendations by category. The next slide introduces select program recommendations. Of course, there's the full 182, but these are the ones that we've discussed with you and the other BNSRC committees as the ones to really highlight.

Are there any questions or comments or suggestions on the way to present this or any key messages for policy or program recommendations before we move into projects?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. Moving into the project recommendations.

MS. MAYS: Donald, I think what I'll ask BTAC is, there's a lot of policy recommendations. What would, you know, they want us to hone in in the message to the Commission? If I were to ask out of the 22, you know, what are your top three or five?

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. Can we back up one slide?

MS. MAYS: On the policies. Same with programs as well. You know, what are kind of like your top three
or five, you know, from your perspective, or at least the top two of each of these.

We have system policies, we have border crossings and we have corridors. If there were two on each of these that you absolutely would like the Commission to hear or look into and think that maybe they have a role to play in, what would they be?

MR. VALE: But Caroline, it has to be what would affect the greatest number of people in the legislature so that they can provide the funds to the recommendations of the TxDOT Commission. That is, to me, the most important thing that we do.

MS. MAYS: Okay. What would that be? So let's just take corridors where TxDOT has a role to play. We have several here. We have system capacity operations, we have connectivity, of course, the last mile of our roadways, you know, connectivity between border crossings and regions. There's roadway safety, you know. So of those, which ones would you like if you were to pick, you know, what to emphasize?

MR. VALE: I think the -- well, the corridors affect everything. They affect all the people in Texas. They affect the crossing points, the ports of entry, all of that. If you have to highlight something for the State of Texas economy, it's going to be driven by corridors.
MS. MAYS: I agree, I totally agree. So that's why I'm trying to pin you guys on how do we frame that.

MR. SCHWEBEL: You know, my recommendation would be that we start off with economic competitiveness, mobility reliability, and Texas-Mexico coordination/collaboration.

MR. VALE: That's a good way to put it. It's still a corridor.

MS. MAYS: Gerry, that's on the system-wide policies, so now let's do border crossing and corridor. The border crossings, which two or three?

MR. SCHWEBEL: Mobility and safety, perhaps security because security is such a critical issue on mobility, good or bad.

MS. MAYS: Okay. You guys talking about border wait times, is that something that we want to highlight? A lot of discussion on border delays, border wait times.

That's --

MR. ZAPATA: Caroline, this is David. I guess I'm curious to see whether members may agree the importance of mobility reliability, operational efficiency, will that cover the importance of processes at the border that influence the crossing time?

MS. MAYS: Yeah. That's the same thing I was trying to ask and turn them on since we had a lively
discussion on border delays and border wait times.

MR. SCHWEBEL: I'm just saying that mobility
reliability, that I would add operational
efficiency/system capacity.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Any other thoughts from any
other members?

MAYOR SAENZ: Caroline, this is Mayor Saenz. I
agree with all of that, but ultimately I think it's the
cost to the consumer, the inefficiencies, the lack of
fluidity will eventually cost someone their time and as
far as the goods, simply because it's taking too long to
be transported. But I think it's reflected somewhere in
there. I just want to make that point that, you know,
ultimately the consumer pays for all of this.

MS. MAYS: Yes. Okay, great.

Donald, you want to go to the programs?

MR. LUDLOW: Sure. Let's go to the programs
next and discuss this similarly. Is there anything that
really jumps to the surface here in terms of the key
programs that should be emphasized?

And again, the programs are a step below the
policies in terms of their depth. These are kind of
specific actions typically requiring partnerships to be
able to advance specific initiatives. Is there anything
in here?
For example, we heard a lot about assessing connectivity issues, especially connecting border crossings within the United States and in Mexico. Is there anything else in here or is this list largely reflective of the things that are already priorities?

MR. VALE: You know, when you're talking about trucks, I think you need to get John Esparza to tell us a lot, or at least to share what are the things that are affecting the industry that create additional costs to the consumers, that kind of stuff, and the same thing with the railroads.

MR. ESPARZA: Sam, thank you. And I'll share, you know, we've spent quite a bit of time ensuring that there's a lot of those inclusions in there. And based on what we've discussed so far, I feel pretty confident that we've got a number of those items -- and I know there's a number of other folks on this group as well that might even identify other areas that we haven't.

But I'm impressed with the thoroughness of how we've gone through and executed -- not just on the recommendations but very diligently found a lot of items that are impacting everybody and certainly for the trucking industry as well.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, great. Any other thoughts or comments here? I appreciate your comments too, John.
MR. SCHWEBEL: This is Gerry. Under programs and border crossings, I'm just wondering if -- I like to inform and educate stakeholders, but I want to make sure that when we're talking about the stakeholders, you know, all stakeholders, because you've got private and public stakeholders. You know, it's a constant education of our public city council members and the MPOs and counties.

You know, it's a constant education. We in the private sectors have to make sure that they're also informed, because a lot of decisions are made at the local and county level as well that feed up to the state, and vice versa. I don't know if we can distinguish that, and I welcome input from others.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah -- sorry, go ahead, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: No, I was just going to say absolutely, Gerry. I think the whole stakeholder engagement -- and you said all stakeholders.

If you all remember, maybe almost three years ago when you guys were doing the blueprint, that was a key area that you guys identified as a key strategic area that we really need to focus on. And I think with the Border Master Plan, it still continues to highlight that. That's a key area that needs to be addressed, and there's kind of several areas.

You know, engaging the public sector in terms...
of investing in the border crossing and engaging the private sector as well, but also the kind of educational piece, educating all users and way beyond the border. So this is like kind of a big area that I think we need to explore more on how best to do that education but also to facilitate better decision-making, you know, through education and awareness.

MR. VALE: You know, Caroline, once the TxDOT Commission has approved the master plan, whatever it is that they approve, I think that we can spend an entire meeting trying to go over the different types of educational efforts, because they are so multi-faceted and they touch so many industries from contractors to trucking companies to the mom-and-pop stores. All of those are affected by how we educate both the state and federal entities and work through our friends on the primary source of revenue which is the federal government.

MS. MAYS: No, absolutely, because you're right. And that's why I said this is a much broader issue that I think it's going to be part of what BTAC moves forward with helping us facilitate.

Because you have got the users of the system both on the people side but also on the trade side, then you've got the infrastructure providers -- a lot of you are infrastructure providers, us and federal level. But
then there's the regulatory piece, and you have people
that are regulating or making policies on the border that
have to be educated and also engaged in those. And then
there's just the outsiders -- you know, when I say
outsiders, the people that don't live at the border that
are not really involved in the border and how that
impacts -- if I'm in Iowa, you know, how the Texas-Mexico
Border impacts me.

