



**TEXAS
FREIGHT
ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**



Texas
Department
of Transportation

Freight Advisory Committee
October 20, 2014, 10:00 a.m.
TxDOT Houston District Office, Texas

Attendees

Committee Member	Organization	Attendance
Judge Ed Emmett, Chair	Harris County	Present
Judge Carlos H. Cascos, Vice-Chair	Cameron County	Not Present
French F. Thompson, III	BNSF	Present
Rigoberto Villarreal	City of McAllen	Not Present
Steve Stewart	Gulf Winds International, Inc.	Designee Present (Gabriel Allen)
Kevin McIntosh	Kansas City Southern (KCSR)	Present
Brenda Mainwaring	Union Pacific Railroad	Present
Joseph Adams		Not Present
Mike Graham, Sr.	HEB	Not Present
Michael Dyll	Texas International Freight	Present
K. Alan Russell	The Tecma Group of Companies	Not Present
Jack Todd	Texas Association of Manufacturers	Designee Present (Madigan Sequenzia)
John LaRue	Texas Ports Association, Port of Corpus Christi	Present
Judge Clay Lewis Jenkins	Dallas County	Not Present
Amir Mirabi	Governor's Office of Economic Development	Not Present
Carlton Schwab	Texas Economic Development Council	Not Present
Kenneth Dierschke	Texas Farm Bureau	Designee Present (Glen Jones)
Steve Boecking	Alliance Texas	Present
John Esparza	Texas Trucking Association	Not Present
Todd Frease, Sr.	McLane Global Logistics	Present
Ronnie Volkening	Texas Retail Association	Not Present
Miguel Perez	Border Trade Alliance	Not Present
Ron Beeson	East Harris County Manufacturers Association	Present
Roger Guenther	Port of Houston Authority	Present
John Hill	Gulf and West Coast for Hapag Lloyd	Not Present
Senator Sylvia R. Garcia	Texas State Senator: District 6	Present

TxDOT & Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI)

Marc Williams, PE	Director of Planning, TxDOT
Caroline Mays, AICP	Interim Freight Systems Branch Manager, TxDOT
Sondra Johnson	Planning and Programming, TxDOT
Erik Stevens	Director Rail Division, TxDOT
Joy Carter	Texas A&M Transportation Institute
Andrew Mao	TxDOT
Bill Orr	Design Division, TxDOT
Raquelle Lewis	TxDOT
Jack Foster	TPP Division, TxDOT
Jim Kruse	Texas A&M Transportation Institute

Other Speakers

Thomas Marian	Buffalo Marine Services, Inc.
Thure Cannon	Texas Pipeline Association
James Mann	Duggins, Wren, Mann & Romero Law Firm

CDM Smith Consultant Team

Vince Mantero, AICP	CDM Smith
Janna Rosenthal	CDM Smith
Rob Bostrom	CDM Smith
Eric McClellan	CDM Smith
Glennis Nelson	CDM Smith
Kim Sachtleben	Atkins
Mark Berndt	Olsson Associates

Other Attendees

Richard Zientek, Office of Judge Emmett
Donna Adams, Parsons Binckerhoff
Michael Bomba, University of North Texas
Chanel Borrega, Hidalgo County MPO
Robert Escobar, Hidalgo County MPO
Sergio Contreras, City of Pharr
Derek Darnell, Office Sen Sylvia Garcia
Raquel Espinoza, Union Pacific
Martha French, Transportation Compliance Consultants (TCCDOT)
Brent Greenfield, Consumer Energy Alliance
Brian P. Hill, US Maritime Administration
Bruce Mann, Port of Houston Authority
Tiffany Melvin, NASCO
William Miller, Office of Senator Ted Cruz
Maro Montes, Harris County Precinct 4
Sherry Piper, SH130 Concession Company
Rolando Ortiz, Killam Development, Ltd
Robert Sakowitz, Hazak Corp
Darrin Willer, HNTB

1. Welcome & Introductions

Judge Emmett opened the meeting and welcomed committee members. He said it would be a long fast-paced day, a lot of work went into developing the plan and there will likely be a lot of criticism. He asked the consultant team to identify themselves and said it may seem the committee is being overly critical but the goal was to provide input. Following the introductions, Judge Emmett noted Steve Stewart is having very serious health issues and is in need of blood. He encouraged everyone to consider donating blood. Caroline Mays acknowledged and thanked UP for donating lunch for all meeting attendees.

