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# Meeting Notes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Introduction and Overview | Presenter: | Dianne Kresich |

#### Discussion:

Dianne called the meeting to order, called roll and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | February 8, 2017 TAC Meeting Notes | Presenter: | Dianne Kresich |

#### Discussion:

Dianne asked if TAC members had any comments or changes to the meeting notes transmitted in advance of the meeting, and none did.

#### Conclusions:

The TAC agreed to adopt the meeting notes for the February 8, 2017 meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Chapter 1 Deliverables Update | Presenter: | Allan Rutter |

#### Discussion:

#### Allan described the process by which the Chapter 1 draft and ADOT comments had been revised in accordance with comments and suggestions from the February 8 TAC meeting. The TAC again stressed that report deliverables refer to this project as a “study,” not as “research” or a “research project,” after a discussion of the contract and funding being research-related. The TAC ultimately believed that the stakeholders for this project, public and private, would be more receptive to participation in and acceptance of the study if the project was more practically oriented. Allan reviewed a new corridor map for use in the Work Plan and Chapter 1. Caroline Mays requested more time to submit edits on Chapter 1, and noted that TxDOT was including Steve Linhart as a co-member of the TAC, to participate in TAC proceedings when Caroline could not. Reza Karimvand requested that the Project Team highlight possible implementation items that states could consider as interim deliverables are submitted.

#### Conclusions:

TAC members were asked to submit any further comments or edits to Dianne so that they could be incorporated into a revised Chapter 1.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Submit comments or edits on Chapter 1 submission
 | TAC members | 3/31/17 |
| * Submit revised Chapter 1 incorporating comments
 | Allan Rutter | 4/7/17 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Task 3 Product Submission Review  | Presenters: | Allan Rutter, Dan Middleton |

#### Discussion:

Task 3, Information Search and Synthesis, involved the collection of information on the latest technologies, innovations, and successful practices in developing common systems requirements and interoperable systems across jurisdictional boundaries (e.g., local, regional, state, interstate) for commercial vehicle credentialing and truck traveler information systems. Allan explained that the draft report submitted was more detailed than the final chapter will be, but was intended to generate a conversation with TAC members about what subjects to highlight in a final, shorter, more accessible chapter.

Dan Middleton led a discussion of the contents of the review, summarizing the elements for consideration in a connected freight corridor. Caroline Mays suggested that the review or inventory should include information on operational issues such as freight-related design standards and actual bridge heights. Paul Sittig discussed the need for information on capacity limitations, particularly at state boundaries, focusing on overall capacity of the entire corridor (numbers of lanes). Matt Hansen voiced a concern that the descriptions of possible alternatives not appear to be too assertive or positive, that the text might appear to be too advocacy-based. Instead, he suggested that discussions of possible alternatives include some discussion of costs or institutional issues associated with implementation. Dan reviewed a summary powerpoint slide summarizing the overall elements in the Task 3 report and asked TAC members to offer feedback on which subjects to emphasize and decrease when the report is edited.

#### Conclusions:

TAC members were asked to submit feedback on Task 3 subjects to Dianne so that they could be incorporated into a revised Chapter 2.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * TAC Members will submit feedback to Dianne.
 | TAC Members | 4/717 |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Task 2 and 4 Update  | Presenters: | Allan Rutter |

#### Discussion:

#### Allan reviewed Task 2 activities and asked TAC members to update Stakeholder Inventory, particularly using state freight plan stakeholder lists.

#### Conclusions:

TAC members were asked to submit feedback on Task 3 subjects to Dianne so that they could be incorporated into a revised Chapter 2.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * TAC Members will send Allan contact information for obtaining freight plan stakeholder lists.
 | TAC Members | 4/717 |
| * TAC Members will identify location and contact information for possible stakeholder workshops.
 | TAC Members | 4/717 |

# Next Steps

Comments and suggestions for the Task 3 materials will be included in Chapter 2 (which also combines material from Task 2). We will schedule a TAC meeting in April to discuss Task 2 deliverables, revisions of the Task 3 materials, and plans for Task 4 workshops.