So a lot of that will come into play, you're
absolutely right. It's very complex. It's very multi-
faceted, and it will be interesting to see, you know, how
BTAC and all the other stakeholders, you know, help us to
facilitate that key issue. And then also, it relates to
collaboration and the coordination that Gerry mentioned
earlier, as well.

MR. VALE: The players on the legislative side
are constantly changing, so it's not like we're repeating
ourselves. Many times, it's new. I can remember a little
over a year ago, Caroline, you and Gerry and several of us
were testifying before a House committee meeting in
Laredo.

They were clueless as to what we're talking
about here. We can talk to each other pretty well. They
had no idea about what we're talking about.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And again, I think that's
what we all have to work collectively to be proactive in educating the different facets of, you know, the stakeholders that we're going to be targeting.

Okay. Any other comments from BTAC on the programs?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. The next three slides summarize the project recommendations, and we'll go on to those just for a moment each. This one summarizes total project recommendations, the next one is by time frame, and the last one is by geography and time frame.

So are there any key points here that the BTAC would like to make, any key messages that need to really rise to the surface on the project recommendations, besides the fact that there’s more -- around three-quarters of them are unfunded?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. So going once. If not, we'll move to this last piece, and this is a segue into our final discussion which we will lead into in just a moment.

But the idea here is, what are the key points for advancing the Border Master Plan and advancing border transportation infrastructure in general, and again, we mentioned this in the executive summary: strengthening
the partnerships, engaging BTAC in implementation of recommendations, pivoting stakeholders from planning to implementation.

MR. CALVO: Hey, Donald, this is Eduardo here. I think this goes to the same comment that I made for the last page of the executive summary.

If this is the last slide, you know, this really should be -- this is a punchline, and especially if we are presenting this to the Commission, and really the Commission in this case, you know, they deal mostly with funding for projects. Right?

So for this particular audience, I think we need a stronger message to say that whether it's a program or a project, at the end of the day we need funding. And you know, for all the reasons that we have explained and all that, the importance of the border and all the trade and the movement of people and goods and all that, but at the end of the day it's funding.

So should we have a stronger punchline saying, hey, at the end of the day, you guys need to put money into the border projects?

MR. LUDLOW: I think that's a really good point, Eduardo. Do others have any similar reaction?

MR. VALE: I would say that he is 150 percent correct.
(Simultaneous discussion.)

MR. CORONADO: -- this is David. Sorry -- I think that he is absolutely right. I think that that probably has to made, that statement, right at the onset, you know, from the very beginning about the needs that we have in the border communities, perhaps not towards the end. Right? Just lead with that. I think, you know, drive the message across from the get-go.

MR. VALE: And it affects every part of Texas.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So lead with the funding gap that's affecting not only the border region but every part of Texas and close with that same thought and then backing it up with the key story that's in the Border Master Plan. Right?

MR. SCHWEBEL: I ditto everyone's comments. I compare this to an opportunity at the very end for the Secretary. To use an analogy, this is a Gordon Gekko moment where you can tell the story that trade, you know, is good -- like what he said, greed is good -- well, trade is good, efficiency of supply chains is good for Texas and for the entire region, North America region. So this is an opportunity for a powerful message.

MR. CALVO: And again, those statements here in this slide, I mean, they're -- it's not that they're inaccurate, but, you know, words like strengthening,
engaging, pivoting -- like no, show me the money. Yeah, I
mean, just phrase it in a nice way. Right?

But, you know, after all these strong arguments
that were made to them and great data that we're showing
about the border reports and all that, you know, the
punchline seems a little too vanilla.

MR. ALDRETE: Maybe investing, using the word
"investing" because maybe that is what is needed.

MR. VALE: Money talks, the rest walk.

MS. MAYS: So Eduardo, certainly what I think
you're suggesting, I think all of you are suggesting is,
one, we need to add a funding component here and however
those suggestions are put out, kind of in language --
because the funding is not just TxDOT. So I think a
commitment from all stakeholders to fund and implement the
recommendations that are being laid out in the plan. So
something to that effect, because broadly the funding is
not just TxDOT.

You all have, you know, projects that you're
funding, the feds on both sides and other stakeholders on
both sides, so I think the funding component needs to be a
little bit broader, so kind of a commitment to that is a
key statement that I think hopefully gets to you guys'
point that we need to add that element in this closing
slide.
MR. CALVO: Yes, and it goes to the point, Caroline, that we were discussing earlier, too, that, you know, we've got multiple audiences. Right? But this one specifically is for the Commission, so I believe -- I'm thinking that the message to the Commission has to be more on funding.

Now, if this presentation is prepared for perhaps a member of Congress or more to the federal agencies, yeah, clearly it's funding but maybe it's more geared also towards the policies and help us get CBP put more agents so that we have more inspection booths open and stuff like that. But this one, I think, for the Commission, I think it's more specific on, you know, the message is, we need funding.

MR. ERDMAN: Caroline, this is Warren Erdman with Kansas City Southern. I strongly support this suggestion for adding a funding element to the conclusion page.

I would just share with everyone that yesterday I was involved in a U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting where we were discussing their outreach to the Biden administration transition, and in the process of that outreach there was a lot of conversation about a bipartisan infrastructure funding program to come early in the Biden administration, which would be the single
biggest source of funding, and that coupled with private sector funding of projects, much as Kansas City Southern is privately funding its own project, it seems to me that there has to be an element of funding from multiple sources -- as, Caroline, you described earlier -- in this closing page.

MS. MAYS: Okay. No. Thanks for those comments. And I think, absolutely, that's what I was trying to get at, that especially to implement all the recommendations out of this Border Master Plan, it's going to require a commitment from everybody, all the project sponsors that were identified in the plan. And certainly TxDOT, the Commission knows that on the roadway side, that's where TxDOT has jurisdiction and plays a role in it.

So, you know, any other thoughts? Otherwise, we can go back and kind of craft that message and definitely be able to include another bullet in here on that.

MR. ERDMAN: I think it's important to say federal, state, local and private funding sources.

MS. MAYS: Yes, absolutely. Because you have a lot of entities involved in this business of providing infrastructure, you know, and operating and maintaining the system. So yeah, it's a full gamut of things, so I
think, yes, we will add that.

Okay. Any other comments? Donald, do we have anything in the chat box? I don't think so. Okay, we can move on, Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, thank you. This has all been very helpful.

So I think, unless there are any other closing comments, I think we're going to skip this next part and move into the discussion of implementation.

MS. MAYS: Yes.

MR. LUDLOW: All right, sounds good.

So during this portion of our discussion today we will be using Mentimeter, so if you have not logged on already, you may want to do that. Go to www.menti.com, and the code is there, 431446.