Marc Williams gave an overview of TxDOT's safety procedures.

Vince Mantero thanked the Judge and the committee and said the team was looking forward to receiving comments. He introduced the consultant team and gave a brief overview of the layout of the plan. Vince urged the TxFAC to let the team know if anything critical was missing.

2. Chapter 1 – Introduction

Judge Emmett stated the intent was not to wordsmith the entire document but he had an issue with the quote from General Houghton claiming, "The movement of goods is the backbone of the Texas economy." He said it was a fine quote but it overstates the importance of goods movement and the energy sector is really the backbone.

Steve Boecking disagreed saying energy is important but it's not everything.

Judge Emmett suggested, "goods movement is critical" but acknowledged it is difficult to change a quote.

Marc Williams recommended removing the quote and suggested, "goods movement is an important economic driver" instead. Freight is tied to 53% of the economic output, which backs up this statement. A theme requiring repeated emphasis is educating the public and elected officials on the importance of freight movement.

Judge Emmett pointed out Page 4 states, "The Eagle Ford Shale now ranks the largest single oil and gas development in the world based on capital expenditures . . ." and suggested people in the Permian Basin may disagree. He recommended the team be careful with such statements. Judge Emmett asked if the amount of tonnage moved includes intrastate pipelines?

Eric McClellan replied, saying Transearch under-reports intrastate pipeline movement so the team looked at other sources.

Judge Emmett said if intrastate tonnage is not being included, a lot of tonnage is being left out. However, the state legislature won't be funding those projects. He went on to say the terminology throughout the document needs to be consistent and referred to Page 5, "connecting gateways and nodes" and confessed he is not sure what a node is.

Brenda Mainwaring pointed out a discrepancy in rail mileage and Judge Emmett replied saying it was already revised in the version provided in the most updated materials.

John LaRue pointed out also on Page 5; the information does not address shallow draft ports. He also mentioned updated Eagle Ford Shale numbers available are available.

Judge Emmett remarked pipelines also move a lot of petroleum products, as well as CO2 and other products.

3. Chapter 2 – Strategic Goals

Judge Emmett said the colored dots were too much. He encouraged members of the committee review the chapter to ensure all comments have been addressed.

Marc Williams said the timeline has been adjusted. The plan will be presented to the Commission in December (this year) with a draft version up for adoption in January 2015. The final product will be posted on the website for public comment.

Caroline Mays added the TxFAC is currently scheduled to meet on November 17th and that is the deadline to address all the comments.

French Thompson noted if comments still need to be addressed by November 17th then it's not really change from the original deadline.

Caroline confirmed and said unless the committee decides to move the November 17th meeting.

Judge Emmett suggested seeing how the day goes and then deciding later about moving the November 17th meeting.

4. Chapter 3 – Economic Context

Judge Emmett pointed out the presentation being given did not match what was listed in the chapter.

Marc Williams suggested the team ignore the first few slides and jump ahead to the slides that are reflected in the report.

Brenda Mainwaring stated the Transearch data for rail is horribly outdated or incorrect. She also pointed out the petroleum supply chain is incorrect and should include more rail.

John LaRue also questioned why the team was using 2010 data and said the data shows little movement and the numbers don't reflect the reality.

Judge Emmett asked if the 2010 data did not include intrastate pipelines.

Eric McClellan responded saying Transearch includes intrastate movements for all modes, but none are recorded for pipeline, which reflects the shortcoming in the Transearch pipeline data.

Judge Emmett said it begs the question should we exclude pipelines altogether; if it's not accurate it brings the credibility of the whole report into question.

Caroline asked if other research is available for pipeline data.

Eric McClellan replied, yes. Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) reports 750 billion tons.

Marc Williams asked Eric to describe the differences between FAF and Transearch.

Eric McClellan reported FAF tracks movements based on a 2% sample and Transearch takes government information and is inclusive of value added processes. Transearch is more inclusive of truck and rail than other modes. Both sources continue to go through changes.

French Thompson asked if the data was updated annually.

Eric McClellan responded saying FAF is based on the Commodity Flow Survey which is updated every five years. The last update was conducted in 2012, however, due to budget constraints and other Federal funding issues FHWA was unable to update internally and instead contracted with IHS Global Insight (purveyors of Transearch) to provide interim 2012 data.

