Freight Advisory Committee Meeting #32
April 6, 2022, 8 a.m.
In-Person at 125 E. 11th St., Austin, Texas 78701
Virtual via Microsoft Teams

ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Emmett, Chair</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Cruz</td>
<td>Office of the Governor</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Landsgard</td>
<td>H-E-B</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Leal</td>
<td>Texas Farm Bureau</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Greer</td>
<td>Coca Cola</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Schelbitzki</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Crutcher</td>
<td>Landgraf, Crutcher &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Schwebel</td>
<td>IBC Bank</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Esparza</td>
<td>Texas Trucking Association</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Patridge</td>
<td>McAllen Economic Development Corp.</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Woodruff</td>
<td>Kirby Corporation</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Shea</td>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dyll</td>
<td>Texas International Freight LLC</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Treangen</td>
<td>TNW Corporation</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Brogoitti</td>
<td>Brogoitti Construction</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Guenther</td>
<td>Port Houston</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolando Ortiz</td>
<td>Killam Development, Ltd.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Beeson</td>
<td>The Lubrizol Corp.</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Strawbridge</td>
<td>Port of Corpus Christi Authority</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Melvin</td>
<td>North American Strategy for Competitiveness</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Stewart</td>
<td>Gulf Winds International</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VJ Smith</td>
<td>Marathon Petroleum Company</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>AllianceTexas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>TEMPO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-Officio Members</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Armando “Mando” Martinez</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Brenda Gunter</td>
<td>City of San Angelo</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Smith</td>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John LaRue</td>
<td>United Corpus Christi Chamber</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Pete Saenz</td>
<td>City of Laredo</td>
<td>Present (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sergio Munoz</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count of Ex-Officio Members Present: 1
Total Count of Committee and Ex-Officio Members Present: 17

**Texas Transportation Commission**
Commissioner Alvin New
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Andrew Mao
Baylor Nix
Bill Hale
Brandye Hendrickson
Carlos Calle
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Curtis Jones
Darran Anderson
Eduardo Hagert
Emily Clisby
Francisco Almanza
Geir-Eilif Kalhagen
Giacomo Yaquinto
Humberto “Tito” Gonzales Jr.
Jessica Butler, P.E.
Joseph McIntosh
Juan Sanchez
Kale Driemeier
Katelyn Dwyer
Lauren Garduno
Loretta Brown
Marty Boyd
Melba Schaus
Noel Paramanantham
Pedro Alvarez, P.E.
Quincy Allen
Ricardo Gonzalez
Roberto Rodríguez, III
Roger Beall
Sherry Pifer
Stacey Strittmatter
Sondra Johnson
Tim Wright
Trent Thomas
Tucker Ferguson
Tyler Graham
Yvette Flores

Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI)
Bill Eisele
Curtis Morgan
Dan Middleton

Cambridge Systematics Consulting Team
Daniel Wong Cambridge Systematics
Elizabeth Welch Cambridge Systematics
Paula Dowell, Ph.D. Cambridge Systematics
Mike Chaney Alliance Transportation Group
Janna Rosenthal Atkins
Vicky Carrasco Kleinman Consultants
Jackie Lopez Poznecki-Camarillo, LLC
John Tiemann Poznecki-Camarillo, LLC
Sirisha Pillalamarri Transcend Engineers
Joseph Bryan WSP
**Other Attendees**

- Adriana Crus  
  Office of The Governor
- Andrew Cannon  
  Rio Grande Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- Benjamin Abeto  
  SH 130 Concession Company
- Bruce Mann  
  Port Houston
- Cameron Walker  
  Permian Basin MPO
- Carlos Lopez  
  HNTB
- Clay Barnett  
  Sherman-Denison MPO
- Clifton Hall  
  Alamo Area MPO
- Collin Moffett  
  North Central Texas Council of Governments
- David Coronado  
  City of El Paso
- Eduardo Calvo  
  El Paso MPO
- Genevieve Bales  
  Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Jason Skarda  
  H-E-B
- JD Esparza  
  Texas Trucking Association
- Juan Pena  
  Rio Grande Valley MPO
- Katherine Parker  
  City of Houston
- Kevin Maggay  
  Navistar
- Lisa Weston  
  University of North Texas
- Luis Diaz  
  Rio Grande Valley MPO
- Michael Bomba  
  University of North Texas
- Michael Chaney  
  Alliance Transportation Group
- Michael Razniewski  
  SH 130 Concession Company
- Michael Johnson  
  North Central Texas Council of Governments
- Paul Stresow  
  City of El Paso
- Paul Treangen  
  TNW Corporation
- Peter LeCody  
  Texas Rail Advocates
- Phyllis Saathoff  
  Port Freeport
- Raquel Espinoza  
  Union Pacific Railroad
- Russell Laughlin  
  Hillwood Properties
- Sean Strawbridge  
  Port of Corpus Christi
- Tyson Moeller  
  Union Pacific Railroad
- Yvette Limon  
  City of Laredo
- Christopher R. Nazar  
  CDM Smith
- Davonna Moore  
  CDM Smith
1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Ed Emmett began the Texas Freight Advisory Committee (TxFAC) meeting at 8:20 a.m. First, he thanked everyone for being at the meeting either in person or online via Microsoft Teams.