And we're going to ask a series of questions to try to really have a discussion today about where we need to go with implementation, what TxDOT and its partners in the U.S. and Mexico need to do next. So we've been talking a lot today about the messaging of the plan, key findings, key take-aways. The discussion right now is intended to really focus on what are the most important next steps? What are the things that need to happen next?

I wanted to start with a question about mainly one thing about this master plan --
MS. MAYS: Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Go ahead, Caroline.

MS. MAYS: If we can pause a second, I wanted to give Secretary Hughs a chance to -- I know that she's spoken a little bit about this, you know, kind of her vision on this.

MR. LUDLOW: Absolutely.

MS. MAYS: Secretary.

SECY. HUGHS: All right, Caroline. Are you asking me to weigh in on what we should highlight?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, kind of your vision, because I know you and I have talked about this kind of, what next in terms of once the plan is done. Kind of what does that look like, and taking it to the next level, to kind of give folks the context for that.

SECY. HUGHS: Sure. Well, I mean, obviously, you know, we've talked about how this group, the work that we do starting in the new year will be important to identify how to best approach highlighting this to policymakers and business leaders. But my vision is that we will hopefully travel and reach out and really have meetings with these key stakeholders to make sure that the plan is in front of them, is very specifically pointed out and addressed, because sometimes just receiving a copy doesn't quite get us where we need to be.
And I think it will be very important to get business leaders, everyone else at the table. So as soon as we're able to travel, or if not, then continuing to do meetings like the ones we've had with the governors in the Mexican states and other policymakers I think will be key.

But I don't know if you're wanting me to share more specifics than that at this point, but I think having some kind of a group within this group that continues with the work, much like these meetings that you've been having regionally to put the report together, I think just as important we need to make sure we have those meetings after the report is concluded.

And to Sam's point and some of the other comments that were made, the legislators whose constituents will be impacted by this, whether they're along the border or not, I think it's very important that that story be told as well.

MS. MAYS: Thank you so much, Secretary, for those insights. And certainly that's in line with what we're trying to present today or have a discussion is, we're nearing the completion of the plan and kind of what next, to start thinking about how we go about advancing or realizing the recommendations of the plan that you all have talked a lot about. How do you move this from a plan to actual tangible actionable items and time frames for
doing that? So that's what we're trying to do here, and
Donald will lead this discussion.

Donald, please go ahead. And we'll expand the
interactive, so you can do Menti but also you can do like
we've done before, verbal comments as well. Thank you.
Donald, you might be on mute.

MR. LUDLOW: I was on mute. Thank you.

So this is an opportunity, if there's one
thing, you know, if you were in Washington, D.C., Austin,
Mexico City, Chihuahua, what's the one thing you would
want policy or business leaders in the U.S. and Mexico to
know about the Border Master Plan, about the challenges
that we're facing? So we'll give everyone a moment here
to kind of jump in.

So economic competitiveness and connectivity on
the border; the wait times; opportunities for social and
intellectual intercultural development; community ties;
efficiency; funding, so show me the money, as Eduardo
said; dedicated commitment to increasing and improving
streams of revenue, so again more on the money.

Are there other thoughts or comments here? The
reason why we wanted to ask this question first is because
some of the subsequent questions are really focused on the
actions needed to implement what's in the Border Master
Plan, so just wanted to highlight some of the things you
thought were most important. Well-coordinated investment
efforts.

So some of the key themes here: funding,
coordination, efficiency, overcoming some of the
impediments on the wait times and really making sure that
the border story is told, which is what's highlighted in
the yellow box. Scale and importance of the border. And
again, this also helps us go back and make sure we're
integrating any key messages in the executive summary and
the Transportation Commission PowerPoint as well.

Very good. Alejandro, did you have any follow-
up questions you wanted to ask here to prompt any more
discussion?

MR. SOLIS: No. I think that it revolves
around the topics that we heard from the committee earlier
today. It's about the economy, the importance of the
border, telling that story, and then, of course, backing
it up with the funding that is needed. So I think that
that is kind of the overarching topic here.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And again, really here we're
looking for this broad, you know, statement from committee
members so we can again articulate the message moving
forward, you know, as Secretary mentioned, really
communicating this later, but also now as we get to the
Questions are going to be asked, you know, what is the ask, you know, policymakers, or even like the Commission, what's the ask for the Commission. So I think some of the statements can help. Sam, to your point, what's the ask of the legislators and being able to articulate a lot of things you guys are highlighting right now, it's really, really helpful, tremendously helpful.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good. All of this is important and helps us frame this going forward. Is there anything else? Secretary Hughes, do you have anything else to add before we move on to the next one?

SECY. HUGHES: I don't. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. So short-term investments need to address current needs. So we're going to get into the short-term investments here in just a moment.

So we first talked about what's the most important thing you would tell somebody, including a business or a policy leader, about what we've done, about what BTAC has done in developing this Border Master Plan. Let's think ahead into the future just a little bit, not too far ahead in the future, but let's maybe think about 2025-2026.

Let's say that we've had five years to work on
BTMP recommendations. Putting on your thinking caps, your creative visioning here, what should the border transportation system ideally look like in five years? What are the conditions and outcomes that we would want to see now and just a few years down the road?

And in a moment, we're going to back into some of those actions, but wanted you to kind of envision what does it look like? What are its characteristics in five years ideally if we all collectively have done a good job in implementing this and making the key arguments for the things that are needed?

So we've got sustainability, best managed and operated border infrastructure that increases through-put, better fluidity. Great. This is all excellent. We're looking for some of these kind of aspirational visions of what ideally would support commerce and people movement the best in the future. Modern, efficient, well-connected, dignified.

And if anybody would like to elaborate on their comments, that would be fantastic as well.

MR. SOLIS: Donald, what I was going to suggest is maybe if operating, really more the sustainability. Sustainability has many different aspects, so if there's any one in particular that you guys would like to highlight, I think that would be very useful for our
purposes.

MR. CALVO: Donald, this is Eduardo. It seems like, you know, five years is like tomorrow. I mean, five years is a very, very short period of time, so I think the question really for five years is, you know, what are the things that we can do right now that can give us a big benefit in the short term. Right?

Because if we're thinking about, you know, big infrastructure projects, you know, like build a new bridge or expand a bridge, you know, those projects take so long to develop and build and all that, so that's beyond the five years. So I'm thinking that the answer to the question has to do more with over a short term it should be more like, you know, make sure that all the inspection booths are open, you know, that we implement better coordinated strategies to make the inspections of people and trucks and stuff and planes and all that, make it faster, like with technology.

What are some of the things that we can implement relatively quickly? There's a lot of technology that already exists today but it's more the political will of the federal agencies on both sides to implement them.

And maybe I'm not, you know, catching or hearing the question, but I don't necessarily see the infrastructure in five years because, again, it takes so
long to develop these projects. However, for the same
good reason that it takes so long we have to get them funded
today because the lead time is long.