Caroline Mays said when TxDOT purchased Transearch last year, 2010 was the latest available data. She suggested the team continue using the information available now and when updated data is available, the plan can be updated. She pointed out this is a challenge given that Transearch is the most comprehensive data source available to establish a baseline.

Judge Emmett said Page 3 shows output is \$31 billion and asked what the real number is. He went on to say it was a contradiction because earlier in the report it is stated the number did not include intrastate pipelines.

Eric McClellan said it is close to the real number because it is supplemented with the IMPLAN model. The graphic in Chapter 3 presents the economic impact Output measure, which includes intra-modal overlap. The graphic shown in the presentation for the Job impact measure excludes such intra-modal overlap.

John LaRue asked what year the IMPLAN model data was from.

Eric McClellan said the team used 2010 data to match the Transearch data.

Marc Williams said there is a need to balance precision and accuracy. The data can be precise but accuracy can be lost. He asked what would be involved in generating an estimate or getting close to 2014 numbers. He referred to Exhibit 3-5 where it shows that 53% of economic output is from freight and questioned how the information would change with more recent data?

Eric McClellan responded saying the percentages probably would not change very much as there are a lot of inputs and factors and some of those would increase and some would decrease.

French Thompson noted two points. First, include a disclaimer saying this is the most recent and complete data available at this point. Second, in regard to the petroleum supply chain, it would be worthwhile adding rail and barge in domestic production. He also noted there is no bracket for petroleum bi-products (Exhibit 3-28), plastics is a big part of the petroleum supply chains.

Roger Guenther noted the Port of Houston provided comments as well and added petroleum products also come in by rail from Canada.

Brenda Mainwaring said the fundamental problem is the data and while she appreciates there are limited sources she feels pipelines are getting an easy out since the data is not available and some detailed forecasts are discussed in later chapters. She continued saying rail has changed dramatically in the last five years and the report makes profound assumptions which do not reflect reality. She expressed real concern about the data limitations.

Marc Williams noted these are the comments the team is looking for. If something is causing heartburn, it can be omitted. This is an area where TxDOT wants to work with the committee. He recognizes the need to keep it big picture and realizes statistics draw criticism and questions the credibility of the plan.

Judge Emmett agreed omitting things is not bad. He pointed out the 1.2 million jobs listed on Slide 13 of the handout does not match the 6.2 million shown in the presentation.

Eric McClellan apologized for the typo in the handout and confirmed the correct number is 6.2 million jobs.

Judge Emmett continued critiquing the pipeline impacts section on Page 16 (Exhibit 3-16) regarding the job breakdown by industry type (specifically Health and Social Services). He feels this detail adds fluff and isn't necessary to the funding decisions that will make freight movement more effective.

French Thompson said the slide on Page 13 (presentation) is a nice graphic but is not reflected in the report.

Eric McClellan described the different types of economic impacts.

Kevin McIntosh noted it seemed different from the economic impacts listed in the chapter.

Eric McClellan replied saying the team continues to review the chapters.

Todd Frease said he interprets the last sentence on Page 11 differently and it gets closer to the number on the slide.

French Thompson repeated how much he likes the slide on Page 13 (presentation) and said it should be included in the chapter.

Marc Williams asked if there was a way the team could extrapolate data out to 2014.

Eric McClellan responded saying it's possible but a strong caveat will need to be included about what is being done.

Marc Williams said showing nearly \$1 trillion of goods moved (Page 13 of the presentation) are the types of statistics that should be included in the report.

Judge Emmett pointed out the handout is different to what's in the report. He said the team is presenting too much information.

Eric McClellan noted it is a challenge to present appropriate data and detail in an understandable format.

French Thompson asked if the target audience is elected officials. He went on to say the team needs to ensure the nuggets included are accurate and consistent. The information needs to be easily digestible and discussions about the importance of freight movement must continue so people understand it can help make policy decisions.

Rep. Garcia agreed the pie chart graphic is a good seller.

Judge Emmett said everyone understands the document needs to be simplified.

John LaRue noted the cotton supply chain is not completely accurate. He suggested discussing this with Glen Jones and his team. Most of the cotton in South Texas is sorted in warehouses

and moves by truck to intermodal centers, then moves by train and a lot goes out through Houston to Central and South America.

Judge Emmett encouraged everyone to read the chapters. A lot of the comments have been addressed already so the team is making revisions. He again encouraged the TxFAC members to look at the chapters in detail especially as it relates to their fields.