Chair Emmett introduced Commissioner Alvin New, Texas Transportation Commission, and thanked committee members for their work in developing the 2023 Texas Freight Mobility Plan (TFMP 2023), and called upon Caroline Mays, Director, Freight, Trade, and Connectivity Section, TxDOT, to encourage participation in the meeting. Chair Emmett then called upon Sherry Pifer, Freight Systems Branch Manager, Freight, Trade, and Connectivity Section, TxDOT, to provide an overview of the meeting.

2. Overview of Today’s Meeting, Recap of Feb. 2, 2022, TxFAC Meeting, and Overview of Ongoing Freight Planning Activities

Ms. Pifer provided a safety moment that highlighted safe habits for the summer season, sharing that one should always wear sunscreen and stay hydrated while outdoors. Then, she provided a recap of the Feb. 2, 2022, TxFAC meeting, an overview of the current meeting, and ongoing freight planning activities. Ms. Pifer noted that TxDOT provided the TxFAC with a white paper in preparation for the Apr. 6, 2022, meeting. She then called upon Kale Driemeier, Freight Planner with TxDOT, to provide an overview of the Texas Critical Rural Freight Corridors.

3. Critical Rural Freight Corridors

Mr. Driemeier stated that TxDOT received additional information from large urban area MPOs on the Texas Highway Freight Network. He noted that the Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC) are essential, and the importance of these designations is to be eligible for funding as part of the National Highway Freight Program. Mr. Driemeier then called upon Elizabeth Welch with Cambridge Systematics to discuss final CRFC designation.

Ms. Welch reminded the committee that the Critical Rural Freight Corridors were introduced during the previous TxFAC meeting, noted that the white paper provided for preparation of the meeting would be referenced, and stated the criteria met to identify preferred candidates for designation on the freight network.

Ms. Welch covered two different approaches as part of the freight designation process. The first approach, called Alternative 1, was built upon the 2018 corridors, and the second approach, called Alternative 2, restarted the process, informed by geographic location. Ms. Welch stated that both alternatives share the following principles:

- All included corridors must meet three or more federal criteria.
- Freight system designation score is used to prioritize corridors when needed.
• Total designations cannot exceed 745 miles.

• Location, status, and funding of projects do not influence Alternative 1 or 2.

Ms. Welch provided an overview of Alternative 1, which includes 460 miles of 2018 Critical Rural Freight Corridors that met the necessary criteria, leaving 285 miles available to TxFAC for designation. She then referenced the white paper provided to the TxFAC members for a list of corridors and additional details for each corridor.

Ms. Welch then provided an overview of the geographic approach for Alternative 2, noting that the state is divided into five regions as part of the analysis. The corridors must meet at least three federal criteria and have logical termini. She referenced the white paper provided to the TxFAC members for a list of corridors and additional details for Alternative 2.

Matt Woodruff, with Kirby Corporation, asked if the criteria being used to score the corridors were the same for both alternatives. Ms. Welch noted the scoring criteria are the same and listed the federal criteria. She said the purpose of the freight system designation score was to further inform the ranking of the corridors.

Paula Dowell, with Cambridge Systematics, shared messages received from the chat. Gerald Schwebel, with IBC Bank, asked how TxDOT would address future corridors such as I-27. Ms. Dowell stated that TxDOT would evaluate future corridors as they are constructed and open to traffic. For interstate designations, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will consider new interstates for addition to the Primary Highway Freight Network.

Paul Stresow, with the City of El Paso, stated that US 62/180 from El Paso to the New Mexico state line is a highly traveled and dangerous corridor.