So maybe one of the things that we need to see
over the next five years is a sustainable funding
mechanism that allows us to start developing those
projects.

MR. VALE: You know, Eduardo, this is Sam. One
of the things that a lot of people seem to pass over too
often is that the greatest delays are not caused by
infrastructure but rather the federal process on both
sides.

If you put a number to them, you'll see how
much that is relative to the infrastructure. Of course
you need more infrastructure but you need more efficient
federal processes. That's why things like unified cargo
processing, all of those simplifications in working
together, thinking of the border as one border but one
port also, both sides need to work as one.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. And so if I can go back to
Eduardo's comments, and I think, Donald, what he's asking
for is maybe we might come to cover that in the next set
of questions, in terms of, you know, what are some of this
low-hanging fruit that can be done to effect change or
improve the border in the next five years.
MR. LUDLOW: Right. And I think maybe this question, if we added the words: After implementing the short-term BTMP recommendations, what should the border transportation system ideally look like in five years? So yeah, this is very much focused on what could be done in the near term.

We have another question later on about the far longer term future. I think many of these questions are in line with that, including some of these comments including related to improving the management and technology and funding for the border region.

And Eduardo, if you wanted to add anything on operations, keeping lanes open, those kinds of things, those are all really important too, but we will be getting into that in a little bit more detail in the subsequent slides.

The take-away here, as I look at this, is that a lot of these comments are related to making improvements to efficiency, fluidity, funding, connectivity, you know, in the near term, within the bounds of what TxDOT and its partners are able to do under a short time period.

Are there other comments or questions here, or thoughts?

(No response.)

MR. LUDLOW: Alejandro prompted whoever said
“sustainable” to elaborate. If anybody would like to elaborate on any of these, “sustainable” or “dignified,” I think that would be very helpful if you're willing to chime in.

MS. MAYS: There's a comment from Pete that operation improvements by federal agencies generally cost a lot less than building roadway infrastructure. So certainly in the short term focusing on some of those operational improvements, process improvements that Sam continues to highlight is important, as well as, you know, just management of existing infrastructure to maximize the capacity that we have.

So this is some of the things to think of in short term. I think some of it is highlighted here, Donald.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, I think the comment in the top middle highlighted with the yellow border is in line with Pete's comment: best managed and operated border infrastructure that increases through-put supports continued economic competitiveness. So I think a lot of this in the near term vision is really about a border that operates well, really well.

MR. VALE: And then define what that actually means. That's a big, big powerful statement but you're going to have to break it down underneath somewhere of
what does that really mean: best managed and operated
border infrastructure. Well, that's a complicated
statement right there. It's correct, but it's
complicated.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, certainly. This again gives
us ideas of what the thought process of the committee is.
Donald, for interests of time, let's move to
the other questions because I think we still have a lot
more to get.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good. Thank you for the
feedback on this first one. So let's move ahead to the
next.

So here we have the opportunity to do some
ranking and we're going to start with the policies. We
did a little bit of this before, and there's three
questions on policies.

The first one is kind of ranking the system-
wide policies, and thank you, Kelli or Hannah, for putting
that up. This kind of puts it into context. So we've got
our system-wide policies, we've got our border crossing
policies, and our corridor policies, and just wanted to
get your idea in terms of ranking those for
implementation, how should these be --

MR. VALE: Well, I don't like the word ranking.
I would say some other word than ranking.
MS. MAYS: Prioritized.

MR. VALE: Prioritized, okay.

MS. MAYS: So really the goal is here is to
gauge you all in terms of priority, you know, in terms of
implementation, what are some of the things that bubble
up. So we want to get kind of an idea as we start moving
into implementation mode to see which areas of this policy
recommendations we should really focus on, and then kind
of peeling the onion and engaging you come next year and
engaging the border stakeholders, as we mentioned earlier,
both public and private.

So we just wanted to get that. And we're going
to ask the BNSRCs and others kind of similar things so we
can, again, start, you know, framing and focusing on some
of the key priority areas.

So Donald, we opened the Menti?

MR. LUDLOW: Yes, it should be available,
should be able to input. And maybe we could move the
other graph -- this slide off, so we can see the --

MS. MAYS: And then again, I failed to mention
earlier, the Menti is exclusively for BTAC members. If
you're not a member, please do not participate in the
Menti, because again, it's the committee input that is
required right now. If your name wasn't called and you're
not on the committee, please do not do that. Thank you.
MR. LUDLOW: All right. Well, we appreciate you providing input here. This looks like it's changing dynamically.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. We still need a few more minutes, we only have five now. So if we have -- I think we had over 20 committee members present, so looking for everybody to participate, every single one of you.

This is crucial to hear from you all. We've got seven. We still have a lot of you that haven't participated yet.

MR. VALE: Do we pick more than one?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, you should be able to prioritize it.

MR. VALE: Okay.

MS. MAYS: If your number one -- you can only pick one number one or one number two, so you've got to go down the list and pick your number one through number eight -- to nine. So might need a little bit more time to allow committee members to go one by one and pick what the rankings -- you know, what their priority areas are.

MR. VALE: What if you like the ones that are there?

MS. MAYS: That's fine. Then you just pick that as your number one and they stay the way they are.

Again, this is just to help us see where you guys' thought
processes are in terms of priority areas to focus on. These are policy areas, and certainly you're seeing on the competitiveness, cross-border resiliency popping up because of COVID. We're living COVID today.

But also collaboration continues to be the number one issue. So this is consistent with what we had before, but at least we wanted to have this kind of documented so that we have a framework or basis for when we start moving forward with implementing or advancing the recommendations of the plan. We have a place to start.

We're about 12. We're still missing a couple of you, so we'll give you another minute or two, committee members. There's a lot of you present, please participate. We've got 13, still missing a lot.

(Pause.)

SECY. HUGHS: Caroline, will you remind me if I get a vote?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, in this case you can. Yeah, you can. This is, again, just dialogue. Yes, Secretary, absolutely.

Sam, you're laughing.

MR. SCHWEBEL: That's the one that counts the most.

MR. VALE: I was going to say, you really can't say no.
(General laughter.)

MS. MAYS: Okay, Donald, maybe another 30 seconds, then we'll move to the next question. But if you want to kind of summarize this, and I think it's fairly consistent with what we've heard throughout the BTMP process.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, absolutely. So we had some early vacillation between coordination, collaboration, cooperation, and a few other issues, including economic competitiveness. But ultimately, it's this idea of continued collaboration that is at the top of the heap for system-wide policies in the near term.