5. Chapter 4 – Freight Policies

Brenda Mainwaring pointed out the chapter doesn't reference the billions of dollars the rail industry is spending in Texas to improve infrastructure.

Marc Williams asked if the consultant team members had a source for that data and the rail committee members agreed to provide the data.

Judge Emmett questioned the capitalization of state vs. State and suggested state not be capitalized when referring to state funds. He also asked if there are any airports owned by the state.

Judge Emmett asked if there should be a reference to the Tex-Mex rail line under Texas railroads and Kevin McIntosh replied no, it's KCS.

Caroline Mays said she recognizes many investments are being made by ports on the private sector side and asked if private sector funding by ports should be included in the report.

John LaRue said the ports are investing huge numbers, probably \$150 billion or more on infrastructure improvements alone, not on new ports.

Judge Emmett suggested referencing the South-Orient railroad.

Brenda Mainwaring clarified the rail infrastructure improvements UP has invested in Texas alone, not what rail users invested.

Marc Williams suggested keeping it at capital investment by owners for railroads and ports. If there are any others, it can be referenced.

Judge Emmett questioned the chapter states on Page 19; "Counties receive a portion of the state's gasoline tax receipts by formula . . ." TxFAC members agreed this information is inaccurate. He observed the comments he provided are not reflected.

6. Chapter 5 – State Freight Transportation Assets

John LaRue noted the freight network does not include ports. (Exhibit 5-2)

The suggestion was either to add ports or to remove airports or use a separate map for each mode.

Marc Williams stated there are a number of highways not on the primary network and said Florida used the term "emerging networks" and suggested using emerging with secondary.

Steve Boecking said as long as it's accurate, he was okay with it.

Marc Williams confirmed it is accurate for some of the roads.

Judge Emmett noted on Page 4 it states trucks carry 62% of freight on highways, and asked what carries the other 38%.

Vince Mantero suggested it may be a word smithing issue.

Michael Dyll suggested removing the dots in Exhibit 5-2.

Caroline Mays said airports are considered gateways.

Marc Williams asked if this map was premature and should the team consider removing the map at this time. He suggested later on including maps showing each mode and a map based on scale and size showing the entire network.

Steve Boecking is not sure the map should be removed; he thinks it's a good starting point when talking about assets.

Judge Emmett said he found the organization of the chapter confusing and too wordy. He suggested placing more emphasis on graphics with a description. He further stated he had trouble reading Chapter 4 because it was not well written.

Kevin McIntosh suggested adding other commodities carried by rail including automobile and chemicals, Page 12, this should also be added to Chapter 3.

Suggest not using the word 'entirely' on Page 12; ". . . internal flows are entirely reliant . . ."

French Thompson agreed. He again urged the team to remember the target audience who thinks rail only moves coal and other stuff and that's not the story. Chlorine ships by rail and water is important.

Judge Emmett asked if "more than 50% of the tonnage is coal," is accurate.

Brenda stated it's not entirely accurate and offered to double check the data. She also noted rail is not entirely supported by highway, as stated in the text (Page 12).

Roger Guenther asked what percentage of truck can be done by rail.

French Thompson said at-grade crossings should be discussed from a rail perspective and not from a vehicular one. He offered to provide a write-up on at-grade crossings.

Brenda Mainwaring said the rail members need to review the information closely to ensure it is accurate and updated. She expressed concern about addressing antitrust issues.

Judge Emmett asked if the pipeline information on Page 21 included intrastate pipelines.

Eric McClellan responded, yes.

Judge Emmett noted the later chapters do not include intrastate and questioned why intrastate data was not being used throughout the document.

Caroline Mays clarified some of the information came directly from the Railroad Commission. She further stated the economic efficiency came from the national freight goals and state freight plans need to align with national goals. She suggested moving it around so it is less confusing.

Judge Emmett emphasized the need for consistency and again urged TxFAC members to read the document and provide comments.

7. Chapter 6 – Condition and Performance

French Thompson acknowledged LOS were difficult to predict and questioned why the team thought LOS for rail would be incorrect. He said as needs increase; the railroads will decide where to invest to support growth. He suggested eliminating the current language and offered to provide language regarding LOS for the report.

Judge Emmett agreed and noted the same would apply to pipelines; do not guess LOS.

Kevin McIntosh noted more bottlenecks need to be included at Laredo, KCS and UP share one in Victoria as well. He offered to provide more information related to bottlenecks.