Mr. Schwebel asked if the connectivity of the major ports of entry is being considered based on traffic volumes and asked what criteria were being considered. He also asked how TxDOT would balance the intermodal model (i.e., land, sea, and air). Ms. Dowell stated that the freight system designation score considers connectivity to water ports, border ports of entry, rail terminals, and airports.

Bruce Mann, with Port of Houston, asked if the focus should be on the assets that are or will be added to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program due to availability for funding. Ms. Mays responded that the designation has nothing to do with current projects or funding, only to identify those corridors most important in the state.

Chair Emmett asked if interstate highways should be considered part of the designations. Ms. Mays stated that interstate highways are already part of the Federal Primary Highway Freight Network. Ms. Dowell noted that not all Texas interstates are part of the Federal Primary Freight Network because Texas is a high-mileage state.

Chair Emmett stated that local knowledge is critical as part of the Critical Rural Freight Network designations.

Charlie Leal, with Texas Farm Bureau, noted that US 59 to Houston might be a shorter trip with less traffic compared to using I-35. He said projects along US 59 from Laredo to Freer
to George West, which includes approximately 18 miles, should be considered for designation for future roadway improvements.

Ms. Mays noted that the designations need to adhere to the criteria set forth by the FHWA. Jessica Butler, Director of TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division, noted that funding will not be lost for projects that are already underway.

Ms. Welch noted that US 83 and US 59 are very close to the freight system designation network and could serve as an example of what should be informed by local knowledge of the TxFAC members. Ms. Mays agreed. Ms. Welch then asked for members to participate in a Mentimeter Question, with the results shown in Figure 1.

Ms. Mays stated that Alternative 2 was the scoring approach used during the last round of designations. Mr. Leal responded that a geographically-based approach is preferred for the agricultural sector. Chair Emmett acknowledged the comment and underscored the importance of keeping freight traffic distributed throughout the state. Commissioner New responded that TxFAC should consider the percentage of freight traffic volumes compared to overall traffic volumes on the roadways.

Ms. Mays said congestion is not part of the criteria, but freight traffic volume is, insofar as the freight traffic volume is 25 percent or more of total traffic. She then recapped the committee’s criteria to apply to the Critical Rural Freight Network designations. Chair Emmett asked for identification of the freight traffic volumes on each of the segments that have been identified for designation consideration. Ms. Mays and Ms. Dowell stated that freight traffic volumes were calculated in the identification and preliminary scoring through

---

Figure 1. Mentimeter Question from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.
the use of the FSD score. Commissioner New noted that data and local knowledge should be considered.

Chair Emmett asked which alternative the committee wanted to take in the approach to freight designation – Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Ms. Dowell asked if the committee would be open to using an approach that includes corridors included in both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Adrianna Cruz, with the Governor’s Office, recommended this approach. The committee agreed to use an approach that included corridors in both Alternatives 1 and 2.

Chair Emmett asked if US 59/I-69 from El Campo to Rosenberg is already being built and asked why there is a designation for this project. Chair Emmett recommended that roadways from Laredo to Goliad be considered part of the designation if US 59/I-69 from El Campo to Rosenberg already secured funding.

Mr. Leal stated that US 59 from Laredo to San Antonio would give more capacity for freight traffic throughout the state. He also asked Ms. Welch to review the roadways identified in South Texas, noting corridors that have cattle and feed-related traffic. Ms. Welch pointed out that if US 59/I-69 were to be exchanged in place of US 83 to SH 16 from Laredo as a Critical Rural Freight Corridor, TxFAC would only add ten miles if the Committee wanted to consider this an option.

Chair Emmett asked if the committee would consider I-69 for designation so that the roadway could be a four-lane divided highway. He noted that the energy sector is experiencing a shift, affecting TxFAC’s decisions in designations around the Midland-Odessa region.

Mr. Mann commented that he does not believe the TxFAC has all the data necessary to make informed decisions about Critical Rural Freight Network designations. Ms. Mays reminded him that the committee has seen all of the data through previous TxFAC meetings, and the white paper sent to the committee.

VJ Smith, with Marathon Petroleum Company, noted that US 62 from El Paso to the Texas-New Mexico state line is another corridor that should be considered. Ms. Welch said that the Critical Rural Freight Network considerations included connecting the entire Texas Freight Network, but TxFAC can modify this approach. Commissioner New noted that the eastern portion of US 62 is a higher priority than the western portion.