Cross-border resiliency, technologies, economic competitiveness are all really critical. And this largely reflects the kind of ranking that the BTAC has done in the past on the weighting for some of the prioritization and goal-setting as well. So we appreciate this.

I think we probably need to move on.

MS. MAYS: Yes. Thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you. So the next question is similar. This one is basically for the most important priorities to implement for the short term for border crossing policies, so specifically related to border crossing, and there aren't as many in this particular category so this may not take quite as much time. Please
go ahead and vote on your preferences here.

MS. MAYS: And then similar to the other one, you know, your priority one, two, three and four on just this. Again, very specific to border crossings.

(Pause.)

MS. MAYS: Still need more of you. I think the last one we had 14 or 15 so we're getting the numbers up. Good job.

SECY. HUGHS: Do we want to talk about, maybe while we're thinking about it, you know, to the extent that you've identified that maybe the order present might be the way to go -- kind of how that conclusion was reached or talk a little bit more about operational efficiency versus system capacity. Safety and security is always a challenge to put further down the road, but then in terms of efficiencies in moving things, it makes sense that it does fall lower down in the categories.

But I wonder if a little discussion about that might be a little helpful while we wait for more people to weigh in.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely, we can open it up to BTAC members to weigh in on this. But I think the story is a little bit consistent with what we've heard, you know, so far that operational efficiency is more what's happening kind of on the federal compound but also
on the corridors as well or highways.

And then, you know, system capacity, there's a lot of discussions about expanding existing border crossings, building new ones. And of course, funding becomes part of the whole equation. So it's kind of interesting now, funding has jumped to number two.

So anybody wants to comment broadly here, as Secretary mentioned?

MR. VALE: Operational efficiency is clearly extremely important -- the hardest thing to control, but it's the most important.

MR. ERDMAN: I would add to that that over a five-year horizon it's pretty hard to do meaningful capacity increases unless you're focused on operational efficiency. So in that short time frame, operational efficiency has to be the focus, and over a longer time frame, increasing capacity, and of course, safety and security goes with all of these.

MS. MAYS: Yes. Awesome. That's great. Any other comments?

MR. LUDLOW: Great. It seems like we're getting to a certain equilibrium point here like we did last time. We've reached 15, so I think we'll go ahead and move on to the next one.

And so this is a similar set of
prioritization. This time it's focused on corridors. So thinking about anywhere from the last mile section of the corridor out to the longer-distance multimodal corridors that you saw on some of the maps today connecting Texas and Mexico.

And one of the questions here, one of the categories is first-to-last mile connectivity versus maybe border crossings and regional connectivity. You have the opportunity to kind of differentiate a little bit depending on your view from the ground.

Alejandro, did you want to add anything else here to this discussion or make any notes about any of the policies that are proposed here?

MR. SOLIS: Not really, Donald. I think that we'll see how the voting goes and then we can try to look at that once we get a few more hits.

MR. LUDLOW: So again, it looks like mobility reliability from the operational standpoint is favored, so far, as kind of the top priority.

The policy on connectivity border regions and crossings, this has come up many times in our discussions, and the reference here is to not only connecting U.S. and Mexico but also connecting crossings within the U.S. and within Mexico. That's at least what we had interpreted and intended. Part of that was due to the need for
greater resiliency and redundancy, the ability to be able
to shift between crossings when needed.

Caroline, do you have anything else to add here
as the group continues to --

MS. MAYS: No. This is, again, consistent with
what we've heard. I think this validates a lot of things,
so it’s really kind of great to hear. Again, open up for
any verbal comments if anybody wants to make comments
here.

We're about 12. We're kind of missing a couple
of you, so please, if you can up the number a little bit,
that would be great. I think we're at 15 or 17, so we're
missing about three people at least. So if you can please
provide that.

But you know, for the most part, I think it's
consistent. Any comments from anybody?

I know, Sam, you talked a lot about
connectivity between border crossings in the event of some
type of disruption. We saw that very clearly when Laredo
World Trade a couple of years ago had the tornado hit it,
and we needed connectivity to and access to Colombia
Bridge.

So again, we have real life examples of why
that is so important, and like Donald mentioned, both on
the Mexican side but also on the Texas side -- U.S. side.
SECY. HUGHS: Caroline, this is Ruth Hughes. You know, I think, it was Ed that made the point earlier about whatever order these are in, safety and security are underlying any of the others being able to move forward, and I worry too that sometimes safety and security are oftentimes politically charged in terms of those words and that may not need its own section.

So I say that just as a thought or maybe conversation about whether it needs to be maybe embedded in some of these other areas rather than have its own distinct prioritization.

MR. VALE: I think that's an excellent point -- this is Sam -- and primarily because safety and security, to me safety is like how safe is the infrastructure. Security, I think, can be interpreted in a lot of different ways.

And so to me safety is always -- well, we all have to deal with OSHA. We all have to follow the regulations. So that to me is a safety issue in the way we're operating. The security, I think that means protect us from something.

MR. ERDMAN: I strongly support the Secretary's observation because safety and security are improved with all of these actions.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. So I'll give you guys a
little bit of a different twist. You know, TxDOT and both
at the federal level, safety is always considered the key
core element of our work efforts, although they are
embedded in others, but generally highlighted.

We have FMCSA on the call today and generally
they look at that from a safety perspective. They have
the metrics on the safety side. We at TxDOT, safety is
one of our core, you know, objectives or strategic goals
that we look at it on crashes on our highway system and to
be able to address that.

I know Commissioner Ryan is here, she's our
safety commissioner, and we look at that mission here how
we can, you know, reduce crashes and fatalities on our
roadways. Railroads as well focus specifically on safety.

So that's why we have it highlighted by itself,
because we have requirements on the federal side, you
know, and the state side to really hone in to safety and
see how we address that. You know, on the highway side,
there’s specific funding just for safety that we have to
make sure that we implement those projects and measure the
effectiveness of those projects to address safety issues,
safety hot spots, et cetera. So that's the only reason
that we have it separated here.

But yes, if you improve mobility and
reliability, if you improve last mile, certainly you're
impacting safety and you're improving safety. Because if you go and remove, you know, stoplights and stop signs, et cetera, and widen the roadway, put shoulders, you're improving connectivity, but also you're indirectly or directly improving safety.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Well, Caroline, I think we may be -- was there another comment or question?

MR. GARCIA: This is Josue.

I think that a lot of the other remaining issues that we talked about was the security and the safety on the Mexican side as commercial and POVs make their way to the border. I think in our earlier discussions when we first started this out, I think that was something that really came out and I think that's why that's there and I think it's very important that we highlight that.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely. So thank you.

MR. LUDLOW: Yeah. So we have a series of three more here before we get into projects, and these are focused on critical programs. And of course, there were 182 programs, and if there's a program that we have not listed, we simply have listed some of the key programs that the BTAC and others have mentioned continuously.