Judge Emmett pointed out the exhibit formatting is off and Exhibit 6-21 is not worth including because it has nothing to do with freight. He went on to note the performance measures (Page 27) does not include Class I railroad improvements or new pipelines.

8. Chapter 7 – Freight Forecast

Judge Emmett noted the same confusion on earlier slides; they do not match the chapter. He asked what was being measured. What does the industry want reflected? He went on to say in the beginning of the chapter when percent change in population is listed, it should be total population change instead because percentages don't drive freight, people do. He said the chapter does not include intrastate pipelines.

Caroline Mays said the team should use RRC data for pipelines.

Marc Williams suggested it be sourced with Transearch data supplemented with RRC and CDM Smith analysis. He said the focus is on a consistent message.

Roger Guenther asked if port tonnage statistics was used to get this number.

Rob Bostrom responded it was Transearch and USACE data.

Judge Emmett suggested letting Roger Guenther and John LaRue decide. He emphasized the need to count everything accurately.

Roger Guenther commented on the need to ensure there is no double dipping.

Judge Emmett said he is not worried about counting things twice. He further referenced Page 10, “. . . water port estimates do not include non-North American international tonnage“and requested the water committee members review the information and work with TxDOT Maritime.

Ron Beeson said it may be appropriate because it may be coming from rail, pipelines, etc.

John LaRue said there is still a lot of crude coming into the port.

Roger Guenther questioned what is being measured under water.

Judge Emmett said the numbers need to be double checked.

In reviewing the pie charts on Page 9, Steve Boecking noted it shows air cargo will drop by 50% by 2040.

Ron Beeson suggested the numbers are flip-flopped since air shows \$1.1M and goes to \$3.6M on the presentation (page 30).

French Thompson again commented pie charts are better to highlight information.

Judge Emmett asked where the drivers to drive all the trucks will be coming from.

Brenda Mainwaring asked where the information came from because the report lists 310 operating days per year (Page 21) and everyone knows there are no weekends off for railroads. She suggested removing LOS for private industries.

Judge Emmett asked what “El Paso to Chihuahua - WE” means in Exhibit 7-43 (Page 36).

Brenda Mainwaring noted on page 35 it states Webb County has the most rail crossings but it is in fact Laredo.

Ron Beeson suggested using a chart or something appealing to the eye when showing commodities. Also need this in Chapter 5, Page 12.

Judge Emmett said this chapter needs a lot of work.

Marc Williams said the team needs to understand that less is more. Need to focus on the overall freight picture and modes, don't want more precision than is necessary unless the team can validate the information.

Rob Bostrom pointed out the challenge of balancing the information with MAP-21.

Marc Williams noted TxDOT is scheduled to meet with FHWA to discuss balancing guidance from the TxFAC with recommended guidelines. Marc suggested a supplemental report may be the solution if there is no agreement.

Judge Emmett noted the drivers of freight forecasts are population (people not percentage) and international goods exports. He said the team needs to start over with this chapter and simplify.

Marc Williams suggested taking a step back to address the judge's comments.

9. Working Lunch – Speaker 1

Thomas Marian with Buffalo Marine Services thanked TxDOT and the TxFAC for the opportunity to present an overview of the industry.

When asked by Judge Emmett to name one or two things that TxDOT needs to focus on, Mr. Marian noted the following:

1. Dredging
2. Work more closely with federal counterparts to address inefficiencies

10. Working Lunch – Speaker 2

Thure Cannon, President of the Texas Pipeline Association addressed the TxFAC and provided an overview of the current and future of pipelines. Mr. Thomas Mann, an attorney joined him in the presentation to address legal questions.

Judge Emmett asked Mr. Cannon to provide input as it relates to pipelines on the report since there is no pipeline representation on the TxFAC committee. Mr. Cannon agreed to do so.

11. Chapter 8 – Trends, Issues and Needs

Judge Emmett said he found this chapter very confusing. For example economics and international trade has a lot of discussion on exports and nothing on imports. Goods coming in will drive freight transportation. He also noted port and border security/efficiency is not important. He did not find any relevance of the quote on Page 7, “Still, Texas will be challenged economically . . .” He went on to say the Permian Basin needs to be added on Page 9, and the percent change on Page 10 doesn’t mean anything.