Ms. Welch asked if any other priorities across the state should inform the designations. Commissioner New and Ms. Cruz stated that the Lubbock area has significant dairy processing growth. Chair Emmett asked what the dairy growth means for freight traffic in the area. Mr. Leal noted that the impact is significant, and TxFAC should be mindful of this area’s increase in freight traffic because of the dairy industry’s growth.

Chair Emmett asked to clarify how many miles are available for designation. Ms. Dowell then provided a recap of the designations up for consideration throughout TxFAC’s discussion.

Chair Emmett said if traffic is going from Lubbock to the Dallas/Fort Worth area, it may be prudent to connect to Snyder, Texas.
Mayor Pete Saenz, with the City of Laredo, said connecting Edinburg to Falfurrias and Zapata to Laredo would better connect all the ports.

Commissioner New stated that SH 349 from Lamesa to Odessa is the only road that meets the critical freight rural corridor criteria, and it is not a divided four-lane facility. He went on to say that the Childress route would allow for an overpass or safety improvements to reduce at-grade crashes.

Ms. Welch asked if TxFAC would like to make any motions on portions of US 60, US 287, US 284, or a portion of US 281 from Alice, Texas, to I-37 for designation in the Critical Rural Freight Network. Chair Emmett encouraged the committee to be mindful of the geographical locations of the designations, noting that some areas may be getting more designations than others.

Rolando Ortiz, with Killam Development, Ltd., stated that some corridors in the Houston area were part of the 2018 designations that are not part of the second alternative.

Chair Emmett asked if SH 6 from Bryan to Waco is included. Ms. Dowell noted that this roadway is designated.

Ms. Pifer asked if US 87 to SH 349 in the Midland-Lamesa area was considered part of the Critical Rural Freight Network designation. Commissioner New stated that this area has a high rate of crashes and recommended that at least a portion of this corridor be considered.

Chair Emmett asked the distance between Midland to Lamesa. Ms. Pifer stated that the distance is 56.8 miles.

Chair Emmett then asked about US 281 from Falfurrias to Alice. Andrew Cannon, with the Rio Grande Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), stated that there are improvements in this area. Chair Emmett recommended adding US 281 from Falfurrias to Alice to this portion.

Ms. Mays asked Ms. Dowell to read out the total of the Critical Rural Freight Corridors identified, including those that were identified in both Alternatives 1 and 2:

- US 59 from El Campo to Rosenberg - 23.1 miles.
- US 59 from Lufkin to Livingston – 29.3 miles.
- SH 288 from Angleton to Houston – 23.6 miles.
- US 181 from Stenton to Gregory – 12.4 miles.
- SH 6 from Bryan to Waco – 52.9 miles.
- US 281 from Alice to I-37 – 51.2 miles.
- US 380 from US 287 to I-35 – 24.5 miles.
- SH 6/US 281 from I-20 to SH 220 – 61.7 miles.
- US 87 from Big Spring to Sterling City – 38.5 miles.
Ms. Dowell reported that this is 348.3 miles identified for designation.

Chair Emmett then asked the TxFAC to consider US 60 from Amarillo to the Texas-New Mexico state line, which would be 68.8 miles. Chair Emmett asked if Lubbock area corridors have been considered in the miles available. Ms. Mays stated that they have not. Chair Emmett recommended the inclusion of 108.6 miles of US 84.

Ms. Pifer stated that US 281 from Falfurrias to Alice was mentioned for consideration, which totals 29.6 miles.

Ms. Mays asked if US 87 from Lamesa to Midland for 56.8 miles would be included in the designation. Ms. Dowell stated that this was a corridor available for designation.

Ms. Dowell reported that the TxFAC members included US 59 from Laredo to SH 16, which would be 55.8 miles considered for designation.

Chair Emmett said that US 62 from El Paso to the Texas-New Mexico State line would receive the remaining mileage for the Critical Rural Freight Network corridor designation.

See Table 1 and corresponding map which summarizes the corridors TxFAC adopted for the Critical Rural Freight Network.