So this first piece is about, what are the most critical programs to implement in the short term focused
on border crossings. And we're getting into more specifics here, instead of saying mobility and reliability, we're saying expand the use of technology, inform and educate stakeholders on funding opportunities. So these are more tactical in nature than the higher-level policies.

So this is an opportunity to prioritize these, and if there's another key program that is perhaps from the list of 182 in the chapter or something else that comes to mind, you can certainly put that in the available space at the bottom. So let's see how this plays out as well.

So again, I'll just kind of repeat the ones we're considering right now for border crossing programs. The ones that came up consistently were: expanding the use of technology; informing and enabling the stakeholders on funding and financing; studies to separate commercial passenger and other modal conflicts; and expanding the use of expedited inspection programs.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and again, Donald, I want to make clear to BTAC this was just representative, you know, programs for border crossings, so please feel free to add additional here. We're not saying that this it because we have issues with border delays. That's a key issue. Yes, we talked about expedited inspection but addressing border
delays is something that we heard over and over again, especially when it comes to border crossings.

You know, Sam, you guys have talked a lot about, you know, hours for border operations and all the other things. Again, unlike the policies where we actually have specifics, this is just a representative sample, and you know, really wanted to kind of gauge you guys on this one.

These are not the key ones. I just want to kind of make clear that these are just samples of the programs at this point.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you for clarifying that some, Caroline.

And I also mistakenly indicated that you could add an additional program on Mentimeter but that is not possible. If there's something else you think is important, you can click on the category for "Other" and then add a comment in the comment box here on Webex.

So Gerry, for example, says, Under “other” for this slide, I would go back to an earlier comment about processing. We have various examples of interrupters or external factors that impact the process that creates border delays.

Jake asks, Is it expand or expedite for number 2? And it's kind of a play on words here, Jake. The
language is close. It's “expand the use of expedited inspection programs.” In other words, make those expedited inspection programs more widely available for both commercial vehicles and rail, the supporting facilities and other infrastructure and technology that's needed to do that programmatic infrastructure.

I hope that helps.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and I think, Gerry, that's like expanding, you know, UCP use at border crossings, joint inspections. Even with, for instance, Laredo, at the airport, they do have kind of that joint U.S.-Mexico inspection of air cargo and passengers. So this is some of the things that that's getting to.

But again, we want to emphasize this is just a sample, so there are many other critical policy recommendations that relate to border crossings that has been discussed and you guys have brought it up.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good. Caroline, how many more would you like us to have here before we move on?

MS. MAYS: We have about ten so give another 30 seconds to make sure we get in a few more, but if not, then we can move on.

(Pause.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Why don't we move on.

So again, this is an opportunity to provide some
prioritization for corridor programs, and again, these are a sample.

And the four that were most commonly cited were: multimodal integrated corridor and connectivity studies, basically understanding the kinds of improvements that need to take place on those specific corridors; improving connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists, especially given the massive increase in the number of pedestrians and bicycles using the border crossings; support a better allocation of funds to designated corridors; and educating and training users of the border crossings and corridors on the practices and regulations, and this was related to helping carriers, drivers and others essentially become better users of the border, to be prepared for what they would need to experience as they went through the processing.

MR. VALE: You know, I might comment on one thing here, and that is I don't think there's a single corridor that was established ten years or more ago that has been completed completely into Canada or Mexico.

MS. MAYS: Sam, I'm not sure if it's the last ten years, but I can tell you that I-35 is probably the best example. That connects with MX-85 in Mexico, and then in Canada the 401 connects with I-35 somewhere up north.
MR. VALE: In every one -- I've seen breaks in
every one, not just some of the smaller breaks but every
one that doesn't have a nonstop kind of corridor. Now,
that may have changed in the last six months or a year,
but the last time I was up, they all had some kind of a
break, including 35.

MS. GARZA-REYES: And it's always going to be
difficult to get to that because of funding. We just have
to continue -- I know, Sam, you do a very good job of
really enforcing that. As much as we want to change all
these things, if we can't sustain funding, these projects,
everything is going to continue just sitting on the shelf.

MR. VALE: Correct.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and I think to those points,
Cynthia and Sam, I think we showed in the executive
summary the kind of continental U.S. and Mexico map and
showed some of the key corridors, highway corridors
connecting ports like Matzatlán, Topolobambo, all the way
to our border crossings. And then connecting all the way
at points north, rail as well, and then including our
ports. And then the first map, we showed kind of a
conceptual map showing kind of how all of that radiates.

And I think that's really the message we're
trying to make here is that, you know, for border trade to
continue, you need these corridors to move things through
the border crossings. And they have to be connected, because if you have one side of the border well-connected by either highway or rail and the other side is not, that border crossing is certainly going to be underutilized, and we talked a lot about that.

And the ones that are kind of almost overutilized, it's because they have great rail, great highway connections and it provides the ability of transporting those goods efficiently. Yes, you've got kind of choke points in the system, whether it's at the border crossing or in the urban areas.

So I think that's really kind of what we're trying to do here is to paint that picture that we need to invest in this corridor so it can be seamless, that there's no breaks. I-69 is an example of that. It's a corridor but it's not all interstate, you know, so again --

MR. VALE: And two-thirds of the consumer market in the United States is east of a line from Laredo straight north.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely.

MR. LUDLOW: All right. So I think we've come to a stabilization point. Let's do this last one and maybe we can do this one relatively quickly and move on to the projects.
But in this last category, this is a catch-all. So these are programs related to short-term improvements on both borders and corridors, so this is for the crossings and the corridors.

And again, the category is: explore mechanisms to facilitate Texas-Mexico collaboration, coordination, and cooperation -- a lot of that obviously has happened during this process, and what's extending that in the future; looking at stakeholder groups, specific kind of working groups potentially or regional groups to explore specific issues; addressing/assessing connectivity issues between the specific corridors; and developing systems to collect and analyze real-time traffic information.

So again, this is a sample, this is not completely comprehensive, but these are some of the areas that continue to rise to the surface. So we'll take some input on this for maybe the next minute.

(Pause.)

MR. LUDLOW: Are there any questions or comments about any of the areas, or anything that we're missing here?

MS. MAYS: We have some more coming in, Donald, so --

MR. LUDLOW: Okay.

MS. MAYS: I believe people are commenting.
Sam, do you have something to say?

(Pause.)

MR. VALE: Caroline, I would point out that I learned something from California a couple of days ago, that they set up some chat calls on a daily schedule for people. A small group of people, particularly the federal agencies and then a few private sectors.

They're very inefficient, but they're the only thing that allows them more rapid exchange of ideas in ways to improve border crossings.

MS. MAYS: So they do this on a daily basis?