He questioned what lagging educational levels and high electric prices had to do with freight (Page 12). He asked about the growth of wind turbines and if meant growth in the number of wind turbines (Page 13). Judge Emmett also expressed concern about the high natural gas prices cited as \$11 in 2008 (Page 13). He noted the impacts on the freight transportation system section on Page 14 seemed out of place. He continued by stating the link of a Global and Regional Pandemic to freight, is weak. He suggested not singling out specific projects.

When discussing climate change, he recommended not stating “is likely to have more impact on the future of surface transportation than any other issue” (Page 16). He also suggested each chapter have its own a table of contents because he found the red and blue titles confusing. The Judge suggested not giving as much emphasis to the freight shuttle and said he is confused by the drone home delivery. He noted five needs were identified on page 19 but 10 are listed in Exhibit 8-9. He also pointed out some of the needs in Exhibit 8-9 appear to be listed under the wrong category. i.e., “Improve rail connectivity” is listed under Safety and should be moved to Intermodal Connectivity. Judge Emmett also recommended including private money under funding.

He felt the information on community impacts is irrelevant and asked what “chronic respiratory ailments” had to do with freight movement. He also questioned the operations, maintenance and expansion budget cited on Page 23. He continued by suggesting “Modal Productivity” may not be necessary. Judge Emmett clarified it’s the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 not 1988.

“Highway freight transport is a notable exception...” (Page 24) Judge Emmett noted modal efficiency is more than just size and weight. He questioned whether the comprehensive size and weight study is needed. He recommended not singling out the trucking industry when discussing regulatory impacts but including other modes also. He continued by questioning why community impacts are again discussed on Page 25.

Brenda Mainwaring noted the chapter focused too much on truck when industries are also served by rail. It felt like a trucking chapter.

John LaRue remarked there was too much extraneous information in the chapter.

12. Chapter 9 – Strengths and Problems

Michael Dyll suggested grouping strengths and problems together.

Russell Allen recommended making the crash data per capita (Page 6).

Steve Boecking pointed out Alliance Airport is not mentioned (Page 3).

Judge Emmett asked why Tarrant county and not Dallas County was considered deficient for freight air capacity when Tarrant county has Alliance (Page 7). He also suggested not making projections regarding pipelines (Page 8).

Brenda Mainwaring recommended adding private investments as a strength under rail. She also noted Tower 55 is a good example of PPP to include on Page 5. As it relates to public/private sector coordination, she pointed out rail does not have the same constituents. She suggested deleting the sentence; “Related to the rail mode, responsiveness . . . rail facilities difficult.”

Judge Emmett clarified there are 254 counties in Texas not 253 and said the document is too wordy. He also agreed with Michael Dyll about juxtaposing strengths and problems.

Brenda Mainwaring requested rail crash data statistics be cited as per capita also.

French Thompson questioned the numbers on page 8 in the last sentence of the rail section.

Judge Emmett asked how the section about the goals on page 17 fits in.

Caroline Mays responded MAP-21 specifically asks “how do we NOT meet state goals.”

French Thompson suggested this section be moved to the beginning.

Judge Emmett referenced page 17, “. . . was validated by crash data analysis,” and questioned what was being validated, safety? He suggested removing this statement and instead saying safety is a focus of TxDOT, stakeholders and private industry.

French Thompson suggested changing the freight shuttle picture on Page 22 to something else.

Judge Emmett requested the wording be changed on the section titled “Problems the state expects to develop in the future”

Rep Garcia suggested “developing problems.”

Caroline Mays suggested “future problems.”

13. Chapter 10 – Decision-Making Process

Judge Emmett questioned if the presentation matched the charts and maps listed in Chapter 11. He continued by saying he is baffled because the report lists nothing about the priority of serving the ports of Freeport, Galveston, and Houston. Major corridors in the MPOs are missing, like SH 146.

Marc Williams said this information looks outside of the MPOs. The methodology looked at larger regional/rural corridors.

Judge Emmett noted MPOs cannot be excluded because that's where people and freight are. French Thompson suggested including a statement to explain MPOs were excluded because they have their own Transportation Improvement Programs.

Rep. Garcia asked if this was the reason MPOs were excluded.

Marc Williams responded yes and suggested extending the corridors of statewide significance through the MPO boundaries. He also offered to look at MPO plans and to evaluate critical corridors identified; with the understanding it can't all be reviewed.