### Table 1  Critical Freight Corridors Adopted by Texas Freight Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US 290 from Brenham to Houston</td>
<td>Bryan and Houston</td>
<td>34.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>US 59 from El Campo to Rosenberg</td>
<td>Houston and Yoakum</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>US 59 from Lufkin to Livingston</td>
<td>Lufkin</td>
<td>38.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH 288 from Angleton to Houston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US 181 from Sinton to Gregory</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SH 6/US 190 from Bryan to Waco</td>
<td>Waco and Bryan</td>
<td>73.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>US 281 from Falfurrias to Alice, Alice to I-37</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>83.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>US 380 from Decatur to Denton</td>
<td>Fort Worth and Dallas</td>
<td>22.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>US 59 from Laredo to SH 16</td>
<td>Laredo</td>
<td>55.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SH 6 from I-20 to Hico</td>
<td>Brownwood and Fort Worth</td>
<td>56.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>US 84 from Lubbock to I-20</td>
<td>Lubbock and Abilene</td>
<td>107.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>US 60 from TX-NM State Line to I-27</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>77.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>US 87 from Big Spring to Sterling City</td>
<td>Abilene and San Angelo</td>
<td>35.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SH 349 from Midland to Lamesa</td>
<td>Odessa and Lubbock</td>
<td>46.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>US 62 from FM 1437 to TX-NM State Line</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>49.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>745.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Safety on the Texas Highway Freight Network (THFN)

Sondra Johnson, with TxDOT, introduced the Texas Highway Freight Network Safety Analysis. Ms. Mays underscored that safety is integral to TxDOT’s mission to eliminate crashes and deaths on the transportation network. She then called upon Ms. Welch to provide an overview of findings and potential case studies for consideration.

Ms. Welch covered the data sources, limitations, and definitions used in the analysis. She covered the highest crash fatalities by year, noting that 2021 was the second-highest in fatalities (4,485) in the past 40 years, behind 1981 with 4,701 fatalities. She shared that Texas fatalities increased in 2021 by 15 percent from the previous calendar year, with a 33 percent increase in fatalities in work zones.

Ms. Welch stated that truck-involved crashes occur primarily in urban areas, but fatal truck-involved crashes are generally as likely to occur in urban or rural areas.

Ms. Welch contrasted the location of all motor vehicle crashes versus truck-involved crashes. She noted a lower relative density of truck-related crashes in Austin and the Rio
Grande Valley compared to other urbanized areas. She also highlighted that in East Texas, truck-related crash densities are higher along SH 6 and I-69.

In Figure 2. Ms. Welch discussed truck-related crashes by roadway functional classification for 2015 to 2020. She covered key contributing factors in these truck-related crashes for the same time period in Figures 3, 4, and 5. She noted that how the data is captured depends on the safety officer conducting the documentation, and that there may be some discrepancies with the data as a result.

![Truck-Involved Crashes by Functional Classification, 2015-2020](image)

**Figure 2. Slide 32 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.**
### Key Contributing Factor in Truck-Involved Crashes, 2015-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Factors Statewide Sorted by Fatal Crash Count</th>
<th>Top 10 in MPO Areas</th>
<th>Top 10 in Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed To Control Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed To Drive In Single Lane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Side - Not Passing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Failed To Yield Right Of Way To Vehicle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Influence - Alcohol</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard Stop Sign Or Light</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled In Traffic Lane</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 3. Slide 33 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.**

### Key Contributing Factor in Truck-Involved Crashes, 2015-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Urban/MPO Areas</th>
<th>Number of Units Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed To Control Speed</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed To Drive In Single Lane</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Failed To Yield Right Of Way To Vehicle</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Influence - Alcohol</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled In Traffic Lane</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Side - Not Passing</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed To Yield Right Of Way - Stop Sign</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard Stop And Go Signal</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Slide 34 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.**
Chair Emmett asked the difference between “failed to control speed” and “unsafe speed.” Ms. Welch explained that “failed to control speed” is failure to stop, as an example, and an “unsafe speed” example would be driving at a speed that is not safe for roadway conditions (e.g., during bad weather).

Clint Schelbitzki, with Union Pacific Railroad, noted that low clearance bridges or trailers could cause issues for the rail industry with damaged tracks or rail paneling.

Ms. Dowell then relayed a question that was asked in the chat: when doing analysis, what percentage of crashes determined who was at fault. Ms. Welch noted that the crash analysis looked at the incident itself and she realizes other entities could consider additional context.

Commissioner New stated that in the 2021 legislative session, the legislature looked at the Crash Record Information System (CRIS) data.

Clark Greer, with Coca-Cola, asked who was responsible for the various components of the dataset, suggesting this could help inform what the trucking industry can do to look at the data to create a more accurate picture. Commissioner New said that he could get this information for the TxFAC.

Commissioner New also noted that the definition of “truck” is broader than just freight vehicles. Ms. Welch then covered the definitions used as part of the training of safety officers in Texas.