MR. VALE: Yes. They schedule it but it's not always the same person, but somebody from that entity. And they're very inefficient. Sometimes they don't have enough people, sometimes they do, but it's best they found yet.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Yeah, we'll follow up with you on that, certainly as we go into advancing the plan recommendations and see what are the best practices out there being used in other places.

MR. VALE: Between Alta Mesa and Tijuana. They have a system.

MS. MAYS: Okay.

MR. LUDLOW: Very good.

MS. MAYS: Donald, want to move on?
MR. LUDLOW: Yeah, let's move on. Thank you very much for your comments here.

Now, this next question is a bit more open-ended. We simply wanted to put this out there. And I know many of you have contributed -- most of you have contributed input to the project list that you've developed of the 652 projects.

And we wanted to take some input from the BTAC members about which projects they're familiar with that they believe are most important for implementation, short-term projects in the next one to five years. And again, these may be more operationally focused, they may be smaller projects, they may be things that are already funded and moving along, but wanted to provide the opportunity here on kind of an open-ended basis to do this.

And obviously many of you are representing a specific area or region, and so feel free to input the project or general category of projects that you think is most important over the short term.

Caroline or Alejandro, did you want to elaborate on that, or add anything else?

MS. MAYS: No. I think that's fine. Broadly, you can talk about areas or you can talk about specific projects. I think that's appropriate here because we're
trying to balance kind of broader, you know, border-wide issue areas or projects that address those issue areas, like border wait times or specific projects. We see I-69 here, you know, and other items specific either to your region.

And again, we’re looking at both sides of the border, not just Texas, so our Mexican counterparts, please chime in to this discussion. I failed to mention earlier that this is not one-sided. We want a balanced input here.

MR. VALE: It still comes down to the federal agencies exchanging and cooperating with each other on each side of the border. That's the biggest problem we've got.

MR. LUDLOW: Thank you.

MS. MAY: Absolutely. We're seeing a lot of comments on corridors. Anything on the border side?

(Pause.)

MR. LUDLOW: All right. Someone reported to me that they had lost audio. Can everyone still hear me?

MR. SOLIS: I think that was Caroline, Donald. I think she was in the middle of a sentence and then she lost audio, but I think her comment was there's a lot of --

MS. MAY: I'm back, Alejandro, yeah. I just
lost audio on my phone, so I'm using the computer now.

Yeah, a lot of comments here, and certainly
great to see BCS system being here and other great
comments. Again, this is also going to help Secretary and
I on some of the things to the Commission. You know, what
are the kind of short-term priorities, low-hanging fruit,
to address the immediate needs.

This plan is a long-range plan that has both
short-, medium- and long-term strategies that have been
outlined, but you know, for the short term, what can be
accomplished? And I think this is why this question and
what we're thinking about is that we are less concerned
with what are some of the things that can be done, you
know, in the short term as we move forward with
implementing or working through the bigger, you know, much
longer-term strategies and all that. So this is great
part of input.

Anybody like to elaborate quickly? I know
we're running short on time, but this is great input.

MR. CALVO: Hey, Caroline, this is Eduardo
here.

Yes, this question, you know, it's interesting
to see the answers and all that, but projects are much
more local than programs and policies. Right? So I’m
sure that you're going to start hearing a lot of -- you
know, of course, here in El Paso we're going to be emphasizing for our projects over here related to, you know, on the Texas side related to I-10, 375, you know, the parallel corridors and all that.

I mean, our situation here, in addition to all of the important stuff that crosses from Ciudad Juarez, from the maquilas, the high value stuff and all that, you know, we've got all the stuff that comes into Texas from the West Coast by truck, right? So I think, you know, this question could also be a little misleading in the sense that, you know, the priorities -- because that's what you asked. Right? But again, you're going to find a lot more, you know, localized opinions.

MS. MAYS: Yeah, and that's absolutely fine. Like here we see a lot of specific projects, I-10, certainly, you know, in El Paso and west Texas. We see here Laredo, I-59, Ports-to-Plains, I-27 and all those, which is fine, you know, to be able to do that. Because the Texas border region is vast and it's different, and I think we've tried to articulate that.

So I think, you know, we can discern from the comments here which ones are regional-specific and which ones are kind of broader, for instance BTSF [phonetic]. That's more of a border-wide need and things that we need to look at from a border-wide perspective, so I think
there's a balance here.

That's what Donald mentioned earlier, that each of you are from some region and have your local regional perspective, and it’s okay to articulate that here. But then also the broader border crossing, you know, issue border-wide to synchronize border crossing times on both sides, that will apply to the entire, you know, border region. We have a mixed bag in here, which is -- I think it's okay.

MR. LUDLOW: Great. So, Caroline, this is a great list and, you know, I guess we do have a couple more questions on Mentimeter but I know we're running out of time. What would you like to do? Should we at least put this one up here?

MS. MAYS: Yeah, let’s do that to kind of see the thought process.

MR. LUDLOW: So this question was, what are the top three potential threats or challenges to implementing the BTMP, either the policies, programs, or projects, what are those broad threats? And I think we’ve heard a number of them from you today.

We did have one other question after this was how to confront or how to overcome those threats, and we may not have time to get into a lot of detail on that, but this is an area that we thought was really important to
hear from you.

So lack of funding, that's one that we've heard a number of times today. Are there other institutional external threats or challenges to implementation? So messaging, we’ve heard a lot today about education and the need to really -- you know, I think maybe it was Sam or somebody else said we're really good about talking to ourselves about this stuff, but maybe not so good about talking to other people. So lack of coordination with partners. Okay, coordination of data. I don’t know if anybody wanted to elaborate on the data side, but --

MR. VALE: I think it's convincing the legislature through the TxDOT Commission how these things really benefit everybody. They're not just good for my town or my county, they're good for the whole state. That is the only way you can sell these things.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay, and I think we've heard loud and clear today that there is some additional effort that's needed on the part of BTAC, TxDOT, the Secretary of State's Office in terms of educating and next steps and mobilizing and SCT and the other partners working together to do that. So the story area is really, really important.

These are all very helpful. Telling the story again. It seems like we're getting some consistent
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threats here, funding, story-telling, education, data.

Caroline, did you have anything you wanted to add here? How much further would you and the Secretary like to go? I know we're running up against the hour and I think we needed a few minutes to summarize and provide your closing comments.

MS. MAYS: Donald, how many more questions do you have, one more?

MR. LUDLOW: There's just one more and that one more question is about -- I mean, there were two more but the second one is about the long-term vision that I think we've been -- you know, I don't know that we have time to go into that today.

But I think the next question is on how to overcome these threats, ideas on how to overcome these, and that may be important for us to go to, in just a moment.