Judge Emmett said it was confirmed during TransTexas corridors putting lines on maps causes great consternation for where they are or where they aren't. He went on ask if it's the committee's responsibility identify the best way to improve the freight network. He said the committee should not shy away from identifying major freight corridors and then state in the implementation plan the MPO is responsible.

French Thompson asked if TxDOT considered what other states are doing.

Judge Emmett questioned whether truck rollovers should be given so much focus.

Marc Williams responded probably not.

Judge Emmett asked what the number ranking is under bottlenecks.

Caroline Mays responded the rankings listed are national rankings.

Judge Emmett suggested clarifying it is national rankings and continued by recommending the team work with the railroad committee members to identify at-grade crossings.

French Thompson said the title for Exhibit 10-10 is confusing.

Brenda Mainwaring stated the three UP crossings that appear to be at the same location might be a mainline and an industrial line so one solution could solve 2 or 3 crossings.

Judge Emmett asked how the stats were acquired.

Brenda Mainwaring said she assumed this didn't take into account traffic at the crossings.

Judge Emmett said he doesn't understand other modes.

French Thompson suggested cross checking the information with TxDOT rail district.

Marc Williams said the point is to target rail crossings that cross the secondary network but if these are the only crossings then they are probably doing well.

Ron Beeson noted this chapter gets into implementation and questioned if it belonged in this chapter.

Marc Williams noted there is a lot of overlap and redundancy.

Ron Beeson recommended it all goes into one chapter.

Judge Emmett said the economic analysis inbound and outbound doesn't include international and suggested the information is so highway focused; it pays no attention to global trade. He also questioned the sentence on Page 26, "Conversely, freight moving through Texas . . . "

Marc Williams noted FHWA asks for project-specific analysis and TxDOT needs to have a conversation with FHWA on this issue.

14. Chapter 11a – Freight Improvement Strategy – Policy Element

Brenda Mainwaring suggested using different language for the second bullet on Page 18.

Judge Emmett again urged the TxFAC members to review information relevant to their fields.

15. Chapter 11b – Program and Project Element

Judge Emmett asked about the order of the chapter and why rail recommendations are listed first. He suggested the public will want to see highways first.

French Thompson suggested following the same order of the other chapters throughout the document.

Judge Emmett noted the same rail projects were listed as in Chapter 10. He asked if the plan was being developed without urban areas and if that's permeating the whole plan, there is much work to be done. He emphasized the importance of identifying where the needs are. He reiterated urban areas cannot be excluded.

Rep. Garcia suggested the MPOs be incorporated so there is one comprehensive list.

French Thompson agreed saying several bottlenecks will be excluded if MPOs are left out.

Caroline Mays noted the information is readily available and can be included very quickly.

Judge Emmett asked for verification of the legislative appropriations amount for rail requests.

French Thompson asked if the cruise terminal 2 was just for passengers (Page 18).

John LaRue replied, yes.

Marc Williams said this list was a set of high priority projects included in the capital program plan.

Roger Guenther pointed out the Port of Houston did vote against the high priority projects included in the capital program plan, and was the only port to vote against. All the ports submitted one project and the concern was that these projects should be outside the fence and should represent the best opportunity to improve freight movement.

Caroline Mays said TxDOT is asking the ports to identify outside the gate priorities they may have.

Roger Guenther stated they are happy to do so and said there is a need for more consideration with funding to and from ports.

John LaRue noted this was his first time seeing the rail priority list and said there needs to be more coordination between entities.

Judge Emmett noted the timber industry moved out of East Texas a long time ago and said US 59 is just a through highway now with NAFTA importance. He noted the repetition in the document. US 290 at I-610 is no longer a bottleneck as the new interchange was opened last week.

16. General Remarks

Marc Williams recognized there is a lot of work to be done. He apologized for the areas that are lacking and said TxDOT will work diligently with the consultant team to get this right. The expectation is this will be a report everyone can be proud of. He went on to say he was not going to put a timeline on everything but the team will probably need more time than November 17th.

Judge Emmett asked when the next meeting needed to take place.

Marc Williams suggested the 15th, 16th, or 17th of December.

It was decided the next TxFAC meeting will be held on December 17th at 8:30 am in Austin, potentially in the Grier Building.

Marc Williams said Caroline will continue to be the point of contact for specific comments from TxFAC members. He also offered if any groups, rail, ports, etc. would like to get together by teleconference, TxDOT would facilitate.

Judge Emmett thanked everyone for attending.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.