Chair Emmett asked if triple trailers were documented in the CRIS data. Ms. Welch stated that there were 171 reported triple-trailer-related crashes in the data. In Figure 6, Ms.
Welch covered who is generally involved in the truck-involved crashes. Ms. Welch then showed the geographical location of these types of crashes in Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truck-Involved Crashes Involving:</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Percent Fatal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Vehicles</td>
<td>120,529</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Trucks</td>
<td>11,110</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parked Truck (struck by any vehicle)</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Slide 36 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.

- Majority of truck-involved crashes (75%)  
- Greatest concentrations in large urbanized areas  
- Interstate corridors show most frequent occurrence:  
  - I-35  
  - I-45  
  - I-20  
  - I-10

Figure 7. Slide 37 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.
Figure 8. Slide 38 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.

- Truck-Involved Crashes Involving Pedestrians, 2015-2020
  - Account for less than one percent of truck-involved crashes
  - More than a third of the pedestrian-truck crashes were fatal
  - Most commonly reported in Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston areas

Figure 9. Slide 39 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.

- Truck-Involved Crashes Involving Cyclists, 2015-2020
  - Infrequent event, averaging only 12 per year reported
  - 16% were fatal
  - Most commonly reported in the Houston area
Crashes Involving Parked Trucks, 2015-2020

- Account for less than 2% of truck-involved crashes
- In cities and on major corridors:
  - I-35, I-45, I-10, I-20, I-40
- Compared to Statewide Truck Parking Study analysis:
  - 2013-2017: 463/year
  - 2015-2020: 505/year

Figure 10. Slide 40 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.
Ms. Welch then covered the at-grade crossing crash data, which identified 38 high-risk crossings primarily in large metropolitan areas. Chair Emmett asked if “non-casualty” meant no one was injured. Mr. Schelbitzki stated that a bridge or crossing strike does not necessarily mean an injury, but structural harm may still occur.

Ms. Welch then covered the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) factors, including:

- Distracted driving.
- Impaired driving.
- Intersection-related.
- Older drivers.
- Speeding.
- Roadway departures.
- Pedestrian.

Chair Emmett asked what is considered an “older driver.” Ms. Welch responded that an older driver is considered 65 years or older.

Ms. Dowell then covered the Freight Crash Hotspot Case Studies candidates, which included the following criteria:

- Average annual daily truck traffic (AADTT).
- AADTT percentage.
- Truck Crash Rate (crashes per 100 million vehicle-miles of travel).
- Number of Truck-Involved Crashes.
- Number of Serious Injury Truck-Involved Crashes.
- TxDOT District.
- TTI Truck Delay Rank.

Ms. Dowell noted that some of the case studies for consideration would be provided to the TxFAC for their review and comment after the meeting in preparation for the July 2020 TxFAC meeting. She offered an example of FM 1472/Mines Road in Laredo as a potential case study, referenced in Figure 11.
Ms. Pifer stated that this presentation and the case studies would be provided after the TxFAC meeting.

### 5. Initial Needs Assessment

Ms. Dowell then introduced the initial needs assessment for the multimodal freight network. She noted seven categories as part of the needs assessment, including:

- Mobility and Reliability.
- Safety.
- Freight Asset Utilization and Preservation.
- Freight Network Design.
- Technology.
- Connectivity Equity.
- Resiliency.

Ms. Dowell covered the additional factors within each category above, included in Figures 12 and 13.
Figure 12. Slide 58 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.

Figure 13. Slide 59 from the TxFAC Meeting #32 Presentation.
Ms. Dowell noted that the needs identified in the initial assessment would be made available in an interactive map to provide additional context and where funding may be needed or lacking. Ms. Pifer noted that the categorization of high, medium, and low needs only reflects the distribution of the identified needs across the freight network.

Ms. Dowell then covered the next steps of the needs assessment, which included refining the needs assessment process, finalizing the needs, evaluating the highway modes, identifying industry-level needs, and vetting the needs with the supply chain working group to then inform a final needs assessment.

Chair Emmett stated that safety and needs assessment is critical for the TxFAC’s work. He also noted that equity is important to the U.S. Department of Transportation. The TxFAC’s work must be a product that the Texas Transportation Commission can accept and be proud of.

### 6. Wrap Up Discussion

Ms. Mays stated that she appreciated the work of the TxFAC in identifying the Critical Rural Freight Network corridors. Ms. Pifer then covered the upcoming project schedule, working group meetings, and next steps. She noted that the next TxFAC meeting would be in-person on July 20, 2022.

### 7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.