MS. MAYS: Secretary, are you okay with that? Maybe we might run about fifteen minutes, five minutes late. And BTAC members okay, so at least we can go into the last question?

SECY. HUGHS: Sure. I do have another meeting so we can try to go a little longer but if I could maybe just briefly provide my closing comments now, in case I have to jump off.
MS. MAYS: Yeah, absolutely.

SECY. HUGHS: And for that I would just mostly indicate that I'm incredibly grateful and impressed, as always, with the engagement of this group and the feedback that we've received. And I just want to remind everyone if you're able to provide public comment next week on December 10 between -- sometime after 11:00, we assume that we'll be done with our presentation and the public is able to weigh in remotely during the TxDOT Commission meeting.

We would very much appreciate that additional support as we provide the plan. I know it's always going to be important to hear from all of you especially because of your own individual leadership roles along the border and in your communities.

So thank you again for all the tremendous work that you do, and I won't further delay since I know we're running late, but look forward to next week and then, of course, continuing the discussion next year as well. And of course, as always, after today's meeting when you've had a chance to review this in more detail or you reflect on it, please feel free to continue to follow up and reach out if you think of anything else.

Thank you.

MR. VALE: Thanks, Secretary Hughes. I think if
we could have a whole meeting just discussing the educational program that we need to implement.

SECY. HUGHS: I agree.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Thank you very much, Secretary, we appreciate it. And maybe in your absence, David can close the meeting once we do the last question.

So Donald, would you like to go to the next question?

MR. LUDLOW: Let's go to the next one. So you’ve listed many, over 16 challenges and threats. A lot of them were in line with funding, education, data, coordination, focus.

What are your ideas on how these challenges can be overcome? Are there tools, resources or partnerships that are most helpful? How do we counter these threats?

Sam has already said we've got to mobilize ourselves to have kind of a unified vision for educating and a plan to educate. That's one. Are there other ways, other mitigating actions that we can take together to overcome some of these threats?

MR. SOLIS: And Donald, Joanne Cisneros contributed something on the chat box, even though she's not a BTAC member. She has an idea about a strong media outreach to kind of -- part of this education but also part of the kind of news information, et cetera. So I
think that’s just something to put out there.

MR. LUDLOW: Okay. So media strategy, education strategy, we'll add that to the list. Somebody has also said better collaboration and coordination.

MS. MAYS: Thank you for that comment.

MR. CALVARIO: Francisco Calvario from SCT.

Good morning, everyone.

MS. MAYS: Hi, Francisco.

MR. CALVARIO: Hi, Caroline.

In Mexico, Erika and myself, mainly, are working with all the Mexican agencies, SAT, SRE, et cetera, both in the operation of the bridges and the crossing points between Texas and Mexico, so we are very interested in the coordination and collaboration with you. Obviously, we may be the most frequent, maybe, to achieve these goals, but we agree with all the comments that we are seeing on the Menti site about collaboration, coordination, funding, et cetera.

And obviously, our port of entry are the very important part of the supply chains, so in the way that we can understand that we are part of the supply chains for medicines, foods, other goods, I think we can achieve more best results in this Border Master Plan.

MS. MAYS: Yeah. Thank you very much,
collaboration. You know, you guys have been great partners with us from day one and we really appreciate that.

But I think it's that continued collaboration with you all, with the federal agencies, state agencies, private sector and all the other partners -- I think, you know, that is one way to accomplish all of this. And again, Francisco, thank you all for your commitment and really being alongside us, you know, the last two years but also even before that through [inaudible] and other organizations, so thank you.

MR. CALVARIO: Okay, sure. You're welcome.

MR. LUDLOW: And Caroline, this is, again, very rich feedback. I'm very appreciative. A lot for TxDOT and the partners to digest.

These comments are really highlighting the continued importance of storytelling, coordination, the messaging, really important. And I think these dovetail nicely into the threats that were outlined earlier. You know, I think these are -- hopefully this is very helpful to you and Secretary Hughs as well as you get ready for the meeting next week.

MS. MAYS: Absolutely, this has been great. Really I'm very pleased with the discussion and dialogue and the input today, and especially this portion. Because
we've kind of been talking about the time but now it's time to start thinking moving forward what we're thinking, so really appreciate that. I know we've taken a lot of folks' time and we will definitely continue some of this dialogue moving forward.

There are things that definitely come next year you all will have to help us kind of start going into a little bit more detail than what we're doing now. But this is good. It’s a lot to digest and a lot to kind of think about and hopefully bring back to you at later meetings, in terms of how we move forward with implementation.

So with that, really in closing, Secretary already did her closing remarks. We're going to Commission next week, and you know, our next meeting on this task is going to be competitive, so stay tuned for the date. We're working with Secretary Hughes on the date for that meeting.

I know in previous meetings we’ve mentioned that we'd go to the Commission in January for the plan adoption, and right now that has now been officially postponed to February, because we need to come back with public comment here. And if we try to go to the Commission in January, we would not have enough time to do that.
So, you know, we're looking at the public comment period ending sometime in January and then having the plan -- you know, presenting the plan to Commission for adoption in February. So that's kind of the loosey-goosey timeline that we have right now.

But again, I just want to thank each and every one of you for your participation today. Like always, please send us any comments you may have. We still have the executive summary that we're looking for comments on.

There's a lot of edits that went into that. Take time to review that and provide us with your comments. I think that probably may be the most immediate need that we have from you for your feedback.

The Commission PowerPoint, if you have any ideas beyond what you shared with us today, please feel free to send us an email on that. And then definitely the final report, I mentioned the BNSRC meetings, and I mentioned that. Please do review the document, and if you can't review the entire document and the chapters, just focus on those and provide us your feedback so that we can, you know, at least get into the next final draft that is represented your perspective.

As Eduardo Calvo mentioned, the project list, we're working on that. We're cleaning that up and it's
still a work in progress, but I think we're making progress on it.

So with that really I want to wish everybody safe holidays, wishing all you guys a very merry Christmas and happy holidays.

And I'll open it up for any final comments before David with the Secretary of State's Office makes a motion to adjourn. Any comments from the committee members, any last words?

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Caroline. This is Josue.

MS. MAYS: Okay. Appreciate it.

David.

MR. ZAPATA: Thank you, everyone, for your time. Great meeting. With that, is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. GARCIA: So moved. This is Josue.

MS. MAYS: Josue so moved.

MR. ZAPATA: Is there a second?

MR. CANON: Second. Andrew.

MR. ZAPATA: Got it.

MS. MAYS: Okay. So, yeah, David, it's 12:08.

MR. ZAPATA: Well, great. We'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you all for your time. Like Caroline said, if we don't see you again, happy holidays.
Whereupon, at 12:08 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.
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